Promises, promises: can the female offender strategy deliver?

Abstract

Following a number of postponements, the long awaited and much needed female offender strategy for England and Wales was finally published in June 2018. The strategy reflects the strong agreement across the sector of the need for a ‘distinct’ or ‘gender specific’ approach to respond to the vulnerabilities of women in the Criminal Justice System (CJS). Despite this, the strategy lacks clarity and offers little assurance that the direction taken will result in actual change and positive reform. It is vital that the government’s implementation of the female offender strategy provides and demonstrates a genuine commitment to appropriate provision for females in the CJS through ring-fenced permanent funding as well as top-down accountability.
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Looking to evidence: a shared vision for reform

‘There can be few topics that have been so exhaustively researched to such little practical effect as the plight of women in the criminal justice system’ (Corston, 2007: 16)

As this quotation from Baroness Jean Corston indicates, there is a long standing and rich body of literature citing similar and overlying concerns, struggles and remedies for women in the CJS, which has come to little or no avail (Carlen, 1985, 2002; Gelsthorpe and Morris, 2002; Worrall and Gelsthorpe, 2009). Unfortunately these sentiments shared over a decade ago are still as relevant today (Women in Prison (WiP), 2017). Many have also argued that the overuse of short sentences for non-violent female offenders, be that on sentence or remand, serve little purpose, especially when removing women from the community (and importantly often from their children) for a short period of time (Baldwin and Epstein, 2017; Masson, 2014; forthcoming). This has continued despite repeated calls for better use of ‘alternatives’, for example, most recently the current Secretary of State for Justice, David Gauke, acknowledged how ‘diversion, restorative justice and community sentences continue to be underused’ (The Times, May 2018).

Women constitute a minority group in the CJS, representing just 5 per cent of the prison population in England and Wales (Ministry of Justice (MoJ), 2018a), but it is widely agreed that they enter the CJS with multiple and complex needs (Corston, 2007; Gelthorpe et al., 2007; Hedderman et al, 2008). This is often owing to the adversities they have experienced before custody, characterised by poor education, unstable housing, poverty, mental health and substance abuse (Burgess and Flynn, 2013; Prison Reform Trust (PRT), 2017a; Williams et al., 2012). Many also report having been victims of both physical and sexual abuse (PRT,
Additionally, many live with, or are primary caregivers of children prior to their imprisonment (Baldwin, 2015; Booth, 2017a, 2017b; Caddle and Crisp, 1997; Masson, 2014; forthcoming; PRT, 2015). It is these vulnerabilities that accompany women into the CJS that led Corston (2007:16) to articulate that ‘equal treatment of men and women does not result in equal outcomes’. Frustrations over a clear strategy stems partly from the embarrassment of riches with regards to recommendations for better approaches to address the level of unmet need for female offenders (for example, Baldwin, 2015; Carlen, 1985; Corston, 2007; PRTa, 2017; WiP, 2017; Worrall, 2003; Worrall and Gelsthorpe, 2009). For over forty years (with a particular momentum in the last decade) we have seen calls for reform and recommendations which are predominately concurrent, coming from all corners of the sector (i.e. academe, international legislation, reform organisations and charities), as well as political parties and agencies.

Looking to the government; promises and postponements

Echoing the evidence, successive governments have repeatedly drawn upon the concept of a ‘distinct approach’ for women (House of Commons, 2017; House of Commons Justice Committee 2013; MoJ, 2012), acknowledging that women have different vulnerabilities and needs. Despite this repeated rhetoric, there has been very little change in relation to the delivery of policy and practice for women offenders. Unfortunately, when change has come, it has not always been positive. For instance, concerns voiced by academics and practitioners about the potential for increased harm in relation to female law breakers due to ‘Transforming Rehabilitation’ (TR), have sadly become a reality (Crook, 2016; Anniston and Brayford, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2013; PRT, 2013). The number of women under supervision recalled to prison has more than doubled post TR; with 1,458 women recalled in the year leading up to June 2017 (PRTa, 2017). The landscape for many women post TR is bleak (Trebilcock and Dockley, 2015) and remains uncertain in light of the recently announced reorganisation of probation services (MoJ, 2018c). The reorganisation is clear recognition that ‘fundamental reform is needed’ (Russell Webster, 2018). Evidence also suggests that women’s centres have the ability to support women involved in the CJS in a more holistic way than other sentences (Howard League for Penal Reform, 2016; Anniston et al, 2018). However, as a result of TR ‘the majority have been hampered by instability due to short-term funding, often relying on a patchwork of support from the Ministry of Justice, local probation, charities and health’ (All Party Parliamentary Group, 2016:2).

We acknowledge that there has been positive change in the approach taken by some justice agencies, such as HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP, 2014), who have created gender-specific “expectations” for the treatment of women in prison. However, due to the absence of an overarching strategic vision it is uncertain how elsewhere this ‘distinct approach’ is integrated into practical solutions and support for women. This is especially the case in light of unstable budgets throughout the CJS (Ford, 2017). In addition, despite multi-party support for the vast majority of the 43 recommendations in Corston’s (2007) seminal review, WiP (2017:27)
recently concluded that ‘we have seen a stagnation and loss of momentum in fully implementing the Corston report’s recommendations in recent years’. The Farmer Review (2017) correctly identifies the importance of positive developments in relation to the role of the family in rehabilitation, and the need for criminal justice agencies to support families in this role. However, it is important to note that the Farmer Review was unapologetically concerned with male law breakers and ignores how connotations of family have different implications for women.

Figure 1: Timeline leading up to the publication of the Female Offender Strategy (2016 – 2018)

The above timeline demonstrates the promises and postponements leading up to the publication of the female offender strategy as well as the variable political and social context in Britain. The reduced attention on women affected by the CJS may have been a result of the political instability that followed both the Brexit referendum and snap general election. Although we welcome the introduction of a women’s lead in HMPPS, in this same short period, there were three different Ministers assuming the role of Secretary of State for Justice, which has inevitably inhibited consistency and a continued vision. Progress cannot be made
when those driving the strategy keep changing. There was indication that some of the delays in publication of the strategy were owing to funding issues which led to an, instruction for the document to be ‘rewritten’ (The Guardian, 2018). This might suggest some backtracking or u-turning of the initial promises or plans that were put forward. Taken together, these events may have impeded the momentum required to release the finalised female offender strategy that was so desperately needed by women affected by the CJS. Consistent political commitment to the development, implementation and evaluation of the reforms is vital for the success of the strategy.

**Looking to the future: can the female offender strategy deliver?**

At a first glance, the female offender strategy (MoJ, 2018b) appears to consolidate many of the recommendations put forward in the plethora of evidence available on women in CJS. Demonstrating this, their strategic priorities seek to reduce the number of women in contact with the CJS, and specifically in prison, and to improve prison conditions. It acknowledges that a whole system, multi-agency approach is necessary to bring about change and suggests that this is achievable through locally-led, partnership-focussed and evidence based working. The strategy outlines plans for a Farmer review focussing on the family ties for women, and the replacement of the Prison Service Order (4800) to a Women’s Policy Framework that will provide guidance for working with women throughout the CJS. To fulfil their commitment, the strategy promises to invest £5 million of cross-Government funding, develop ‘residential women centres’ and reduce the number of women serving short sentences.

However, the strategy (MoJ, 2018b) ought to have clearly outlined the specific pathways, resources and changes to lead to improvements in the current system. In reviewing the strategy, we have identified a number of areas that are cause for concern. Firstly, the tone and language used in certain instances within the strategy is disappointing. For example, the concept of ‘productive citizens’ (p.334) reinforces negative images of women; providing a smoke screen to the wider social context, whilst instead favouring the responsibilisation of the individual. There is also a risk of history repeating itself with ‘women-centred’ and ‘enlightened’ ideologies ‘fail(ing) to deliver equality of justice for women’ (Worrall and Gelsthorpe, 2009: 334). Meanwhile, poorly evidenced assumptions from the male estate regarding intergenerational offending are being regurgitated with little consideration to the application to maternal incarceration. The authors also have concerns that the strategy is vague, for example not providing the mechanics for how it will be operationalised, with ambiguous proposals that strive to be both ‘locally-led’ and ‘partnership-focused’ at a national level (MoJ, 2018b: 7). It provides sound bites of optimism that are unsubstantiated by facts and figures. By way of illustration, although there are plans to develop residential women’s centres in at least five sites across England and Wales, there is no indication of the economic provision to support such ambitions.

One key way to have ensured women would be at the centre of criminal justice policy was to introduce gender-specific sentencing guidelines to better enable women’s diversion from
prison and, where appropriate, from the CJS altogether (Baldwin and Epstein, 2017). This separation would have mirrored that of the youth justice system and facilitated gender appropriate punishments. However, there was a missed opportunity in the strategy where there appears to be an abdication of responsibility with regards to gender-specific guidelines, alongside a reluctance to direct the judiciary to alter their sentencing practices. Another potentially less transformative approach would have been to have adopted best practice from Scotland and have a presumption against short prison sentences (The Criminal Justice and Licensing (Scotland) Act, 2010). This would have increased the use of less financially and emotionally expensive community sentences, suspended sentences and use of women’s centres. Although promising that they are exploring innovative practice from Scotland (for example Scotland’s 218 Centre), it is disappointing that the strategy has failed to definitively adopt such models or a presumption against short sentences. For critics who maintain that ‘alternatives’ are not punitive enough, it is suggested that concerns may be quashed by the use of potentially emotionally draining and challenging restorative justice (RJ) conferences (Masson and Osterman, 2017). We were therefore very surprised to see no mention of RJ in the strategy given previous financial investment and on-going rhetoric which supports this approach, including a recent statement by David Gauke (The Times, May 2018).

However, there were aspects of the strategy that we wholeheartedly embrace. We are thrilled with the current proposal to shelve the development of new women’s prisons in favour of community-based solutions. We sincerely hope that conversations do not return to this matter with any potential change in political or financial climate. We were also pleased to see the proposed revision and expansion of Prison Service Order (PSO) 4800 (National Offender Management Service (NOMS), 2008) to the women’s policy framework. This ought to inform the conditions and treatment of the prison environment as well as the wider criminal justice system. We expect this framework will also show commitment to international guidelines (UN Bangkok Rules, 2010), and the growing evidence-base to ensure that operations in practice are concurrent with the vast knowledge which outlines the challenges faced by women in the CJS (Baldwin, 2018; Booth, 2017a, 2018; Crewe et al, 2018; Masson, 2014; forthcoming). Furthermore, it is encouraging to see the promise of a Farmer review focussing on females and their families affected by the criminal justice system. Within this, we hope to see ‘through the gate’ recognition and support for families affected by maternal imprisonment, with specific guidance and support in relation to rebuilding and reuniting families factored in to post release supervision (Baldwin, 2017; Masson, 2014; forthcoming). However, we urge consideration of the diverse forms of ‘family’ alongside women’s lived experience and their histories that may feature abuse and dysfunctional relationships.

There are many promises within the strategy but we are acutely aware that positive change can only be delivered through on-going financial resources. Therefore, we were utterly dismayed that the original £30million (The Guardian, 2018) that was identified for the female offender strategy has been slashed to £5million, rendering the many promises within the
strategy impossible to deliver. It is especially disconcerting to observe that some of the financial resources needed to make this strategy work are subject to the eventual closure of some women’s prisons. This is problematic because it is unpredictable and fails those currently in the system. Any assurances within the strategy would be more credible through permanent, ring-fenced funding and resource-provision. Initiatives, like women’s centres and ‘through the gate’ support, need the space and support to thrive; this is not possible with unstable, patchwork provision.

In conclusion, many women who end up in prison do so after experiencing a number of vulnerabilities beforehand. There is a plethora of research that suggests that most female offenders can be diverted from prison and dealt with in the community with more positive outcomes for all involved. We are pleased that the female offender strategy has committed to shelving the development of new women’s prisons, to a revised gender-specific prison (and CJS) directive, as well as the women specific Farmer review. However, we have serious concerns that the strategy does not support gender-specific sentencing guidelines, a presumption again short sentences, or pay attention the potential benefits of restorative justice. We also identified issues concerning the tone, language and vagueness of the strategy and the implications of this for actioning positive change with any immediacy. Fundamentally underscoring the strategy we identified a significant issue with the finances that are supposed to enable the proposed changes. Women in the CJS deserve confirmation of informed action, ring-fenced, committed and permanent funding, and top-down accountability. Without this, the female offender strategy will be unable to deliver any of the promises and they will become broken promises.
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