

The Prisoner Learning Alliance (PLA) very much welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation on the Prisons Strategy White Paper. The PLA is a network of organisations and individuals with an interest and expertise in prison education. We use our collective voice to advocate for improvements and we hold the government to account by monitoring prison education. We have over 200 members across the sector, including education providers, professional bodies, people with lived experience, teachers, and voluntary sector organisations. Prisoners' Education Trust provides our secretariat.

This submission has been written after receiving written responses from, and having conversations and focus groups with members, including people with lived experience of prison and prison tutors. While we have sought members' views on this consultation and gathered information through ongoing engagement, this submission does not necessarily represent the views of any individual or organisational member of the PLA.

1) Do you agree that these are the right long-term ambitions for the prison estate?

We agree that the safety of people living and working in prisons has to be the primary concern. But the reality is that we cannot create safe and purposeful prisons without reducing the prison population to a manageable size. The system is managing a population too large for the available accommodation and infrastructure and this impacts on every area of prison life, including the delivery of education.

Activity spaces in prisons are woefully insufficient. Even before Covid, far too many people could not access activities. We cannot provide adequate classroom, workshop, and training space without reducing the population in our most crowded prisons and we do not have sufficient staff to implement the changes the White Paper strives for.

The PLA is very keen to see a 'step change' in prison education. However, for this to happen the right infrastructure, sufficient investment and effective implementation processes need to be in place. There needs to be a far more strategic, coordinated approach to education. Currently, despite the best efforts of most prison and education staff, insufficient resources, the commissioning process, and understaffing make a whole system approach to education impossible. The PLA would like the MoJ to conduct and publish an audit of current capacity of education and classroom spaces, training, workshop and workspaces, and teacher, trainer, and instructor hours, to evaluate how much current provision there really is. This could form the basis for future commissioning and contracting.

We are concerned to note that, notwithstanding the changes in the way data is collected and monitored, participation in education appears to have fallen. In 2013/14, over 95,000 learners were recorded as participating in prison education. The latest figure we have for 2019/20, which is an increase from the previous few years, is just over 67,600. We do not see numbers of participants as the key factor in delivering or monitoring the quality of prison education, however it would be useful to understand this decline in participation.

Evidence from people in prison shows repeatedly that purposeful activity makes a real difference to their quality of life inside. People need activities that offer a sense of meaning, a sense of progress, and a way of assisting them to cope with the austerity and mundanity of prison life. There is also clear evidence that being engaged in purposeful activity can reduce

violence and self-harm. The Prison Strategy White Paper (PSWP) focuses on security and behaviour management as ways of creating safe prisons, but education and purposeful activity are tools that create safer prisons too and should be fundamental to the new regime delivery.

In terms of the long-term ambitions laid out in the PSWP, the key concerns and questions of PLA members are:

What real changes will happen through the new Prison Education Service?

The vision for the Prison Education Service is unclear, and, particularly for education staff, the lack of detail and direction are creating uncertainty and concern about the future. There are very few specific commitments in the White Paper about education. Many of the 'commitments' in the White Paper are already in place or would be if resources allowed.

- The current Prison Education Framework (PEF) contracts already focus on functional and vocational skills, but the challenges of delivering education in prison means that these are not always accessible or achievable.
- The infrastructure is available for personal learning plans, but teachers and other staff do not always have the time to do these, and engagement from learners remains too low. There are many reasons for this but one is that there is some cynicism from learners on whether the plans are deliverable, and a belief that they are designed to support paper trail and audit process, rather than learning.
- The curriculum and progression and neurodiversity coordinator roles are already in place in Accelerator prisons and, prior to the PSWP, there were existing plans to roll these out across the estate. However, comprehensive information about the development of the Accelerator prisons project is not readily available.

The current vision for the PES is far too limited – it has not committed to diversifying the curriculum, offering study at a higher level, rollout of digital technology, apprenticeships and training. All of these are essential if prison leavers are going to be able to access sustainable and decent employment. If the Prison Education Service is to justify its name it needs to be broader, with a wider range offer, and both officers and teachers needs to be supported, and professionalised.

Are there any additional resources and investment for prison education?

It is not clear how much new resource there will be for education, if any. We understand that any further funding will come out of the (up to) £200 million earmarked for reducing reoffending programmes. This also covers prison leavers' accommodation, employment support, substance misuse treatment and early intervention. Significant investment is needed in prison education if it is going to be effective. Funding for prison education must take account of the extra resource needed to ensure levels of engagement and the additional support required by learners in a custodial environment. Prisoners are probably the single largest group where the education system has failed. However, prison education funding has stayed at the same level since 2013 (approx. £129 million). The Treasury had asked the Ministry of Justice to review spending on education services at the end of 2019-20, following a new assessment of the services provided under the PEF and DPS. Nothing has been published and the PLA still hope that the Treasury review will be forthcoming. We would like to see additional funding for education, with clear ringfenced funding streams including the informal curriculum, Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) and for support for people with neurodiverse needs, and also additional resource for the PEF contracts to enable more flexible delivery.

The current system for delivering core education through the PEF contracts is over 'contractualised', bureaucratic, and the current PEF contracts are not fit for purpose. The administrative and monitoring burden on staff and teachers is huge. The pressure of time spent on management, monitoring and reporting risks detracts from time and resources that are needed to support a whole-prison education culture. Furthermore, competition means that good practice and resources are infrequently shared.

The roll-out of digital technology

Prisoner Learning Alliance members are extremely concerned about the lack of progress in digital technology. The government has made a commitment to in-cell technology in all closed prisons, but the published plans are for 15 prisons only. It is disappointing that the roll-out of digital technology does not go far enough, and is not happening fast enough.

The Covid lockdown demonstrated that technology is essential – and that secure intranet and restricted internet can be provided safely in prisons. The in-cell capability and infrastructure are available in many prisons that already have in-cell telephony. In these sites, in-cell technology could be brought online quickly, if devices were provided and it would be relatively quick and inexpensive to do this. There are no excuses for not rolling out in-cell technology to the prisons that are already wired. The numbers of people in prison with access to in-cell technology remains far too low. Currently, access to digital technology is too dependent on Governors individual focus and while there are a number of positive initiatives around the estate, this is not coordinated and the systems are not compatible with each other. A strategic approach with linked operating systems would save resources and ensure consistency and equality of access.

The focus on getting prison leavers into jobs is not going to be effective if people cannot access in-cell technology and obtain essential digital skills. The vast majority of jobs require some digital capability. Without this, people will continue to leave prisons without the skills they need to compete in the job market. If the government is serious about getting prison leavers into work, in-cell digital technology needs to be resourced and prioritised nationally.

2) Do you agree these are the guiding principles around which the future regime should be designed? 3) How should we develop outcomes frameworks to ensure our Future Regime Design ambition is realised?

There is a real appetite among prison educators (PEF contracted teachers and others) to work differently and to support prisons to be safer and more productive. But there is a concern that the current plans are unrealistic. The numbers of prison officers are falling, despite substantial efforts to recruit, and we need more prison officers if we are going to support regime change. During lockdown, prisoners have lost out on much support and activity that could have been provided by PEF providers and by external and voluntary organisations. There is a willingness to get back to working in prisons, but the right structures and support from prison staff is necessary to make that happen.

The stated guiding principles for the future regime design are a tailored approach to meet diverse needs, a regime that supports safety and embedding technology. Prisons cannot provide personalised and bespoke opportunities and activities for prisoners without harnessing the capacity and capability of education teams, the voluntary sector and others. There are many ways technology could support a reformed regime, but as outlined above, progress in this area is too slow. Video links are being used for family visits, and health appointments and the plan to extend these for job interviews are welcome – but they could also be used to deliver education with external bodies and to use local colleges and universities to support this.

Current challenges with new regime activities – in cell study and wing activities

PLA members have particular concerns about the increase of in-cell learning and self-study. While we understand that the demands on the prison estate mean that in-cell learning is going to continue, this must never be used as an excuse to keep people locked in their cells for longer. We are also concerned that self-study does not encourage learners to develop transferable skills, such as communication, teamwork, problem solving, developing initiative, planning and organising, and decision making which are essential for employability and preferred by many employers over qualifications. Self-study is most effective if resourced adequately and taking place in a decent environment. This could be in a group setting, i.e., in a library, classroom or on a wing. Any in-cell learning must be progressive, curriculum based, and have the opportunity for interaction and real time support, e.g., peer support, or tutor support via phone.

HMIP and Ofsted have identified that 'Remote learning in prisons was particularly challenging for the high proportion of prisoners with low levels of literacy or SEND, or who speak English as an additional language.'¹ As in-cell learning continues, the Prison Service must assess any potential for disadvantage on grounds of disability and nationality.

There is a minority of prisoners that are able to learn alone without support, and for individual study to work, additional resources must be found. Distance learning is not always adequately supported, often because it is not included in PEF contracts. While some in-cell materials are excellent quality, many currently used are poor and do not have a good understanding of learning needs. There needs to be more work on developing high-quality materials and supporting staff to do this. Collaboration between prisons and providers would be beneficial.

Although PLA members are aware of some good creative practice in wing activities, many prisons do not have adequate space for wing activities to happen safely. These initiatives can also need a lot of operational support, and low officer numbers can make this challenging. Educators would welcome the support of prison officers in delivering wing activity, but officers are often called away to deal with other operational needs. There are many voluntary and other organisations that could offer cultural and artistic projects on wings, but these needs adequate safety measures to be in place. Wing activity and informal education opportunities can also be positive for those who have been traumatised by their experience of formal education.

Educators would like to move away from three-hour classes to a schedule that has shorter lessons and is more aligned with further education in the community. Changing the core day so that prisons can utilise classroom and workshop space more effectively, rather than being empty for considerable periods over lunch, would also be welcome. The current review of regimes is an opportunity for reform that brings in evening and weekend activities as standard practice. A culture of learning and creative opportunities outside of the core day would better replicate the community.

Outcome frameworks for future regime design should include feedback from prisoners, officers, tutors, and others delivering services in the prison. Alongside quantitative data such as time out of cell, there should be a method of evaluating how much people value the activity that they have participated in, their sense of distance travelled and how well their needs have been met. Prisoners should be asked to rate the quality of the activities and whether they think it will have any impact on their future life chances. Changes in regime

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/launching-our-prison-education-review>

should be analysed to see any impact on reducing violence and self-harm. Prisons should be assessed on the variety of activities they can deliver and the strength of their partnership working. It would be helpful if prison staff consulted their provider organisations more, and collaborated with them to set priority outcomes for services.

4) Do you agree with our long-term priorities for making prison safer? 5) Where can we go further?

There needs to be a culture shift in prisons, to improve the understanding of the root causes of violence and self-harm, and to understand the impact that purposeful activity can have on reducing this. Teachers and other educators should be part of behaviour management strategies, and operational and education departments should work closer together to support people with complex needs.

While mental health difficulties can impact upon a prisoner's motivation to engage with education, providing the right education can have a positive effect on mental health outcomes and mental illness. A BIS funded study² found that the benefits of education are greater for mid-level qualifications, for women, and for individuals at greater risk of mental illness. Research³ has also found that arts projects had positive effects on people in prison (80% men and 83% women), including improved behaviour and improved mental health. It also shows significant gains in self-confidence and self-esteem.

Literacy is also a key factor in self-development and being able to cope with prison life. Learning to read benefits people by helping them to understand what is going on around them, such as navigating signs, forms, applications, and paperwork. It also enables communication with the outside world, including family and friends, which can be a protective factor. We are pleased to note that there will be funding allocated for innovative literacy projects – we hope this will draw on the good practice and expertise currently available in both the voluntary sector and PEF provision, and expand on these.

6) Where can we go further to give prisoners the skills to secure stable employment on release?

Governors need additional resource to be able to make links with employers. There is interest from employers in prison industries but workshops need further funding if they are going to be industry standard and Governors need expertise to develop prison training to meet local employment need. Links with local employers often depend on individual learners or staff using their own initiative.

Apprenticeships were a commitment in the MoJ's Education and Employment Strategy in 2016, but there has been almost no progress on this in the last five years. This is a missed opportunity for individuals, for employers who cannot recruit due to labour shortages, and for our economy and society as a whole. Release on Temporary License (ROTL) is woefully underused, and particularly so for education and training purposes. Links with apprenticeship and traineeship providers in the community need to be established.

The White Paper is interested in how 'ban the box' schemes could be enhanced with employers, but the real structural change that is needed is reform of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (ROA). This Act was passed in 1974 when sentence lengths were shorter, and the sentencing framework was very different. Our rehabilitative periods remain some of

² BIS: Chevalier and Feinstein (2005)

<https://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/CEE/ceedp71.pdf>

³ Dept. BIS, 2013

the most punitive worldwide, and lengthy or indefinite disclosure periods prevent people moving forward. There have been a few welcome changes and amendments to this Act, but these are piecemeal, and it is well overdue a whole-scale reform.

7) What are the main issues and barriers that prison leavers face when they are making a claim for Universal Credit? What impact do they have on prison leavers?

Prison leavers being unable to access benefits creates hardship and increases the risk of reoffending. The technology and processes should be in place to enable the majority of prison leavers to obtain ID, bank accounts and an email account prior to release. They should be facilitated to make an application for Universal Credit prior to release, with the money going into their account on the day they leave prison. Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) staff should be embedded in prisons to ensure this happens systematically.

8) Should we take a legislative approach, as described above, for those at risk of reoffending who would otherwise be released on a Friday? If so, how should we structure this approach?

The evidence from resettlement agencies, including a number of PLA members, is very clear. Resettlement workers face a race against time to secure housing, prescriptions and other services for people released on a Friday. Over a third of people are released from prison on a Friday. Changing release dates for people on Home Detention Curfew would assist with this and using discretionary powers to avoid other releases on Fridays would be beneficial.

9) Do you agree with the 'guiding principles and priority outcomes and areas of focus we have identified for developing the Resettlement Passports? 10. How can we implement the Resettlement Passport approach in a way which is most effective for prison leavers and practitioners?

It would be useful to know whether or how Resettlement Passports will link into Sentence Plans and Personal Learning Plans. In particular, it would be useful if prison leavers were able to access their qualification certificates, and not just a record of these, on release. Although the focus on resettlement is welcome, there is not enough focus on transitions into community education post prison and partnership working.

Resettlement planning across the estate should be reviewed to ensure learning from where it is most effective. Following the reunification of the National Probation Service and the tender of resettlement contracts, new processes are still being implemented. Currently, people in prison can have multiple plans from different departments and organisations, and it is still unclear how the Resettlement Passports will differ to the current systems in place. Whatever format is used, they will need to be accessible electronically if they are to be useful on release and once in the community.

11) How should we encourage prisoners and prison leavers to comply with conditions and expectations in return for support provided, and what consequences should be in place if they do not?

Attendance and engagement are different. The contractual focus on getting people into classrooms does not always mean the right people are going to the right classes. Allocation processes should be completely reformed and take account of personal preference and pathways wherever possible.

It is more constructive to encourage engagement rather than enforce compliance. In our experience the majority of people in prison are keen to engage in meaningful opportunities,

and courses and workshops that are seen as offering relevant skills and future opportunity will be oversubscribed.

Probation teams should have access to the right advice and guidance services so that prison leavers can explore their options, which may not always be about employment, but may be about studying or training that can lead to more suitable and sustainable employment.

Support post release should also not be dependent on compliance, but on need. Intervening early to offer additional help when someone is showing signs of struggling or being under pressure is the right approach. This is dependent on significant services being available in the community but will support successful resettlement.

12) Do you agree with our long-term vision?

Discussions with our members highlight their concern that the current contracts make the creative, holistic, pastoral, and social elements of education more difficult to provide. PLA members are very clear that the current curriculum does not meet learners' needs. We need a wider range of content delivered in classes, as well as through individual and distance learning and, ideally, online. Functional skills could be taught in a more practical and accessible way, and vocational training, which incorporates functional skills, is strongly supported. Peer-to-peer projects are helpful for people who feel less comfortable in formal education settings. Despite the recommendations in the Coates Report⁴, there is still too little variety in course provision, and qualifications at level 3 or above are scarce.

While getting a job is essential for many, national education policy needs to recognise that employability is not a priority for all, or even a possibility for some prisoners. Concerningly, there are growing numbers of people who are not realistically expected to be released, growing numbers of elderly prisoners, and people serving longer sentences. Education options that enrich lives, build engagement, and develop social and cultural capital are more essential than ever.

13) Where can we go further in turning prisoners away from crime?

Education is key in both reducing reoffending and improving employment chances. Despite this, education is not given a high enough priority in prisons. Research⁵ conducted regarding prison learners showed they were significantly more likely to be in P45 employment than non-learners one year from release. It also found that people who had participated in education were significantly less likely to reoffend within 12 months of release (by 7.5% points). This study linked administrative data from BIS, MoJ, DWP and HM Revenue and Customs to estimate the impact of prisoner learning on post-release re-offending, employment and learning outcomes. These findings are reinforced by the most comprehensive international study, the Rand report⁶, which found prison education improves chances of not returning to prison and reduces risk of reoffending by 13%.

Currently, no data is collected on whether prison leavers go on to any training or education. Resettlement data that is currently collated from the National Probation Service (NPS) on

⁴https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/524013/education-review-report.pdf

⁵https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/708156/evaluation-of-prisoner-learning-initial-impacts-report.pdf

ation-of-prisoner-learning-initial-impacts-report.pdf

⁶ https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR266.html#:~:text=Correctional%20education%20improves%20inmates'%20chances,recidivating%20of%2013%20percentage%20points.

employment outcomes should be expanded to include educational and training outcomes, and MoJ needs to link up more with HMRC and other government departments to track who gets jobs.

14) and 15) Do you agree with our long-term vision for women's prisons? What more could we do to support women in custody, with particular reference to meeting the needs of women prisoners with protected characteristics?

PLA members support a reduction in the women's prison population, and in particular a reduction in the number of women serving short sentences. We support the expansion of the open estate for women, many of whom can be held in low secure conditions. We hope this will lead to an increase in the numbers of women able to access ROTL, not just in the new open estate sites, but in all women's prisons. We would like to see clear links between prisons and local colleges, universities, and apprenticeship providers. Our recent submission to the Justice Committee Inquiry on women called for a whole person approach to education for women in prison. This would include developing family learning opportunities, trauma-informed approaches, increased use of technology, and supporting additional learning needs more effectively. As with all prisoners, there is a pressing need to understand the links between education and employment and how this aids progression routes to aid successful resettlement.

16) Are there specific areas of training you think we should be offering prison officers which we do not already? 17) Do you agree that more bespoke recruitment training will enable prison officers to better support the needs of prisoners?

Prison officers do not always understand the importance of education or the impact it can have on reducing reoffending. This needs to be a core part of all new prison officers' training. Our recent research, Hidden Voices, demonstrated that interaction between prison officers and educators is valued and valuable. In some prisons working under lockdown restrictions has encouraged this contact.

While we are pleased that new prison officer training has been extended and is now an apprenticeship, we are concerned that there are no core mandatory modules about education. We are also concerned that there is not enough oversight or quality control of current officer training. In busy prisons, supervisors do not always have enough time to train new officers.

The shortage of prison officers is immobilising the Prison Service. and the recruitment plans do not go far enough. Significant staffing shortages undermine rehabilitation activities, including access to education. Investment is needed to improve prison officers' pay and conditions and incentivise people to join. The plans in the PSWP cannot be realised without a new approach.

Moreover, the MoJ needs to develop a strategy to recruit, retain and develop prison teachers – this should not just be the provider's responsibility. The PLA believes that we are potentially facing a workforce crisis in prison teaching. The combination of an aging workforce, along with people leaving due to elevated levels of stress and poor pay and conditions, is a significant concern. The pipeline of prison teachers needs to be developed, and the MoJ should lead on this work, rather than education providers, who may change over time. Teachers in prison receive lower wages than in the community, and there are concerns about the lack of professionalisation of prison teaching as a career. There is little investment in training and promotion. The uncertainty of the delivery plan changing yearly means that educators do not know if they'll be employed the following year, and this creates

uncertainty and a reluctance to join the prison education workforce. Prison tutors' pay and conditions should be equivalent to further education staff in the community.

As with prison officers, it is not just the number that is important, but the level of experience and expertise. We know that many new prison officers and teachers are excellent, but we also know that familiarity with the role can be needed to navigate the complexities of a prison environment. Prison teachers do not always get a full prison induction, or training around jail craft. Many teachers would welcome opportunities for training on safeguarding, recognising grooming and dealing with challenging behaviour.

What other cohorts should we be focusing on and how can we do this in a manner that advances equality of opportunity for offenders with protected characteristics?

While there are pockets of good practice, we are far from a whole prison approach to supporting neurodiversity. There are multiple problems with screening and assessment in prisons at the moment. Initial screening does not always pick up needs, and it can also be difficult for people who have entered prison and may be experiencing 'entry shock' to disclose their needs. Some people have not previously received diagnoses of their neurodiverse conditions or mental health needs, and these may not be identified. There are multiple difficulties with the consistency of education screening.

The Prison Service should consider whether assessment of literacy and numeracy could take place at a later stage and trial this, to see whether it is effective and workable. Shared systems do not always work on transfer. Until prisons use the same tools in the same way and to the same standard, multiple assessments and duplicate screenings are going to happen. This is a waste of resources, but it also undermines learners' confidence in the system.

Learning support needs to be done outside the classroom too. There is not enough specialist support in prisons, and some learning support jobs are becoming entirely administrative, because they are tasked with screenings and uploading data, rather than supporting learners. We welcome the development of the new neurodiversity coordinator posts and hope they will be speedily rolled out across the estate.

Other specific cohorts of people that need a distinct approach to education and support include:

- ESOL learners – needs are not always identified and ESOL provision is not always available
- Higher level learners – courses at advanced levels should be standard provision
- Long sentenced/life sentenced learners - currently there is too little provision, although there is a lot of demand
- Older learners – focus on employability may not be as relevant
- People on remand – taught and distance learning courses are rarely available, and this population is growing due to court backlogs

17) Are there any areas where we should extend autonomy for all Governors to support the delivery of improved outcomes?

PLA members are concerned that there does not seem to be a clear framework for Governor autonomy. Governors were not given autonomy to choose their own PEF provider but are expected to monitor the progress of the contract. Although Governors set their yearly annual

delivery plan for the education contractors, there are limits to how much discretion they have.

There are many contractual measures that aim to hold both education providers and Governors accountable for education. While these create an administrative burden, there is little evidence that they improve performance or lead to better outcomes. Governors are expected to assess the quality of education and teaching as part of their management of the education contract. However, we query how realistic this expectation is in addition to Governors' other complex and substantial duties.

Governors need more expert resources and advice if they are to commission and oversee education. We welcome the commitment to bring in education expertise to support Governors and help them to design a curriculum and assess progress. We advocated for this in our 2020 PLA report 'Leadership in Prison Education'⁷, where we highlighted that recruiting from the further education sector could build a new culture, and support commissioning and contract management. The new Education, Work and Skills Specialists must be at a high enough level to have influence in the prison, and there must also be sufficient administrative resource for monitoring.

Monitoring and performance management frameworks must be proportionate. Governors' and education providers' distinct responsibilities must be clear, so that they can be held to account in a more meaningful way. We need measures that are clear about how a prisoner's progression can be assessed. The current contracting system can create tensions between prison staff and providers, and does not support good partnership working. Ultimately, it is learners that are losing out. We do not think that blaming either prisons or providers for poor education performance is helpful when the contracting mechanism is at fault. We would strongly argue against tighter contracts or more control from the centre. We are concerned that the current plans to increase oversight and the monitoring of education will be counterproductive. We believe that this would be even more onerous and detract further from frontline provision. PEF providers and teachers should be given far more flexibility and choice to develop education provision.

Governors should have the autonomy - and the resource - to commission the informal curriculum, including art, cultural, personal, and social development, and sports activities. There should be clear funding streams for these activities, which should not be seen as optional extras. Governors should have more discretion in whether to use grant funding, the DPS or use joint funding partnership arrangements when developing services.

19 How can we further strengthen independent scrutiny of prisons in future?

We are supportive of the plans to strengthen the role of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) and Prisons Inspectorate. It is notable that, while Ofsted often find prison education is not meeting standards, they do not take regulatory action as they do with community providers. Assessments of deficient performance by Ofsted inspectors are often related to problems with allocation and attendance. It would be unfair to hold education providers accountable for poor attendance rates caused by prison officer shortages. Education, like most services in prison, depends on good relationships, leadership, communication, and adequate prison officer staffing.

⁷ <https://prisonerlearningalliance.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/PLA-FETL-Leadership-in-Prison-Education-report.pdf>

The current inspection process is that HMI Prisons liaise with Ofsted and coordinate prison inspections, which Ofsted inspectors attend as part of the whole prison inspection. We believe that Ofsted inspections of prison education could be more aligned with further education inspection in the community, with inspection intervals, follow-up arrangements, and support visits driven by performance data. The Ofsted framework has changed, which we very much welcome, but the Covid pandemic has meant that it is not yet possible to draw conclusions about the impact of the new inspection framework.