



SAFETY, RESPECT
AND DIGNITY
FOR ALL

LA SÉCURITÉ,
LA DIGNITÉ
ET LE RESPECT
POUR TOUS

**Evaluation Report
Community Correctional Operations:
Chapter 2: Community Supervision Strategies
and Staff Safety**

Evaluation Division

Policy Sector

December 2012

(Page left blank for double-sided printing)

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to express their appreciation to the many individuals who contributed to this evaluation and provided valuable information on the operations of Community Corrections.

Firstly, we would like to thank CSC staff, community partners and stakeholders who shared their views and experiences with the evaluation team through focus group discussions and online questionnaires.

The evaluation team sincerely appreciates the collaboration and assistance offered by the Executive Steering Committee, the Consultative group and representatives from the Community Reintegration Branch, the Offender Reintegration Program Division, the Learning and Development Branch and Finance throughout the evaluation process. Furthermore, the assistance of the Community Planning, Resources and Partnership Division, particularly the work of Pamela Rudiger-Prybylski, is greatly appreciated.

The evaluation team also wishes to extend their appreciation to Duyen Luong for her contributions, including the development of the Terms of Reference in the initial stages of the evaluation, as well as, her leadership and dedication throughout the completion of Community Corrections Chapter 1: Correctional Interventions.

In addition, the team would like to specially thank Paul Verbrugge for providing his quantitative expertise to this evaluation, including training new employees and sharing his conceptualization of statistical models, which were integral to the present report. Lysiane Paquin-Marseille also contributed greatly to the statistical and data expertise of this report. Statistical expertise was also provided by Dr. Shelley Brown of Carleton University, who further enhanced the quality of the statistical work in the present report.

Evaluation Team

Evaluation Team:

Kendra Delveaux, Senior Evaluation Manager

Sarah Heath, Evaluation Officer

Jillian Flight, Evaluation Officer

Marcie McKay, A/ Evaluation Analyst

Christopher J. Rastin, A/Senior Evaluator

Nicole Allegri, Senior Evaluation Manager

Sheena Bradley, Evaluation Analyst

Hortense Kambou, Junior Evaluation Analyst

Sean Horne, Evaluation Analyst

Kossi Aziaba, Junior Evaluation Analyst

Mark Di Pasquale

Other contributors:

Melissa Kingston

Colleen MacDonald

Adam Crawford

Rhea Adhopia

Signatures

**DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT: COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS OPERATIONS:
CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY SUPERVISION STRATEGIES AND STAFF SAFETY**

Original signed by

**Bernard Marquis
A/Executive Director, Evaluation
Evaluation Division**

Date

Original signed by

**Don Head
Commissioner**

Date

Executive Summary

The following report is the second of four reports evaluating the community correctional operations of CSC and examines relevance and performance as per the Treasury Board Secretariat Policy on Evaluation (TBS, 2009). There are no recommendations contained in this chapter. However, the fourth chapter will summarize all three reports and provide comprehensive recommendations addressing all evaluated components of community corrections.

The interventions being evaluated in this report accounted for 9.48% of CSC's direct program spending for the 2010-2011 fiscal year.

Given the scope of CSC's community correctional activities, the evaluation was chaptered based on five themes. The current report examined Theme 3: Supervision of Offenders in the Community and Theme 4: Community Staff Safety. Overall, the evaluation found that CSC community operations are relevant to public safety, government and CSC priorities, and are the responsibility of the federal government. Performance results are presented separately for each theme.

Theme 3: Supervision of Offenders in the Community: The evaluation demonstrated that the tools and strategies used by CSC to manage and supervise offenders in the community are in accordance with offender risk and need profiles and are associated with a number of positive correctional outcomes. Findings indicated that the level of intervention was appropriately assigned, with higher-risk offenders requiring more contact with Parole Officers than lower risk offenders. In addition to enhanced face-to-face contact, staff reported using additional case management techniques to effectively monitor and supervise offenders in the community, such as monitoring program participation and progress and engaging offender collateral contacts including friends and employers, to corroborate offender information. Moreover, findings demonstrated that the number of PBC imposed special conditions were in accordance with offender risk/need profiles and that the number of special conditions were associated with slight decreases in revocation and recidivism, indicating that appropriate imposition of special conditions (i.e. linked to risk and offender profile) is an effective case management tool to enhance community outcomes.

Overall, increased supervision of offenders was associated with a greater rate of technical revocation. For instance, offenders subject to intensive supervision and residency conditions had higher rates of technical revocation. Similarly, offenders voluntarily residing in a Community Residential Facilities (CRFs) or Community Correctional Centres (CCCs), were found to have higher rates of revocation for technical violations than those released directly to the community. However, the rate of revocation for a new offence and the rate of return within two years of Warrant Expiry Date (WED) were not significantly different. It should be noted that a suspension for a technical violation is one case management tool that can be used to prevent risk should the observed risk escalate.

Lastly, CRF and CCC bed spaces for special populations including women, older offenders and offenders with mental disorders are limited and could be enhanced to meet the needs of these sub-populations.

With respect to alternatives to suspension which could lead to a PBC decision to revoke release, CSC staff reported using a range of alternative measures to revocation. Examples include: disciplinary interviews; urinalysis testing; increasing the level of intervention; and additional treatment/programming.

Community programming is integral to case management. There was an extensive review of community programs performed in Chapter 1 (Correctional Interventions) of the Community Correction evaluation. As such, the current chapter focused on the examination of the continuum of services for offenders in the community. CSC's ability to find and provide more affordable models (cost savings) of offender risk supervision and management strategies in the community is greatly dependant on partnerships and collaboration with community organizations. Staff respondents also noted gaps in service delivery, particularly in the areas of social programs, employment services, and mental health services.

Finally, the last area examined within Theme 3: Supervision of Offenders in the Community section was changes in offender risk/need levels from intake to WED. Overall findings indicated that the majority of offenders did not have any changes to their risk/need profile. It is unclear if this is a result of no demonstrated changes or simply because risk/need profiles are not always reviewed or updated in accordance with policy. However, for those offenders who did have a change to their risk/need profile, levels changed in a favorable direction. For example, risk and need levels from intake to WED decreased and motivation levels from intake to WED increased. Reintegration potential levels appear to be moderated such that from intake to WED, more offenders are being rated at medium than either low or high.

Theme 4: Community Staff Safety: Community staff safety is of paramount importance to CSC. Several components of staff safety were examined, including staff training, staff safety assessments, tandem supervision, and community staff safety incidents. Although staff perceived some threats to safety in the community, the majority of Parole Officers were not concerned with safety, as they reported that tandem supervision and the use of technology enhanced their community staff safety. However, changes to the tandem supervision criteria and policy and the use of technology were suggested by staff. Overall, staff safety training is provided in a timely manner to those who require it. However, some staff indicated that they would benefit from more frequent staff safety refresher training. Initial staff safety assessments are largely completed in accordance with policy, yet staff safety re-assessments for tandem supervision cases are not consistently conducted within the required 90 day timeframe. Staff safety assessments determine if a tandem visit is required where an additional person accompanies the Parole Officer in face-to-face meetings with the offender in the community. Tandem supervision overrides regularly occur which may indicate that tandem supervision criteria are broad to ensure increased community staff and public safety. Analyses revealed that there are few incidents and that the majority of staff safety incidents recorded in OMS involved threats to community staff. However, these results should be considered with caution as there were data entry difficulties that could have limited the sample of staff safety incidents. Lastly, the evaluation examined the

review of the pilot program for the Community Staff Safety Program. The review identified the program as being effective and cost-effective.

Efficiency: The evaluation noted that the majority of parole (day and full parole) application withdrawals, postponements, and waivers were made by offenders, with the most common reason being the incompleteness of correctional programs. These findings support that there is an efficiency to be gained by increasing the rate of parole applications.

Regarding discretionary releases, the evaluation examined concordance between the recommendations made by CSC and the decision made by PBC. In the majority of day parole and full parole decisions there was significant concordance between CSC's recommendations and PBC's decisions. This indicated efficiency in that CSC plans and supports a discretionary release for the offenders and PBC agrees and grants release.

The use of voluntary residency (i.e. stays in a CRF or CCC which were not imposed by PBC) was also examined in this evaluation. The use of voluntary residency was rare, and although analyses determined that voluntary stays in a CCC or CRF were not associated with improved correctional outcomes, they do appear to provide a benefit to public safety and potential cost-savings by allowing offenders to remain in the community.

Conclusion: Effectively managing and supervising offenders in the community is essential to ensuring public safety. When risk is manageable in the community through the use of specialized community supervision tools and strategies, cost-savings are significant for CSC. Throughout the evaluation, effectiveness and efficiency was determined, and ways to enhance efficiency have been noted. Overall, the supervision of offenders in the community and staff safety have demonstrated relevance and performance.

List of Key Findings

- FINDING 1:** CSC community correctional activities are relevant and align with federal priorities, roles and responsibilities.
- FINDING 2:** Level of intervention is appropriately assigned in accordance with risk level according to policy.
- FINDING 3:** Both community and institutional Parole Officers reported frequently sharing information, but highlighted the need for more in-person communication with one another.
- FINDING 4:** The rate of revocation for a technical violation or a new offence decreased for each condition type imposed. The likelihood of returning to custody also decreased for each condition type imposed.
- FINDING 5:** Matching an offenders dynamic need through the use of a corresponding special condition can dramatically reduce the offender's likelihood of revocation and recidivism
- FINDING 6:** Offenders overall demonstrated improved levels of risk, need, motivation and reintegration potential ratings from intake to WED.
- FINDING 7:** Although staff perceived some threats to safety in the community, the majority of Parole Officers were not concerned with their safety, as tandem supervision and the use of technology were identified by staff as a means of enhancing their community staff safety.
- FINDING 8:** While data indicated relatively high compliance rates for staff safety training, front-line staff desire more frequent staff safety refresher sessions.
- FINDING 9:** While initial staff safety assessments are largely completed in accordance with policy, staff safety re-assessments for tandem supervision cases are not consistently conducted within the required 90 day timeframe.
- FINDING 10:** While technical challenges were identified in the Community Staff Safety Program pilot project conducted in 2008-2009, the program was assessed by a management review as being cost effective and providing timely responses.
- FINDING 11:** Only one third of parole applications result in a decision and approximately 20% of applications are withdrawn, postponed or adjourned at the offender's request.
- FINDING 12:** There is concordance between CSC and PBC in the majority of discretionary release decisions.
- FINDING 13:** Most residency conditions are recommended by CSC before being imposed by PBC, and almost all offenders released with a residency condition are released on statutory release.
- FINDING 14:** Although voluntary stays in CCCs and CRFs were not associated with improved correctional outcomes, placement in a structured environment with increased monitoring may be used as an alternative to revocation for offenders. This would allow offenders to continue to be supervised in the community. The result of voluntary stays from this perspective could result in a cost savings.

SUMMARY FINDING 1: Typically, with increased supervision in the form of intensive supervision and residency, offenders have higher rates of revocation for technical violations than those offenders who are supervised less closely. Increased supervision did not affect the rate of revocation for a new offence. This may be explained by the closer monitoring of offenders and a higher probability of observing risky behaviour which results in a revocation for a technical violation.

SUMMARY FINDING 2: Generally, the use of special conditions reduces revocation and recidivism. Specifically, when these condition types are paired with the corresponding dynamic need, the reduced rate of revocation was dramatic (35% for personal/emotional need followed by a corresponding condition). Further, for Aboriginal offenders in particular, the use of a substance abuse condition paired with the corresponding need reduced recidivism.

SUMMARY FINDING 3: CSC's ability to find and provide more affordable models (cost savings) of offender risk supervision and management strategies in the community is greatly dependant and can be enhanced by partnerships and collaboration with community organizations. Women offenders, older offenders and offenders with mental disorders are particularly affected by this challenge.

SUMMARY FINDING 4: To ensure public safety, broad criteria are used to identify offenders requiring tandem supervision and overrides are then used to narrow the scope of the criteria to ensure that only offenders who pose a risk to staff safety are supervised in tandem.

SUMMARY FINDING 5: Financial and operational efficiencies can be made by increasing parole applications through a greater emphasis on preparing offenders for discretionary release (i.e. through the completion of correctional interventions).

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Evaluation Team	iv
Signatures	v
Executive Summary	vi
List of Key Findings.....	ix
Table of Contents	xi
List of Tables	xiv
List of Appendices.....	xv
List of Acronyms	xvi
Introduction.....	1
Current Focus of Chapter 2: Community Supervision Strategies and Staff Safety.....	2
Theme 3: Community Supervision 2	
Theme 4: Staff Safety 3	
Background	3
Governance Structure	4
Related Policies and Legislation	4
Financial Resources 5	
Evaluation Method	9
Offender Management System (OMS) Data	9
Release Cohort 9	
Additional Quantitative Datasets 10	
Constructs and Measures 11	
OMS Data Analysis 12	
Sources of Financial Data.....	12
Sources of Qualitative Data.....	12
Focus Groups12	
Online Questionnaires 13	
Document Review 13	
Limitations.....	14
Aboriginal Offender Community Supervision Strategies 14	
Focus Group Data 14	
Casework Records 14	
OMS Data – Staff Safety Incidents 15	
OMS Data – Special Conditions 15	
OMS Data – Level of Intervention (LOI) 16	
OMS Data – Alternatives to Revocation 16	
OMS Data – Returns to Custody 16	
Community Program Data 16	
Training Compliance Data 17	
Revised Commissioner Directives 17	
Key Findings.....	18

Evaluation Objective 1: Relevance.....	18
Evaluation Objective 2: Performance.....	19
Community Supervision Strategies.....	19
Strategies and Tools Used to Monitor Offenders and Manage Risk in the Community.....	19
Level of Intervention	20
Strategies Identified by Staff for Managing Risk Among Specific Offender Populations...	22
Case Conferences and Information Sharing	22
Intensive Supervision Units (ISU)	24
Integrated Police and Parole Initiative	26
Special Release Conditions	26
Alternatives to Suspension and Revocation.....	32
Suspensions and Frequency of Suspensions.....	33
Community Residential Facilities and Community Correctional Centres.....	35
Profile of Offenders Residing in CRFs and CCCs.....	35
Voluntary Residency in CRFs and CCCs.....	37
Number of Available Beds Used in CCCs/CRFs.....	38
Women Offenders	39
Older Offenders	39
Offenders with Mental Disorders	39
Offender Perspectives of Residency Options	40
Recent Residential Service Improvements	40
Changes in Risk/Need Levels from Intake to WED.....	41
Community Staff Safety.....	43
Perceptions of Community Staff Safety.....	43
Staff Training for CSC Community Staff.....	44
Contents of Staff Safety Training are Appropriate for Community Staff	44
Staff Perceptions of Relevance/Effectiveness of Training	44
Training/Refresher Courses are Completed in a Timely Manner and in Accordance With Policy	45
Equipment and Technological Changes/Modifications	48
Staff Safety Assessments.....	48
Number and Type of Community Staff Safety Incidents Over the Last 5 Years.....	52
Community Staff Safety Program (CSSP).....	54
Evaluation Objective 3: Efficiency and Economy.....	56
Frequency of Rates of Parole Applications, Withdrawals, Postponements, Adjournments	56
Concordance Between CSC and PBC	58
Concordance Between CSC and PBC Regarding Residency Condition	60
Staff Perceptions of the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Information Sharing Between CSC and PBC in Relation to Concordance Rates	62
Use of CCC and CRF Resources.....	64
Number of Non-PBC Imposed Residency Days in a CRF or CCC and the Potential Cost-Savings Associated with the Placement of Offenders in CCCs or CRFs	64
Overall Efficiency and Economy of Community Supervision.....	65
Conclusion on Performance.....	67
List of References.....	68

Appendices..... 71

List of Tables

Table 1: Financial Resources Related to Offender Case Management and Correctional Interventions Offered in the Community	6
Table 2: Financial Resources Related to Program Activity: Community Supervision (including Community Based Residential Facilities and Community Management and Security)	8
Table 3: Demographic and Sentence Characteristics for the Release Cohort	10
Table 4: Risk, Need, Motivation and Reintegration Profiles of the Release Cohort at Release.....	10
Table 5: Offender Level of Intervention for all Offenders and by Gender and Aboriginal Status.....	21
Table 6: Condition Concordance by Gender and Ethnicity	28
Table 7: Frequency of Conditions by Need	29
Table 8: Likelihood of revocation and recidivism based on conditions.....	30
Table 9: Likelihood of revocation and recidivism based on conditions in relation to offender need domains.....	31
Table 10: Reason for First Suspension for all Offenders while on Conditional Release in the Community	33
Table 11: Days in a CRF/CCC from Release	36
Table 12: CRF and CCC Release Type by Risk.....	36
Table 13: Release Type by CRF and CCC	37
Table 14: National Training Compliance Rates for FY 2010-11	47
Table 15: Decision Status for Day Parole and Full Parole Applications for Offenders in the Release Cohort	57
Table 16: CSC and PBC Concordance and Discordance Outcomes.....	58
Table 17: Concordance Between CSC and PBC Decisions for Full and Day Parole	59
Table 18: Concordance Rates for Women.....	59
Table 19: Concordance Rates for Aboriginal Offenders.....	59
Table 20: Residency Conditions Imposed by PBC at Release by Need and Risk Profile.....	60
Table 21: Costs of Residency Stays where a Residency Condition was Not Imposed (FY 08-09)	65

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Constructs and Measures	71
Appendix B: Staff Training Descriptions	77
Appendix C: HRMS Staff Safety Training.....	79
Appendix D: Level of Intervention.....	84
Appendix E: Community Supervision Strategies Tables	85
Appendix F: Changes from Release to WED	97
Appendix G: Mandatory Training in Risk Assessment for Operational Staff	100
Appendix H: Efficient Use of CCC and CRF Resources	101
Appendix I: Efficiency of the Parole Application Process	103

List of Acronyms

ACB	Alternative Community Bed
ACDO	Aboriginal Community Development Officer
ACLO	Aboriginal Community Liaison Officer
ALO	Aboriginal Liaison Officer
BOI	Board of Investigation
CAC	Citizen Advisory Committee
CAPS	Community Assessment and Parole Supervision
CCC	Community Correctional Centres
CCLO	Community Corrections Liaison Officer
CCRA	Corrections and Conditional Release Act
CCRR	Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations
CD	Commissioner's Directive
CMHI	Community Mental Health Initiative
CMT	Case Management Team
COMO	Cost of Maintaining an Offender
CPMS	Community Population Management Strategy
CPPR	Correctional Plan Progress Report
CPR	Cardio-Pulmonary Resuscitation
CRFs	Community Residential Facilities
CSC	Correctional Service Canada
CSSP	Community Staff Safety Program
CSSPP	Community Staff Safety Pilot Project
DFIA	Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis
DFIA-R	Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis-Revised
EM	Electronic Monitoring
FCCS	Federal Community Corrections Strategy
FY	Fiscal Year
GPS	Global Positioning System
GSIR	General Statistical Information on Recidivism
HRSDC	Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
HWB	Halfway Back
ICPM	Integrated Correctional Program Model
IFMMS	Integrated Financial & Material Management System
IPOs	Institutional Parole Officers
IPPI	Integrated Police and Parole Initiative
IS	Intensive Supervision

ISU	Intensive Supervision Units
LOI	Level of Intervention
LTSO	Long Term Supervision Order
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NHQ	National Headquarters
NJSPB	New Jersey State Parole Board
NMC	National Monitoring Centre
NTS	National Training Strategy
OIA	Offender Intake Assessment
OMS	Offender Management System
PBC	Parole Board of Canada
PO	Parole Officer
POCD	Parole Officer Continuous Development
POIT	Parole Officer Induction Training
POO	Parole Officer Orientation
PPA	Personal Portable Alarm
PSC	Public Safety Canada
RHQ	Regional Headquarters
RNR	Risk-Need-Responsivity
ROPE	Repeat Offender Parole Enforcement
SIO	Security Intelligence Officer
SIR	Statistical Information on Recidivism
SIR-R1	The Statistical Information on Recidivism - Revised 1
SOP	Standard Operating Practices
SSA	Staff Safety Assessments
SSHROC	Supervision Strategy for High Risk Offenders in the Community
TBS	Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada
UAL	Unlawfully at Large
WED	Warrant Expiry Date
WHRAST	Western Health Risk Assessment Screening Tool

Introduction

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) mission is to contribute to public safety by “encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens, while exercising reasonable, safe, secure and humane control” (CSC, 2010a). With a significant offender population in the community and changing offender need profiles, the supervision of offenders and the safety of staff have become exceedingly important to CSC’s ability to fulfill this mandate.

Indeed, one-third (7,338) of CSC’s total offender population (22, 240) is actively supervised in the community (Public Safety Canada, 2010). Over the last 9 years, there has been a decline in day parole (72% vs. 66%) and full parole (42% vs. 41%) grant rates, with the 2009-10 fiscal year (FY) reaching a ten year low (Public Safety Canada, 2010). During the same period, there has been an increase in the percentage of offenders supervised in the community on statutory release, from 29% to 34%. These changes suggest that offenders are being released to the community later in their sentences, with potentially greater risk and need profiles.

The community reintegration process begins at intake with a preliminary assessment conducted by a community Parole Officer within five working days of an offender receiving a federal sentence. Offenders are transferred to intake assessment units where risk and needs are assessed and a Correctional Plan is developed. A Correctional Plan is designed to address criminogenic factors and to guide the appropriate program referrals. An important aspect of correctional planning pertains to the development of a community strategy – aimed at preparing offenders for release into the community. Sentences have start (Sentence Commencement Date) and end dates (Warrant Expiry Date). Between these dates, there are three principle release types: day and full parole and statutory release. Day and full parole are discretionary releases that require approval from the Parole Board of Canada (PBC) while statutory release is legislated once the offender has completed two-thirds of their sentence and therefore, does not require a PBC vote.

In order to manage the needs of offenders being supervised in the community, CSC operates 84 parole offices (and sub-offices) and 16 community correctional centres across the country (CSC, 2010a). CSC has approximately 200 signed contracts with community residential

facilities and partners with community organizations which provide accommodation, programs, and services that also assist offenders with community reintegration (CSC, 2010a).

Current Focus of Chapter 2: Community Supervision Strategies and Staff Safety

The evaluation of community correctional operations was based on five key themes and divided into four chapters. Chapters 1 and 3 focused on correctional interventions and community engagement, respectively. This report, Chapter 2, will focus on the third and fourth themes, community supervision and staff safety. For additional information on the focus of each Community Corrections evaluation chapter along with associated descriptions, please refer to Chapter 1 (Correctional Interventions)¹.

Theme 3: Community Supervision

The activities of community supervision include: assisting and supporting offender reintegration through the provision of accommodation options; the application of tools and strategies used to monitor offenders in the community; taking into account offender risk and need levels; and using community resources and collateral contacts to monitor progress in the community. Offenders are ultimately accountable for their behaviour, and community supervision is intended to actively encourage them to assume responsibility for their actions while on discretionary and legislated release in the community. Moreover, CSC offers programs, services and supervision strategies in the community that are structured to address the specific needs of offenders including Aboriginal, women, and other specific offender populations.

The supervision of offenders in the community by community Parole Officers allows for the timely detection of escalating levels of offender risk. Furthermore, Parole Officers may exercise professional discretion and use alternatives to suspension when levels of escalating risk are detected early and the offender's risk is still deemed manageable in the community. This includes residency conditions (both voluntary residency and PBC imposed residency) and urinalysis testing.

¹ For more information please refer to Chapter 1: Correctional Interventions, on CSC's website <http://www.csc-ccc.gc.ca/text/pa/ev-cci-fin/index-eng.shtml>

To this end, the community supervision component of this evaluation will examine community supervision strategies, alternatives to revocation, community based residential facilities, community programming and changes in risk/need levels from intake to WED.

Theme 4: Staff Safety

CSC has implemented a number of staff safety tools and measures to enhance the safety of staff working in the community, including the implementation of sign-in and sign-out procedures for parole offices, requirements for tandem supervision, for offenders meeting the tandem criteria, introduction of staff safety assessments, blackberries and satellite phones issued to Parole Officers, etc. In addition, CSC removed the requirement for more than 50% of Parole Officer contacts with offenders to be in the community in August 2005 (CSC, 2007d).

As a result, the staff safety component of this evaluation will focus on the relevance and effectiveness of all safety measures available to staff in the community. The report will also take into account the perception of CSC staff concerning risk and safety.

Background

One of CSC's corporate priorities is the "safe transition to and management of eligible offenders in the community" (CSC, 2011a). As a result of the CSC Review Panel report *A Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety* (2007), CSC has implemented the Transformation Agenda designed to address a number of recommendations, including strengthening community corrections.

One way CSC has met this obligation is through the implementation of CSC's Population Management Strategy, which provides strategic operational direction and support to effectively and efficiently manage the offender population. An objective of the Population Management Strategy is to strengthen the links between institutional and community operations. This strategy is based on the principle that the more gradual and supervised the release of offenders, the greater the chance of successful reintegration (CSC, 2010c).

As a sub-strategy of the Population Management Strategy, the Community Population Management Strategy (CPMS) specifically emphasizes the use of activities known to be effective in enhancing public safety. CPMS has three principal goals: to enhance release planning and case preparation; the reintegration and targeted use of community resources for

higher risk cases who require greater monitoring and intervention; and to maximize the use of resources within the first three months of release for the highest risk offenders.

Additionally, in November 2009, CSC committed to the development of a Federal Community Corrections Strategy (FCCS), developed in collaboration with partners and stakeholders. The FCCS is an overarching strategy linking CSC's primary reintegration strategies and activities with enhanced partnerships as a means to best position community corrections activities to the year 2020.

The FCCS also provides a framework to enhance offender reintegration opportunities, including specialized populations in the areas of employment and employability and offender support systems that include volunteers and community acceptance (CSC, 2011e).

The safety of community staff is of paramount importance for CSC as evidenced by the implementation of additional community staff safety practices. The implementation of these staff safety measures is also directly aligned with one of CSC's corporate priorities which is the "safety and security of staff and offenders in our institutions and community" (CSC, 2011a).

Governance Structure

Please refer to the Report of the Evaluation of CSC's *Community Corrections, Chapter 1: Correctional Interventions* for a complete description of the governance structure guiding community corrections.²

Related Policies and Legislation

Community supervision

The *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (CCRA, 1992) mandates CSC to be responsible for "the provision of programs that contribute to the rehabilitation of offenders and to their successful reintegration into the community" (s. 5 [b]) and for the "parole, statutory release supervision and long-term supervision of offenders" (s. 5[d]). Additionally, several CDs govern community correctional operations. Of particular interest to the current evaluation is *CD 715-1: Community Supervision* (CSC, 2012a). This CD provides direction on assessing and managing

² The Report of the Evaluation of CSC's Community Corrections, Chapter 1: Correctional Interventions can be found at the following link: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/pa/ev-cci-fin/index-eng.shtml>

an offender's transition to the community following release from an institution (CSC, 2012a). For additional information on the legislation and internal CSC policies governing community corrections, please refer to Chapter 1: Correctional Interventions.

Community staff safety

As outlined in *CD 715-1: Community Supervision* (CSC, 2012a), Parole Officers and Parole Officer Supervisors are required to conduct staff safety assessments (SSA) to assess the existence of staff safety concerns for all offenders being released to the community. SSAs must be conducted prior to each offender's first community contact (including temporary absences) and no later than ten working days following release. Prior to meeting an offender in the community, staff must review the SSA and consider all identified risk factors in all decisions (e.g. determining a location to meet the offender, police notification, and tandem supervision; CSC, 2012a).

Financial Resources

Table 1 and Table 2 present the financial resources allocated to CSC program activities (correctional interventions and community supervision) evaluated in the current report. Table 1 (Correctional Interventions) presents financial resources allocated to case management, coordination and offender reintegration, and correctional programs offered in the community, for a total of \$97,114,161 in FY 2010-11. Table 2 (Community Supervision) presents resources allocated to community based residential facilities and community management and security, representing a total of \$91,667,176 in FY 2010-11. In FY 2010-11, the previously identified expenditures related to correctional interventions and community supervision constituted 7.95% of the total direct annual financial resources/program spending at CSC, and 9.48% of CSC's direct program spending.

Table 1: Financial Resources Related to Offender Case Management and Correctional Interventions Offered in the Community

	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
	Expenditure	Expenditure	Expenditure
Offender Case Management			
Case Management, Coordination and Offender Reintegration			
Community Correctional Liaison Officers (CCLO)	\$1,176,625	\$1,752,441	\$1,501,514
Community Parole Officer Resource Formula	\$66,202,727	\$67,673,743	\$71,621,984
Case Management-Support ^a	\$3,133,319	\$1,498,805	\$2,460,617
Case Management-Delivery ^b	\$894,074	\$610,095	\$6,660,925
Case Management- Management (coordinator) ^c	\$4,674,234	\$5,066,492	\$6,891,398
Correctional Reintegration Programs			
Alternatives Associates and Attitude Program	\$343,632	\$412,092	\$549,576
Violence Prevention Programs			
Violence Prevention Program-Moderate Intensity	\$29,137	\$98,253	\$197,058
Family Violence Prevention Programs			
National Moderate Intensity Family Violence Program	\$172,390	\$139,132	\$187,820
Sex Offender Programs			
Moderate Intensity Sex Offender Program	\$337,403	\$273,614	\$312,466
National Low Intensity Sex Offender Program	\$52,110	\$99,006	\$69,490
Substance Abuse Programs			
National Substance Abuse Program- Moderate Intensity	\$126,998	\$119,543	\$602,156
National Low Intensity Substance Abuse Program	\$670,492	\$518,637	\$68,406
Maintenance Programs			
Sex Offender Maintenance Programs**			
Maintenance Program (Institution and Community) - Sex offender	\$77,431	\$89,159	\$59,434
National Maintenance Sex Offender Treatment	\$780,194	\$819,303	\$647,980
Substance Abuse Maintenance Programs**			
Other Substance Abuse Programs - Booster/Maintenance/Follow-up	\$81,927	\$115,905	\$606
National Substance Abuse Maintenance Program	\$516,339	\$245,802	\$56,446
Family Violence Maintenance Programs**			
Family Violence Maintenance Program	\$22,117	\$27,033	\$8,970

Family Violence National Maintenance Program	\$5,206	\$0	\$0
Community Correctional Maintenance Programs			
Community Maintenance Program	\$1,048,584	\$1,913,160	\$2,485,009
Aboriginal Women's Maintenance Program	\$2,602	\$24,434	\$85,491
Counter Point Program ^d	\$394,797	\$375,842	\$720,534
Women Community Maintenance Relapse	\$84,804	\$241,717	\$223,552
Women Offender Correctional Programs			
Women Offender- Self Management Program-Community			\$26,985
Aboriginal Women Offender- Self Management Program- Community			\$441
Integrated Correctional Program Model*			
ICPM - Community Maintenance Program - Aboriginal			\$112,750
ICPM - Community Maintenance Program - Multi-Target			\$938,778
ICPM - Community Maintenance Program - Sex Offender			\$404,081
ICPM - Community Program			\$219,694
Total (\$)	\$80,827,142	\$82,114,208	\$97,114,161

Source: Data were extracted from CSC's Integrated Financial & Material Management System (IFMMS) on October 23, 2012.

^{a,b,c} Although these cost centres are intended to capture institutional related cost, CSC's districts are using them to code financial resources related to community corrections activities.

^d Although this program was phased out in FY 2009-10, expenditures are still coded under this cost centre due to coding errors. The Reintegration Programs Division has consulted with the regions to review the financial coding errors and a plan will be put in place to address coding errors and ensure that the active financial codes are consistent with existing program delivery.

Note: Black areas indicate fiscal years prior to program implementation.

Note: Expenditures presented exclude the Employee Benefit Plan (EBP)

Table 2: Financial Resources Related to Program Activity: Community Supervision (including Community Based Residential Facilities and Community Management and Security)

	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
	Expenditure	Expenditure	Expenditure
Community Based Residential Facilities			
Community Residential Facilities			
Residential Services (Beds and Surveillance)	\$61,277,866	\$63,407,801	\$66,245,769
Community Correctional Centres including Section 81 CCRA			
Provision of Correctional Services Pursuant to Section 81 of CCRA	\$4,626,694	\$4,558,409	\$4,800,464
CCC - Security - Commissionaire's Services	\$4,620,596	\$4,992,687	\$5,059,792
CCC - Security - Maintenance	\$14,293	\$15,841	\$25,708
CCC - Correctional Officers	\$1,106,232	\$1,124,228	\$1,304,691
Community & CCC - General / Administration	\$7,432	\$3,801	\$3,088
Community Management and Security			
Senior Management - Community	\$3,633,333	\$3,888,296	\$3,981,752
Community - Urinalysis	\$1,263,568	\$1,550,273	\$1,760,308
Community Reintegration Operations Management ^a (including the Community Staff Safety Program ^b)	\$362,834	\$5,349,828	\$6,092,246
Communities - Security - Commissionaire's Services	\$150,385	\$146,397	\$148,945
Communities - Security - Maintenance	\$115,404	\$30,278	\$16,782
Community - Preventive Security	\$644,553	\$1,017,037	\$1,363,495
Community Services (Aboriginal)	\$672,589	\$2,212,450	\$864,136
Total (\$)	\$78,495,779	\$88,297,326	\$91,667,176

Source: Data were extracted from CSC's Integrated Financial & Material Management System (IFMMS) on October 23, 2012.

^a Costs for 2009-10 and 2010-11 include all Community Reintegration Branch costs including the DG's office, Community Operations (including Electronic Monitoring), Community Planning Resources and Partnerships (including Community Staff Safety Program), and the National Monitoring Centre. In 2008-09, "Community Reintegration Operations" existed as a Division under another Branch, as such, the 2008-09 costs are not comparable to the costs in subsequent years.

^b The Community Staff Safety Program was piloted at the Ottawa Area and Sault St-Marie Parole Offices between September 29, 2008 and April 30, 2009 in order to test the efficiency of the technology used, and to identify future operational needs and requirements. On May 1, 2009, the project was awarded program status and became the Community Staff Safety Program (CSSP). A second community staff safety initiative, the Real Time Reporting application, began in FY 2011-12 and is currently being piloted in the Pacific, Atlantic, and Ontario regions.

Note: Expenditures presented exclude the Employee Benefit Plan (EBP)

Evaluation Method

The present evaluation used data extracted from the Offender Management System (OMS), focus groups, and questionnaires conducted with CSC staff and community partners. The key sources of financial information were drawn from CSC's Integrated Financial & Material Management System (IFMMS).

Offender Management System (OMS) Data

To address the evaluation issues, a sample of offenders on a first-term release³ from April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2011 was created. Data on these offenders were extracted from OMS⁴. A detailed description of this sample is provided below. In addition to the release cohort, separate datasets were created to analyze the prevalence of staff safety incidents and the concordance of CSC and PBC parole decisions.

Release Cohort

OMS data were used to identify all offenders on a first-term release from April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2011. Release refers to legislated and conditional release, including offenders released on day parole, full parole, statutory release or long-term supervision orders. These releases represent the group referred to as the release cohort, which was used in the majority of quantitative analyses reported in this evaluation. Where a different sample was used, it is described in the text. The mean age of the 27,280 offenders in the release cohort was 36 years at release, and the average determinant sentence length was 3.4 years. The vast majority of offenders in the release cohort were male, non-Aboriginal, serving determinate sentences, and convicted of Schedule I offences (see Table 3).

³ First-term release refers to the first time an offender is granted a release on their current sentence. First term releases were selected to allow for a representation of data as all offenders had a first term release, whereas only 49% of offenders had a second term release. Similarly, the first term release was selected to avoid the potential influence of factors from an offender's prior term(s) on the current release term under study.

⁴ OMS is an electronic filing system designed to monitor and track offenders under the supervision of CSC. Data captured in OMS include the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA), a comprehensive and integrated examination of offenders at the time of their admission.

Table 3: Demographic and Sentence Characteristics for the Release Cohort

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex (n = 27,280)		
Men	25,572	94%
Women	1708	6%
Ethnicity (n = 27 091)		
Aboriginal	4,834	18%
Non-Aboriginal	22,257	82%
Sentence type (n = 27,280)		
Determinate sentence	26,787	98%
Indeterminate sentence	493	2%
Offence type (n = 19,772)		
Schedule I	12,817	65%
Schedule II	6,045	30%
Schedule I and II	910	5%

Source: OMS (2011).

Note: ^a Ethnicity data were not available for all cases.

As seen in Table 4, the largest proportions of offenders at release were rated as moderate risk, moderate motivation level, moderate reintegration potential, and high need.

Table 4: Risk, Need, Motivation and Reintegration Profiles of the Release Cohort at Release

Profile of Release Cohort ^a	Static Risk (n = 27,250)	Need (n = 27,253)	Motivation Level (n = 27,254)	Reintegration Potential (n = 27,254)
Low	18%	12%	13%	24%
Medium	44%	39%	57%	40%
High	38%	49%	30%	36%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: OMS (2011).

Note:^a Missing cases ranged from 26-30 for these domains.

Additional Quantitative Datasets

In addition to the release cohort dataset, two additional datasets were created from OMS. One dataset was created to analyze the prevalence of staff safety incidents in the community while another was created to examine the concordance between all CSC and PBC decisions regarding conditional release for FY 2010-11. The community staff safety incidents dataset and

the CSC and PBC decision concordance dataset are described in detail within the relevant key findings sections of the report. Aside from these two additional datasets, specific sub-sets were created from the main release cohort. For example, to analyze changes in dynamic need from intake to the last assessment of an offender prior to reaching WED, a sub-set of only offenders who had reached WED by April 10, 2011⁵ was created from the release cohort.

Constructs and Measures

Numerous constructs and measures (e.g. static risk, dynamic need, reintegration potential and motivation for intervention) were included in the analysis of relevance and performance of CSC community supervision. Several of these constructs were used extensively throughout this report and are described in detail in Appendix A.

Supervision Outcome

For the purpose of this evaluation, supervision outcome was measured in four ways:

- 1) **General revocation:** If an offender was revoked (at least once) while on release (e.g. revocation for a technical violation or revocation for a new offence).
- 2) **Revocation for a technical violation:** If the offender was revoked (at least once) while on release for a technical violation.
- 3) **Revocation with a new offence:** If an offender was revoked (at least once) while on release for a new offence⁶.
- 4) **Return to custody within two years of WED:** If the offender was readmitted to federal custody for a new sentence during the two year post WED follow-up period⁷.

The supervision outcome ‘general revocation’ includes offenders revoked for a technical violation and/or for a new offence. When significant results were found for revocation with a

⁵ April 10, 2011 was the date of data extraction from OMS.

⁶ Revocations with a new offence also include offenders revoked for a new crime for which they have not been sentenced (i.e. offenders revoked with outstanding charges).

⁷ Returns to federal custody within two years of WED were examined in order to be consistent with the terminology used in CSC’s Departmental Progress Report (DPR). However, it should be noted that if there was a return to provincial custody within this timeframe, the offenders would not appear in our sample

technical violation or revocation with a new offence, these results were listed in the report. When no significant results for revocations for a technical violation or revocations for a new offence were found, the results pertaining to revocation in general were reported.

OMS Data Analysis

This evaluation employed a number of descriptive and inferential statistics (Cox regression, chi-square test for independence, analysis of variance (ANOVA), Wilcoxon signed-rank test, and Kappa percentage agreement) to identify patterns and to assess differences across groups. The type of test used was determined by the level of measurement of each variable, the normality of the data, and the specific performance indicator being assessed.

Sources of Financial Data

The key sources of financial information were drawn from CSC's IFMMS.

Sources of Qualitative Data

Qualitative data included focus groups and on-line questionnaires with CSC staff, community partners, and stakeholders and a document review.

Focus Groups

CSC Staff

Please refer to Chapter 1 for details on participants in staff and community partner focus groups.

Online Questionnaires

CSC Staff

A total of 530 CSC staff responded to an online questionnaire. More than half of the respondents worked at a parole office (52%)⁸, of which the largest proportion were community Parole Officers (34%).⁹ Regionally, the largest proportion of respondents were from the Quebec region (31%), followed by the Ontario (26%), Prairie (21%), Atlantic (12%) and Pacific regions (10%), and National Headquarters (1%)¹⁰. Closed-ended questions consisted of five point Likert scales, dichotomous and categorical items and a thematic analysis was conducted for each open-ended question.

Community Partners and Stakeholders

A questionnaire for community partners and stakeholders was created using SNAP survey software including questions for Parole Board of Canada (PBC) Board Members. A total of 19 Parole Board of Canada Board Members responded to the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to identify possible reasons for discordance between CSC and PBC regarding residency conditions and discretionary release.

Document Review

To contextualize the key evaluation findings, government reports, policies, and peer-reviewed literature were reviewed as a component of this evaluation. Specifically, the Evaluation team conducted a review of government reports and policies including: previous CSC audits, research, investigation and evaluation reports, CSC staff safety training modules, documents related to CSC's Transformation Agenda, the General Social Survey, and the Speech from the Throne. In addition, an environmental scan focusing on existing correctional services and programs that support offender reintegration in Canada, as well as internationally, was conducted under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of Montreal.

⁸ Data were missing for 14 respondents.

⁹ Data were missing for 8 respondents.

¹⁰ Data were missing for 8 respondents.

Limitations

The following is a listing of some of the limitations encountered over the course of this evaluation and methods used by the evaluation team to negate or minimize the impact of these limitations on the evaluation.

Aboriginal Offender Community Supervision Strategies

The current evaluation examined general community supervision strategies, and specifically for women and Aboriginal offenders where possible. However, Aboriginal offender specific community supervision strategies (i.e. the roles of Elders and Aboriginal communities within the Aboriginal continuum of care, Aboriginal Community Development Officers, Aboriginal Liaison Officers, etc.) were not examined given that the Strategic Plan for Aboriginal Corrections (SPAC) evaluation was simultaneously conducted. For additional Aboriginal offender specific information, please refer to the SPAC evaluation report.

Focus Group Data

Focus groups with CSC staff, partners, and stakeholders were conducted prior to the commencement of Chapter 2 in anticipation of using these data to inform all chapters of the evaluation. The focus group data were collected prior to the refinement and finalization of the Chapter 2 evaluation matrix; therefore, it is important to note that the focus groups were not designed explicitly to answer all questions in Chapters 2. Throughout the report, results from the focus group discussions were used to contextualize and interpret questionnaire results.

Casework Records

All supervision activities such as interviews, observations of offender behaviour and contacts with CSC staff or individuals working under contract with CSC are documented within the offender casework record. The offender casework record also identifies offender needs and includes an analysis of offender behaviour, progress towards the correctional plan, attitude, and motivation.

A file review to obtain this information was not feasible because the scope of the evaluation was too broad to examine the individual casework records for each offender ($n =$

27,280) in the release cohort. In light of this challenge, the evaluation team was able to extract information housed in OMS under discrete variables, flags, etc. and through focus group discussions with community partners and CSC staff, and an online questionnaire for CSC staff.

OMS Data – Staff Safety Incidents

The present evaluation could not examine the number of community staff safety incidents pre- and post-implementation of community staff safety measures due to the small frequency of these events. In fact, only 34 community incidents were coded as involving staff (e.g. threats to staff or assaults to staff) between April 1, 2005 and April 10, 2011. As a result of this small sample size of community staff safety incidents ($n = 34$), only limited analyses were feasible. Reliability issues due to coding errors in OMS were also found which could have resulted in under-reporting of community staff safety incidents. Therefore, considerations should be taken into account when interpreting the findings within this section of the report.

The Incident Report module in OMS was revised on November 5, 2012 to more effectively capture incidents occurring in the institution and community. The new module includes additional incident types and allows updates to previously entered incidents (with the addition of new information). As these two areas were the source of coding errors in OMS, it is expected that these revisions will result in fewer errors and subsequently a more accurate assessment of community staff safety incidents in the future, which will better inform future evaluations.

OMS Data – Special Conditions

The special conditions that CSC recommends to PBC, but which are not ultimately imposed by PBC are not stored in the OMS data warehouse; only the special conditions imposed by PBC are recorded. The special condition recommendations made by CSC are qualitatively captured within the Assessment for Decision document. However, qualitative coding of this information was not feasible given the size of the release cohort.

OMS Data – Level of Intervention (LOI)

LOI assessments are updated in OMS when offender supervision status is revised. As a result, a LOI assessment cannot be entered into OMS without a corresponding supervision status entry. Without a corresponding supervision status entry, offender LOI assessments would not have been captured and would not have been included in the analysis. In an effort to capture all relevant data, the evaluation team also explored the use of variables that recorded LOI assessments elsewhere in OMS. Upon examination of the data, these variables did not appear to be a viable choice as they were infrequently used.

OMS Data – Alternatives to Revocation

The evaluation team attempted to examine alternatives to revocation using OMS data. However, due to several reliability issues, this was not possible. The evaluation team examined the use of alternatives to revocation within 120 days of the suspension warrant execution date. As a result, the evaluation team could identify increases in levels of intervention, program referrals, and special conditions imposed after a suspension warrant was issued, but could not identify the number of times alternatives to suspension were used to manage escalating levels of risk where a suspension warrant was not executed. This information is qualitatively captured within offender casework records, but a file review as previously indicated, was not feasible for the current evaluation.

OMS Data – Returns to Custody

The evaluation team examined returns to federal custody for a new offence, within two years of WED, for those in the release cohort who reached their WED. Therefore, offenders who returned to a provincial facility would not be considered as having a return to federal custody.

Community Program Data

National community reintegration program data were not extracted from OMS for this chapter given that national correctional programming was extensively examined in Chapter 1 (Correctional Interventions). In addition, previous evaluations (Luong et al., 2010) determined that comprehensive and standardized data regarding program assignment, program participation

and the use of services delivered by contract service providers (i.e. non-CSC service providers) in the community were not readily available or maintained within OMS. Due to these concerns, this evaluation examined changes in risk and need profiles of offenders from release to WED to determine whether criminogenic needs are being addressed in the community, rather than examining participation in community programs. Overall performance of national correctional programs will be summarized in the 4th component of the current evaluation.

Training Compliance Data

Training compliance data were calculated in accordance with the formula adopted by the Learning and Development Branch in FY 2010-11. Once an individual completes the required training, within or outside the timeframes outlined in policy, they are considered to be compliant. Overall compliance rates indicate the percentage of individuals who received required training in a particular FY. However, they do not provide insight into whether training is completed within the timeframes specified in policy. In order to best present the extent to which CSC is compliant with national training standards, the evaluation team has provided a snapshot of training compliance in FY 2010-11 within the context of the report and has included compliance reports for fiscal years ending 2007 through to 2011 inclusively in Appendix C.

Revised Commissioner Directives

On June 13, 2012, revisions to CDs 715: *Community Supervision Framework*, 715-1: *Community Supervision*, 715-2: *Post-Release Decision Process*, and 715-3: *Community Assessments* were released (see Policy Bulletin issue 364). When this evaluation was conducted it reflected the previous policies on community supervision and staff safety, however the report has been updated to reflect the revised policies unless otherwise noted.

Key Findings

Evaluation Objective 1: Relevance

Relevance is assessed through three issues:

- 1) Continued Need for the Program: Assessment of the extent to which the program continues to address a demonstrable need and is responsive to the needs of Canadians.*
- 2) Alignment with Government Priorities: Assessment of the linkages between program objectives and (i) federal government priorities and/or (ii) departmental strategic outcomes.*
- 3) Alignment with Federal Roles and Responsibilities: Assessment of the role and responsibilities for the federal government in delivering the program.*

FINDING 1: CSC community correctional activities are relevant and align with federal priorities, roles and responsibilities.

The federal government is constitutionally responsible for the administration of federal correctional activities for offenders receiving a sentence of two or more years (Constitution Act, 1982; Criminal Code of Canada, 1985). Furthermore, legislation has been developed such as the CCRA (1992) and Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations (CCRR) (1992) that guide CSC in how to appropriately administer these constitutionally required activities. As well, the work that CSC undertakes in the areas of correctional interventions, community supervision, and community engagement directly addresses Canada's priority of protecting Canadian families and communities while fostering an environment where offenders can be accountable for making meaningful changes in their lives. Moreover, CSC's mission to contribute to public safety "by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens, while exercising reasonable, safe, secure and humane control" (CSC, 2011b, p.5) is aligned with several of CSC's six strategic priorities (CSC, 2011b), particularly the safe transition to, and management of, eligible offenders in the community.

Evaluation Objective 2: Performance

Performance (effectiveness, efficiency and economy) is assessed through two issues:

1) Achievement of expected outcomes: Assessment of progress toward expected outcomes, including immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes, with reference to performance targets and program reach, program design, including the linkage and contribution of outputs to outcomes.

2) Demonstration of Efficiency and Economy: Assessment of resource utilization in relation to the production of outputs and progress toward expected outcomes.

The performance of Theme 3: Supervision of Offenders in the Community is comprised of four components: (1) Community supervision strategies; (2) Alternatives to suspension and revocation; (3) Community residential facilities and community correctional centres; and (4) Changes in risk/need levels from intake to WED. The last component, Changes in risk/need levels from intake to WED, is dependent upon other supervision strategies and techniques. Specifically, risk and need is expected to be reduced for offenders supervised in the community, as a result of these targeted case management and community intervention activities. The effectiveness of these activities will be included within each particular section of the report. Overall efficiency will be reported at the end of the report, after Theme 4: Community Staff Safety.

Community Supervision Strategies

Strategies and Tools Used to Monitor Offenders and Manage Risk in the Community

Offenders are monitored and risk is managed in the community through the use of numerous tools and strategies, including: the assignment of an appropriate level of intervention, the use of case conferences and information sharing, the use of specialized supervision strategies (e.g. participation in an intensive supervision unit and the Integrated Police and Parole Initiative), and the imposition of special conditions.

Level of Intervention

FINDING 2: Level of intervention is appropriately assigned in accordance with risk level according to policy.

Level of intervention (LOI)¹¹ indicates the minimum frequency of supervision contact that Parole Officers must have with offenders (CSC, 2012a). There are six LOI categories:

- 1) Level I (Intensive Supervision) - A minimum of eight face-to-face contacts per month.
- 2) Level A intervention - A minimum of four face-to-face contacts per month.
- 3) Level B intervention - A minimum of two face-to-face contacts per month.
- 4) Level C intervention - A minimum of one face-to-face contact every month.
- 5) Level D intervention - A minimum of one face-to-face contact every two months
- 6) Level E intervention - A minimum of one face-to-face contact every three months.

As presented in Table 5, for an initial LOI, the majority (52%) of offenders in the release cohort were assigned to level A, and over a quarter (27%) were assigned to level B. The highest level of intervention (I) was assigned to 12% of offenders, while the remaining 9% were assigned to level C, D or E¹². Further analyses¹³ revealed that LOI was significantly related to gender and Aboriginal status. Specifically, a relatively low percentage (4%) of women were assigned to level I, whereas 13% of men were assigned to level I. Additionally, a relatively high percentage (20%) of Aboriginal offenders were assigned to level I, whereas only 11% of non-Aboriginal offenders were assigned to level I. This may be explained by the overall higher risk profile of Aboriginal offenders in general (PSC, 2010).

¹¹An offender's level of intervention is established prior to release and is recorded in the Community Strategy. During the first 30 days of release, the Parole Officer reviews the offender's pre-release LOI and either adjusts the LOI through the completion of a Correctional Plan Update or confirms the pre-established LOI and documents the information in the offender's casework record. Unless the offender is assessed pre-release at level I, the Parole Officer will supervise the offender at level A for the first 30 days (regardless of their pre-release assessment) until the pre-release assessment can be confirmed or adjusted.

¹²Note: Level C: $n = 2267$; Level D: $n = 9$; Level E: $n = 2$

¹³Analyses were conducted using a chi-square test for independence.

Table 5: Offender Level of Intervention for all Offenders and by Gender and Aboriginal Status

Level of Intervention ^a	All Offenders (n = 26,434)	Men Offenders ^b (n = 24,793)	Women Offenders ^b (n = 1,641)	Aboriginal Offenders ^c (n = 4,678)	Non- Aboriginal Offenders ^c (n = 21,571)
Level I	12%	13%	4%	20%	11%
Level A	52%	52%	48%	54%	51%
Level B	27%	27%	33%	23%	28%
Level C, D, E	9%	8%	15%	3%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: OMS (2011).

Notes: ^a LOI data were missing on 846 offenders and LOI and/or ethnicity data were missing for 1031 offenders.

^b $X^2(3) = 201.6, p < .001, V = .08$

^c $X^2(3) = 531.8, p < .001, V = .14$

Analysis of OMS data on risk level and LOI indicated that LOI was significantly related to offender risk, in accordance with policy¹⁴. Within the high-risk group, the majority of offenders were assigned to level I and level A, whereas within the low risk groups, the majority of offenders were assigned to levels B, C, D, or E. These findings were generally consistent for men, women, non-Aboriginal, and Aboriginal offenders (see Appendix D, Table D1).

Staff Perceptions of LOI

Overall, the majority (68%) of staff surveyed reported that the criteria used to determine offender levels of intervention are clear, with only 9% reporting they are unclear. Moreover, 69% of staff respondents stated that they would not suggest any changes to the criteria on LOI. Among these staff (31%) who thought that changes were necessary, 46% stated that there is a need for more flexibility and reliance on staff professional judgment and discretion. Approximately 38% stated that reliance should be on more than one measure (e.g. SIR, static factors, past release success, individual cases), that offenders should be reassessed more often (32%; particularly in institution prior to release and also post release), and that more clarity and training is needed (13%).

¹⁴ According to *Commissioner's Directive 715-1: Community Supervision*, when static or dynamic factors are rated as "high", offenders are required to be supervised under Level I or Level A level of intervention (CSC, 2008a).

Strategies Identified by Staff for Managing Risk Among Specific Offender Populations

In addition to LOI, which is a critical tool that establishes frequency of contact for all offenders, there are other strategies or tools that staff may use with different offender populations. CSC staff reported that some strategies/tools most frequently used to monitor offenders and manage risk in the community included: establishing relationships with offenders (90%), community contacts with offenders (77%), monitoring program participation (77%), urinalysis (74%), and communication with collateral contacts such as friends, employers, police (68%) (see Table E1 in Appendix E for additional information).

Staff surveyed also noted a number of strategies they use for working with specific offender populations, including high risk offenders, offenders with mental disorders, Aboriginal or women offenders. As reflected in Table E2 (Appendix E), these strategies included increased frequency of contact with collaterals for managing risk among high risk offenders (31%); use of the Community Mental Health Initiative (CMHI) resources (19%) and involvement of mental health professionals (19%) for managing risk among offenders with mental disorders; contact with Elders (institutional and community) as helping manage risk with Aboriginal offenders (17%); and use of specialized women's supervision units for managing risk of women offenders (17%).

Several strategies/tools used by staff to monitor offenders and manage risk are examined in greater detail in the sections below, including case conferences and information sharing, intensive supervision units, the integrated police and parole initiative, and special release conditions.

Case Conferences and Information Sharing

FINDING 3: Both community and institutional Parole Officers reported frequently sharing information, but highlighted the need for more in-person communication with one another.

Case conferences are defined by CD 715-1: *Community Supervision* as a meeting between (at least) the person supervising an offender and a Parole Officer Supervisor. Case conferences are held in the following circumstances:

- To discuss release plans or a change in the release plan;

- Prior to completion of a Correctional Plan Update or an Assessment for Decision;
- To reassess risk and review progress; and
- To discuss any required interventions, such as program referrals (CSC, 2012a).

Focus group interviews with CSC front-line staff highlighted the importance of regular communication such as case conferences, consultations, and information sharing between Parole Officers, Parole Officer Supervisors, community Parole Officers, institutional Parole Officers, psychologists, and program personnel, in identifying escalating risk. Staff noted that, in some cases, when levels of escalating risk are detected early, supervision strategies can be used to manage risk in the community.

As part of the CSC staff questionnaire, Parole Officers were also asked about the methods and frequency of information sharing between institutional and community Parole Officers. Over three quarters (78%) of institutional Parole Officers surveyed stated that they frequently shared information with community Parole Officers, and 20% reported occasionally doing so. Of all community Parole Officers surveyed, over half (56%) stated that they frequently share information with institutional Parole Officers, and 37% reported doing so occasionally. Overall, the most frequently reported methods for sharing information reported by both institutional Parole Officers and community Parole Officers included email, entering the information into OMS, telephone calls, and case conferences. Face-to-face meetings rarely occurred (see Table E3 in Appendix E for additional detail).

Fifteen percent of institutional Parole Officers suggested changes to the way information is shared with community Parole Officers. Of these, the majority (63%) indicated that there is a need for more communication both in-person and on the telephone. Similarly, 19% of community Parole Officers recommend changes to the way they share information with institutional Parole Officers. The most common recommendations included a need for more timely communication and liaising between community and institutional Parole Officers (83%), particularly regarding release preparations, and the need for more face-to-face contacts (30%) via workshops, meetings, and one-on-one interactions.

Collaboration and early face-to-face contact between case management teams was viewed by CSC staff in focus groups as providing informed and organized supervision of offenders in the community and was seen as contributing to better risk management. In light of

this, staff mentioned that opportunities to build rapport and relationships between community and institutional staff would increase collaboration. However, workload issues and fewer professional development opportunities hinder efforts in this area. According to staff, in general, case conferences are conducted over the phone due to time and scheduling constraints.

Intensive Supervision Units (ISU)

SUMMARY FINDING 1: Typically, with increased supervision in the form of intensive supervision and residency, offenders have higher rates of revocation for technical violations than those offenders who are supervised less closely. Increased supervision did not affect the rate of revocation for a new offence. This may be explained by the closer monitoring of offenders and a higher probability of observing risky behaviour which results in a revocation for a technical violation.

One of the supervision strategies mentioned by staff, for use with high-risk offenders was the use of Intensive Supervision Units (ISUs). ISUs are specialized units within a parole office, where selected offenders are provided with a more structured and actively involved case management approach, to ensure their successful supervision and reintegration. Parole Officers within these units provide contact with the offender up to eight times a month, impose curfews, perform unannounced curfew checks at offender homes, request frequent urinalysis testing, and liaise closely with the police.

In order to determine the effectiveness of ISU participation on supervision and post-supervision outcomes, analyses were conducted to compare the outcomes for offenders who participated in Toronto and Montreal ISUs¹⁵ versus a matched group of similar offenders also

¹⁵ A search of OMS facility codes found only two ISUs with codes that could be used to identify offenders who were assigned to ISUs: “37026 – Intensive Supervision Practice Montreal Area” and “48008 – Toronto Team Supervision Unit”. A review of CSC’s internal Website found two additional projects that appeared to meet the definition of an intensive supervision unit – the Vancouver high risk offender support team and the Calgary intensive supervision team. Additionally, in consultation with CRB the Evaluation team discovered that within various Women Supervision Units (WSUs), specialized risk management strategies are employed to effectively supervise high risk women offenders with a level of intervention of IS. Given there is no specific facility code in OMS for women offenders who are supervised using these additional strategies, these offenders could not be included in this analysis. Therefore only participants in the Toronto and Montreal units were included in the analysis on intensive supervision practices. As these units only include men offenders, there were no women offenders included in this analysis.

supervised by Toronto and Montreal area Parole Officers who did not participate¹⁶. As demonstrated in Table E4 in Appendix E, analyses indicated that the rate of revocation for a technical violation for those who participated in an ISU was 1.52 times greater than those in the matched comparison group who did not participate in an ISU.

The ISU group did not have a significantly different rate of revocation for a new offence in comparison to the matched group that did not participate in an ISU. Similarly, there were no significant findings on the rate of returns to custody within two years of WED for those who participated in an ISU, in comparison to those in the matched comparison group who did not participate in an ISU¹⁷. Therefore, ISU participation appeared to increase the rate of revocation for a technical violation, but had no effect on the rate of revocation for a new offence or returns to custody within two years of WED. ISUs are used as an alternative to incarceration to monitor high risk offenders in the community. Although revocation for technical violations occurs more frequently, ISUs can be viewed as another mechanism to effectively manage risk. As a result of technical revocation, an offender may receive additional programming and support to address their needs, which may decrease their likelihood of committing a new offence.

All supervision outcomes were also examined for Aboriginal offenders who participated in an identified ISU in contrast to their counterparts who did not participate. The rate of revocation for a technical violation, the rate of revocation for a new offence or the rate of return to custody two years post WED were not significantly different for Aboriginal offenders who participated in an ISU versus Aboriginal offenders in the matched comparison group who did not participate¹⁸ (see Table E5 in Appendix E). It is important to highlight that the lack of significance found may be a result of the small number of participants (n = 30), and not a result of the performance/effectiveness of ISUs for Aboriginal offenders.

¹⁶ ISU offenders were matched with offenders in Toronto and Montreal area parole offices. These included Longueuil Parole Office, Maisonneuve Parole Office, Ville-Marie Parole Office, Toronto East Parole Office, and Toronto West Parole Office. The offender's first supervision office after release was used for these analyses. Full parole, day parole and long-term supervision order offenders were excluded from the analysis as there were not a significant number of these offenders in the treatment group, to match with the comparison group. Participants were matched on the following significant variables: initial LOI, level of attitude need at release, level of education and employment need at release, level of personal/emotional need at release, level of associate/societal need at release, overall need rating at release, overall risk rating at release, overall reintegration rating at release and whether the offender was released to a CRF or released to the community.

¹⁷ For specific ISU supervision outcomes and statistical results, refer to Table E4 in Appendix E.

¹⁸ Aboriginal participants were matched on the following significant variables: initial LOI, level of education/employment need at release and overall need rating at release.

Integrated Police and Parole Initiative

The objective of the Integrated Police and Parole Initiative (IPPI) was to allow for more effective follow-up and supervision of higher risk offenders and earlier apprehension of offenders who were unlawfully at large (UAL; Delveaux et al., 2008).

An evaluation of IPPI indicated that the initiative had little impact on recidivism rates (all returns, returns with a new offence and revocations for a technical violation) for higher risk offenders in the CCLO areas from pre-implementation (54%) to post-implementation (53%) (Delveaux et al., 2008). In addition, there was little difference between the proportions of offenders who went UAL before the implementation of IPPI (38%) versus after the implementation (38%) when combining results from all CCLO areas. However, there was a significant reduction in UAL offenders in the Atlantic region pre-IPPI (36%) and post-IPPI (30%) (Delveaux et al., 2008). Overall, there was a slight increase in the percentage of UAL apprehensions relative to the total number of UAL cases nationally (from 91% to 94%), and moderate reductions in time to UAL apprehensions in the Quebec and Pacific regions (approximately 5 days), following implementation of IPPI. It should be noted that the ability to detect impacts of IPPI may have been limited due to short follow-up periods, data quality issues, and/or implementation issues related to the identification of appropriate offenders for inclusion in the initiative. IPPI has now been permanently integrated into CSC.

Special Release Conditions

SUMMARY FINDING 2: Generally, the use of special conditions reduces revocation and recidivism. Specifically, when these condition types are paired with the corresponding dynamic need, the reduced rate of revocation was dramatic (35% for personal/emotional need followed by a corresponding condition). Further, for Aboriginal offenders in particular, the use of a substance abuse condition paired with the corresponding need reduced recidivism.

Special conditions are restrictions that can be placed on offenders at release, in addition to the standard release condition imposed on offenders¹⁹. This section is focused exclusively on special release conditions, as opposed to standard release conditions. These special conditions include: Abstain from drugs; Abstain from alcohol; Abstain from intoxicants; Abstain from driving; Abstain from gambling; Avoid certain persons; Avoid certain places; Follow psychiatric counsel; Follow psychological counsel; Follow treatment plan; Report to police; and To reside. Parole Officers may recommend special conditions but the imposition of conditions can only be made by the PBC (PBC, 2011). To impose a special condition, the condition must be directly related to the identified needs of an offender and the probability of reoffending must be plausible if the condition(s) was to be violated (PBC, 2011).

Concordance between CSC and PBC regarding special conditions

Of the 91,571 special conditions imposed on offenders²⁰, 79% were recommended initially by CSC. As Table 6 demonstrates, this pattern is similar for men, women, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders.

¹⁹ While many offender also have special conditions imposed, the CCRA and CCRR (1992) impose a set of standard conditions on every offender released on day parole, full parole, statutory release, or long term supervision order (LTSO). These include: (1) on release, travel directly to the offender's place of residence, as set out in the release certificate respecting the offender, and report to the offender's parole supervisor immediately and thereafter as instructed by the parole supervisor; (2) remain at all times in Canada within the territorial boundaries fixed by the parole supervisor; obey the law and keep the peace; inform the parole supervisor immediately on arrest or on being questioned by the police; (3) at all times carry the release certificate and the identity card provided by the releasing authority and produce them on request for identification to any peace officer or parole supervisor; report to the police if and as instructed by the parole supervisor; (4) advise the parole supervisor of the offender's address of residence on release and thereafter report immediately any change in the offender's address of residence, any change in the offender's normal occupation, including employment, vocational or educational training and volunteer work, any change in the domestic or financial situation of the offender and, on request of the parole supervisor, any change that the offender has knowledge of in the family situation of the offender, and any change that may reasonably be expected to affect the offender's ability to comply with the conditions of parole or statutory release; not own, possess or have the control of any weapon, as defined in section 2 of the *Criminal Code*, except as authorized by the parole supervisor; and (5) in respect of an offender released on day parole, on completion of the day parole, return to the penitentiary from which the offender was released on the date and at the time provided for in the release certificate.

²⁰ The time period for analysis this was 30 days before release to the date in which the offender was followed (i.e. the date they were revoked or reached WED, or the last date of data collection – April 10, 2011 for offenders in the release cohort.

Table 6: Condition Concordance by Gender and Ethnicity

Condition Concordance	Percentage of Conditions Recommended by CSC
All Offenders (<i>n</i> = 91,571)	79%
Men (<i>n</i> = 85,271)	79%
Women (<i>n</i> = 6,300)	77%
Aboriginal (<i>n</i> = 15,928)	81%
Non-Aboriginal (<i>n</i> = 75,643)	79%

Source: OMS (2011).

Policy (*CD 712-1*) requires that special conditions are imposed through the identification of need in a given area, so the association between specific needs and conditions imposed to mitigate those needs was examined. Special conditions that are related to offender need domains include: personal/emotional need area (i.e. follow psychiatric counsel, psychological counsel, or a treatment plan), associate need area (i.e. abstain from gambling, avoid certain persons or certain places) and substance abuse need area (i.e. abstain from drugs, alcohol, or intoxicants).

Analyses²¹ revealed that special conditions are imposed through the identification of a given need for offenders with associate or substance abuse needs, but not offenders with personal/emotional needs. As reported in Table 7, offenders with personal/emotional need (i.e. some or considerable need) were significantly less likely to have at least one related condition (32% vs. 68%), while offenders with an associate need were also significantly more likely to have at least one associate related condition (53% vs. 47%) and offenders with a substance abuse need were significantly more likely to have at least one substance abuse related condition (61% vs. 39%).

²¹ Analyses were conducted using a chi-square test for independence.

Table 7: Frequency of Conditions by Need

Conditions	Personal/Emotional Need ^a		Associated Need ^b		Substance Abuse Need ^c	
	No Need (n = 5,711)	Need (n = 21,422)	No Need (n = 8,727)	Need (n = 15,395)	No Need (n = 8,511)	Need (n = 18,622)
No related conditions	85%	68%	52%	47%	78%	39%
At least 1 related condition	15%	32%	48%	53%	22%	61%

Source: OMS (2011).

Notes: ^a $X^2(1) = 628.9625, p < .001, V = .1505$

^b $X^2(1) = 52.941, p < .001, V = .0440$

^c $X^2(1) = 3491.6865, p < .001, V = .3377$

FINDING 4: The rate of revocation for a technical violation or a new offence decreased for each condition type imposed. The likelihood of returning to custody also decreased for each condition type imposed.

The strategic use of special conditions is an effective method of managing risk, as the use of special conditions resulted in a slight improvement in supervision and post-supervision outcomes for offenders. Specifically, analyses²² of special conditions and the likelihood of supervision and post-supervision outcomes found that the imposition of more condition types resulted in a slightly lower rate of revocation and recidivism, controlling for other factors that might impact release conditions (i.e. risk, need, release type, and age at release). Each condition type resulted in a 2% reduction in the rate of revocation for a technical violation. Similarly, the rate of revocation for a new offence was 8% lower for each condition type imposed on the offender, and for each condition type imposed on the offender, the rate of return to custody within 2 years after WED was 4% lower (See Table E6 in Appendix E for additional details)²³.

All supervision outcomes were also examined specifically for Aboriginal offenders with special conditions. The rate of revocation for a technical violation was 3% lower for each condition type imposed and the rate of revocation for a new offence was 8% for each condition type imposed for Aboriginal offenders specifically. The rate of return two years post-WED was

²² Analyses were conducted using Cox regression analysis.

²³ For the post-supervision outcome previous revocation (in general) was found to be significant and was therefore controlled for ($p < .0001$).

not significantly different for each condition type imposed for Aboriginal offenders specifically (see Table E7 in Appendix E). Table 8 below provides a summary of this information.

FINDING 5: Matching an offender’s dynamic need through the use of a corresponding special condition can dramatically reduce the offender’s likelihood of revocation and recidivism.

To understand if this reduced likelihood of revocation and recidivism was linked to specific conditions further analyses were performed. These analyses²⁴ found that when personal/emotional or associate needs were met with a related condition, rates of revocation or recidivism were also lower overall and for Aboriginal offenders specifically. However, when substance abuse need was met with a related condition, the rate of revocation was higher for offenders overall and the rate of return was lower for Aboriginal offenders specifically. See Table 8 below for further information.

These results suggest that the imposition of a special condition is an effective case management tool. When the special condition is linked to a corresponding need, the result is a reduction in the likelihood of return (either revocation for a technical violation or for a new offence) and recidivism. This is an important finding that indicates when offenders’ behavior is restricted to mitigate risk and based on an identified need, it results in enhanced correctional outcomes.

Table 8: Likelihood of revocation and recidivism based on conditions

Each Condition Type Imposed	All Offenders		Aboriginal Offenders
	Revocation for a technical violation	2% reduction (Each Condition Type)	3% reduction (Each Condition Type)
Revocation for a new offence	8% reduction (Each Condition Type)	8% reduction (Each Condition Type)	
Return to Custody (within two years of WED)	4% reduction (Each Condition Type)	Not significant	

²⁴ Analyses were conducted using a Cox regression. These analyses controlled for age at release, release type, risk rating at release, need rating at release.

Table 9: Likelihood of revocation and recidivism based on conditions in relation to offender need domains

Need Domain		All Offenders	Aboriginal Offenders
Conditions for Offenders with a personal/emotional need (follow a treatment plan, psychological or psychiatric counselling)	Revocation for a technical violation	15 % less likely	17 % less likely
	Revocation for a new offence	35% less likely	35% less likely
	Return to Custody (within two years of WED)	Not Significant	Not Significant
Conditions for Offenders with an associates need (avoid certain persons, places or to reside in a particular place)	Revocation for a technical violation	34% less likely	20% less likely
	Revocation for a new offence	37% less likely	Not Significant
	Return to Custody (within two years of WED)	23% less likely	Not Significant
Conditions for Offenders with a substance abuse needs (abstain from intoxicants, drugs, and alcohol)	Revocation for a technical violation	Not Significant	Not Significant
	Revocation for a new offence	20% more likely	Not Significant
	Return to Custody (within two years of WED)	Not Significant	31% less likely

Alternatives to Suspension and Revocation

SUMMARY FINDING 3: CSC’s ability to find and provide more affordable models (cost savings) of offender risk supervision and management strategies in the community is greatly dependant and can be enhanced by partnerships and collaboration with community organizations. Women offenders, older offenders and offenders with mental disorders are particularly affected by this challenge.

According to *Commissioner’s Directive 715-2: Post-Release Decision Process* (CSC, 2012b), when offenders pose an increased risk to the community²⁵, Parole Officers and Parole Officer Supervisors will hold a case conference to determine if offender risk is manageable in the community through an alternative²⁶ to suspension. If offender risk is deemed unmanageable, then only persons that have the designated authority for suspension under sections 135 and 135.1 of the CCRA can issue a warrant of suspension (CSC, 2012d). Once the warrant is issued, Police proceed with the apprehension of the offender on conditional or legislated release.

Once release is suspended, Parole Officers have 30 days to reassess offender risk to the community. If Parole Officers determine that offender risk is manageable through an alternative²⁷ to revocation, the suspension will be cancelled and offenders will return to the community under continued supervision. If offender risk to the community is still deemed unmanageable, an offender will appear before PBC for a post-suspension hearing where PBC will determine if the offender’s conditional or legislated release will be revoked.²⁸ It is important to note that not all post-suspension referrals to PBC lead to a hearing. Offenders may waive the right to a hearing and request a paper decision from PBC.

²⁵ A parole officer may believe that an offender poses an increased risk to the community if they have received information suggesting that the offender poses an increased risk to the community, has breached their conditions, provides a positive urine sample or refuses to provide a urine sample

²⁶ According to CD 715-3, these alternative approaches to managing offender risk in the community could include 1) the imposition of additional treatment/programming 2) the addition of special release conditions by the parole officer and imposed by PBC, and/or 3) the addition of control measures to manage risk which may include an increased level of intervention between the offender and Parole Officer, increased urinalysis, CRF or CCC admission, and curfews (CSC, 2008b).

²⁷ Such alternatives to revocation may include any of the actions mentioned above as alternatives to suspension.

²⁸ Due to data reliability issues, the evaluation team was not able to examine the use of alternatives to revocation to manage risk in the community. A description of the issues encountered by the evaluation team can be found in the limitations section of this report.

Suspensions and Frequency of Suspensions

Overall, 47% of offenders in general, 41% of women and 61% of Aboriginal offenders in the release cohort had at least one suspension while on conditional release in the community²⁹. Violating an abstinence condition was the most common reason for a first suspension. Other common reasons included: deteriorating performance, whereabouts unknown, and failure to return/walk away from a CRF. This pattern was consistent for men, women, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders. However, in contrast to all offenders, women offenders had a higher percentage of suspensions from failing to return to a CRF and Aboriginal offenders had a higher percentage of suspensions resulting from “whereabouts unknown” (See Table 10 for additional detail).

Table 10: Reason for First Suspension for all Offenders while on Conditional Release in the Community

	Reasons for Suspension ^a				
	All Offenders (n = 12,847)	Men Offenders (n = 12,221)	Women Offenders (n = 706)	Aboriginal Offenders (n = 2,952)	Non-Aboriginal Offenders (n = 9,841)
Violation of Abstinence	23%	23%	23%	23%	23%
Deteriorating Performance	18%	18%	20%	16%	19%
Whereabouts Unknown	12%	12%	11%	17%	10%
Failure to Return to/ Walk away CRF	12%	11%	20%	16%	11%
New Criminal Charges	11%	11%	7%	10%	11%
Other	8%	8%	8%	6%	9%
Failure to Return to/ Walk away CCC	5%	5%	1%	5%	4%
Violation of Treatment	3%	4%	2%	1%	4%
Suspicious Criminal Act	3%	3%	4%	2%	4%
failure to Report	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Violation of Avoiding Criminal Associates	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%
Violation of CRF Rule	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Violation of Avoiding Victim	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Source: OMS (2011).

Note: ^a Ethnicity data were missing for 54 offenders.

²⁹ Only the first suspension while on release was considered for the data presented in this section as most offenders only had 1 suspension. 20% of offenders in the release cohort (n = 5,573) had more than 1 suspension (range = 1-9).

CSC staff surveyed indicated that the alternatives to suspension and revocation reported by staff are consistent with those stated in policy CD 715-3: *Community Assessments* (CSC, 2008e). Specifically, disciplinary interviews, increased level of intervention, urinalysis testing and additional treatment/programming were used frequently or very frequently by at least three-quarters of CSC staff surveyed as alternatives to suspension³⁰.

The importance of having flexibility to use professional discretion was highlighted by front-line staff in focus group discussions. This flexibility allowed staff to develop individualized intervention strategies and use alternatives to suspension and revocation to manage escalating risk in the community. These alternatives included earlier curfews, increased in-person supervision meetings and check-ins, increased urinalysis testing, substance abuse treatment, psychological counselling, increased programming, and periods of voluntary residency in halfway houses. In addition, supervisors identified the use of reporting centres, electronic monitoring devices, house confinement, and the revocation of weekend/overnight passes as potential alternatives to suspension.

However, the use of these alternatives to manage levels of escalating risk in the community varied. For instance, approximately 78% of staff surveyed reported that the availability of community services (e.g. residency options, programming) influenced whether they would use an alternative to suspension or make a recommendation to PBC that the offender be revoked. For example, Chapter 1 of the Community Corrections Evaluation identified several gaps in programs and services offered to offenders in the community, namely in the areas of social, employment and mental health services. Furthermore, Chapter 1 also revealed that the availability and accessibility of programs and services varied across communities, thus having a direct impact on the choice of supervision strategies and alternatives to suspension/revocation used in each jurisdiction.

³⁰ Since CSC staff reported the frequent/very frequent use of these methods, it is possible that the 51.8% of offenders who did not have an OMS reported action (i.e. program referral, special condition imposed, revocation or increased level of intervention) recorded within 30 days of their suspension were given another alternative (i.e. disciplinary interview, urinalysis test or additional treatment/program).

Community Residential Facilities and Community Correctional Centres

Profile of Offenders Residing in CRFs and CCCs

The two most common residential placements include Community Residential Facilities (CRF) and Community Correctional Centres (CCC). CRFs are non-governmental, privately owned facilities identified as community residential facilities or halfway houses that provide a variety of services to offenders in the community³¹. In contrast, CCCs are CSC operated minimum security facilities that aid in offender reintegration into the community through the provision of a supportive environment. Depending on an offender's risk, CSC may recommend and/or PBC may require that an offender reside in a residential facility as a condition of their release (CSC, 2008d).

Offenders released directly to a CRF and CCC were mostly male (91% and 99%). A higher proportion of women offenders were released directly to a CRF (9%) compared to a CCC (1%). Offenders released directly to a CRF and CCC were mostly non-Aboriginal (85% and 75%). A higher proportion of Aboriginal offenders were released directly to a CCC (25%) compared to a CRF (15%).

Approximately half (54%) of all offenders in the release cohort had at least one stay in a CRF or CCC during their release. Of these offenders, the majority (94%) stayed in a CRF and the remaining 6% stayed in a CCC. Almost all CRF (91%) and CCC (92%) residents entered the facility/centre on the same day they were released from custody. Offenders resided in a facility/centre on average for 110 days in a CRF and 87 days in a CCC. The median number of days offenders resided in the facility/centre were 80 days in a CRF and 27 days in a CCC. Data differed for women and Aboriginal offenders (for more information please refer to Table 11).

³¹ There are approximately 166 CRFs currently partnered with CSC, which provide accommodation, counselling, programming and supervision to federal offenders in the community (CSC National CRF Directory <http://www.csc-sec.gc.ca/text/pblct/community/cr-eng.shtml>).

Table 11: Days in a CRF/CCC from Release

	Number of Days in a CRF/CCC from Release					
	Mean		Median		Range	
	CRF	CCC	CRF	CCC	CRF	CCC
All Offenders	110	87	80	27	0 to 1,551	0 to 974
Men	110	89	81	30	0 to 1,551	0 to 974
Women	106	0	68	0	0 to 1,038	0
Aboriginal	97	119	63	65	0 to 1,279	0 to 974
Non-Aboriginal	112	79	83	19	0 to 1,551	0 to 802

Source: OMS (2011).

As Table 12 demonstrates³², offenders released directly to a CRF were mostly medium risk, while offenders released directly to a CCC were mostly high risk. In comparison to all offenders, women released to a CRF tended to be lower risk³³. Aboriginal offenders released directly to a CRF and released directly CCC were mostly high risk.

Table 12: CRF and CCC Release Type by Risk

Risk Level	Released to CRF or CCC by Risk Level					
	All offenders ^a		Women Offenders ^b		Aboriginal Offenders ^c	
	Released to CRF (n = 12,537)	Released to CCC (n = 854)	Released to CRF (n = 1,122)	Released to CCC (n = 10)	Released to CRF (n = 1,848)	Released to CCC (n = 216)
Low	25%	13%	45%	0%	10%	5%
Medium	46%	37%	40%	30%	40%	30%
High	29%	50%	15%	70%	50%	65%

Source: OMS (2011).

Notes: ^a $X^2(2) = 156.1167, p < .001, V = 0.1080$

^b The chi-square test was unreliable for women as over 50% of cells had expected values of less than 5 .

^c $X^2(2) = 17.9275, p < .001, V = 0.0932$

³² Analyses were conducted using chi-square tests for independence.

³³ Analyses could not be conducted to confirm that the proportion of women released directly to a CRF was different from those released directly to a CCC because of the small number of women ($n = 10$) released to a CCC.

As demonstrated in Table 13, differences³⁴ were found between release type and whether the release was to a CRF or CCC. The majority of day and full parole releases are going to CRFs, while the majority of statutory releases are going to CCCs. This suggests that higher risk offenders released on statutory release, possibly with residency conditions, are being released to CCCs.

Table 13: Release Type by CRF and CCC

Release Type	Released to CRF/CCC by Release Type ^a	
	Released to CRF (n = 12,547)	Released to CCC (n = 856)
Full Parole	1%	0%
Day Parole	75%	48%
Statutory Release	24%	49%
Long-term Supervision Orders	0%	3%

Source: OMS (2011).

Note: ^a $X^2(3) = 354.33, p < .001, V = 0.16$

Voluntary Residency in CRFs and CCCs

CRFs and CCCs typically have offenders residing in these facilities under two scenarios – those that are mandated to stay there (i.e. day parole or those with a residency condition) and those that stay there voluntarily. A voluntary stay occurs when an offender resides in a CRF or CCC without being mandated to stay in the facility/centre by the type of release (i.e. day parole) or by a residency condition imposed by the PBC.

Analysis³⁵ of OMS data on voluntary residency stays³⁶ revealed that offenders voluntarily released to a CRF or CCC had a significantly greater rate of revocation for a technical violation, but there was no difference in their rate of revocation with a new offence or rate of returning to custody two years post WED. Specifically, the rate of revocation for a technical violation was 1.43 times greater for offenders who were released to a CRF and 1.76 times greater for offenders

³⁴A chi-square test for independence was used to identify statistically significant differences in the data.

³⁵ Analyses were conducted using Cox regression, which controlled for the following covariates: age at release, need rating at release, and risk rating at release.

³⁶ To assess the effectiveness of voluntary residency stays, offenders released on day parole and offenders with a residency condition were excluded from these analyses because they both require the offender to reside in a CRF or CCC.

who were released to a CCC than those who were released to the community (see tables H3 and H5 in Appendix H). Similar results were found for voluntary residency with Aboriginal offenders (See tables H4 and H6 in Appendix H).

These findings indicate that offenders who are voluntarily released to a residential facility receive more revocations for a technical violation, but when it comes to revocation with a new offence or returns to custody post-WED, they are similar to their comparison group. Voluntary stays in CRFs and CCCs are often an alternative to incarceration. Although revocation for technical violation occurs more often, this can be viewed as another mechanism to effectively manage risk as this revocation may result in additional programming and support for the offender, subsequently decreasing their likelihood of returning for a new offence. This supports the summary finding presented earlier that with enhanced supervision and monitoring offenders are revoked at higher rates, but do not have a higher rate of new offences (either revocation with a new offence or return to custody post-WED). The efficiency of CCCs and CRFs will be further explored in the efficiency section of this report.

Number of Available Beds Used in CCCs/CRFs

In 2008, CSC collaborated with a total of 16 CCCs and 129 CRFs. The combined bed-spaces offered to offenders totaled 2,580, with an average of 20 bed-spaces per facility. Data indicated that 75% of CRF beds are typically occupied (range: 59% to 91%) (CSC, 2008d). The average occupancy rate as reported by a recent review of community based residential facilities, was comparable for CRFs and CCCs (84% versus 83%). CCCs reported that 75% have waitlists, compared to 52% of CRFs (CSC, 2008d).

Having several residential options available in the community allows greater flexibility when considering offender placement options and ensuring that the best possible release plan is established prior to an offender's release (CSC, 2008d). Unfortunately, offenders may not always have the option of returning to their preferred release location due to key factors that Parole Officers must consider when developing release plans, such as public safety, employment, available community support, and bed space availability (CSC, 2008d). For example, in focus group discussions, staff respondents noted that an offender may be released to an unfamiliar community because the community has the services that the offender requires (e.g. methadone clinic, available bed space in a CRF). Likewise, the majority of staff surveyed indicated that the

availability of bed spaces impacts the release destination for offenders in general (80%), as well as for women offenders (79%), Aboriginal offenders (78%) and offenders with mental disorders (80%) in particular.

Women Offenders

Generally speaking, staff respondents mentioned a lack of programming resources for women under the care of community based residential facilities, specifically in the areas of employment and mother/child programming (CSC, 2008d). Suggestions to address these gaps include increased access to employment counselors and services as well as other programs that may be delivered in small groups (CSC, 2008d). It was also suggested that more bed spaces, including private home placements³⁷, for women be created and further training focusing on women-specific issues and supervision should be administered.

Older Offenders

Access to adequate housing and programming for older offenders were two of the most cited community limitations for older offenders. Currently, 22% of all CRF and CCC beds are accessible to physically disabled residents. However, 27% of the offenders in the community are over 50 years old and 24% of offenders released have known physical disabilities (CSC, 2008d). Given the aging population, there is an increased need for CRFs and CCCs to be equipped to accommodate physically disabled residents (CSC, 2008d). To reduce service gaps for offenders with physical health needs, there are a number of suggested strategies to improve CRFs and CCCs including: retaining on-site nursing staff, creating CRFs designed to accommodate physically disabled and critically ill offenders in close proximity to public health care facilities, developing partnerships with healthcare networks, and upgrading current facilities to accommodate physical disabilities.

Offenders with Mental Disorders

In 2007-08, almost 900 offenders were released with mental health conditions. Many

³⁷ A private home placement is a private home that provides accommodation to offenders referred by CSC and in accordance with Section 66(3) of the CCRA.

offenders with mental health issues require at least one period of CRF and CCC accommodation due to their needs (CSC, 2008d). CSC staff surveyed indicated that available residency options may not be adequate to manage offenders with mental health problems. As previously mentioned in this report, CSC has traditionally experienced challenges in accessing community based beds and services for this clientele. Focus groups with community partners and CSC staff highlighted that the issue of bed space may be more pressing for women offenders with mental disorders than men, given the high proportion of women released into the community with mental health needs, in relation to the number of beds available to women in the community.

Offender Perspectives of Residency Options

Interviews with incarcerated offenders found that many plan to live in a CRF or CCC upon release, perceiving many benefits to this plan. These benefits included the facilitation of a more gradual transition into society (25%), assistance in finding employment and saving money (22%), access to essential resources and support from staff (20%), and help with becoming more accountable and disciplined (20%).

Recent Residential Service Improvements

Lastly, it is important to note that in October 2011, the Federal Community Corrections Strategy was released and consists of five Strategic Principles. This Strategy provides a vision to guide community corrections in CSC to the year 2020 and speaks to the specific needs of women, Aboriginal offenders and offenders with mental health disorders. With regard to accommodation, as noted in the Strategy, the needs of the previously referred groups of offenders will be a key consideration in the development of partnerships which seek to enhance access to specialized housing opportunities.

Changes in Risk/Need Levels from Intake to WED

FINDING 6: Offenders overall demonstrated improved levels of risk, need, motivation and reintegration potential ratings from intake to WED.

The focus of this section is a review of changes in offender profiles during the supervision period, specifically, risk, need, motivation, and reintegration potential between time periods – intake, release and WED³⁸. It is important to note that this profile was performed only on those offenders who had reached WED so that the same offenders were compared across time.

With respect to need, the highest proportions of offenders were rated as medium or high need at intake, release, and WED. In terms of risk and motivation level, the highest proportions of offenders were rated as medium or high risk and motivation at intake, release and WED. With respect to reintegration potential, the largest proportion of offenders were rated as having a medium or high reintegration potential at intake, release, and WED (for further details on these analyses please refer to Appendix F).

Results show that all ratings (risk, need, motivation, reintegration potential) are headed in a positive direction. On average, the majority of offenders had no change reported in these case management indexes, but where change was recorded, the change was in a positive direction. Specifically, for offenders whose need ratings changed from release to WED, 77% improved their need level. Of the offenders whose risk level changed, 88% improved their risk level. Of the offenders whose motivation level changed, 61% improved on motivation. As well, of the offenders whose reintegration potential level changed, 55% improved their reintegration potential. For further details on these analyses please refer to Appendix F.

According to the Audit of Community Supervision (CSC, 2010b), Correctional Plans and Correctional Plan Updates are not always reviewed or revised in accordance with policy. It is

³⁸ For the purpose of this section of the report, a WED subset was created from the release cohort in order to compare offender risk, need, motivation level and reintegration potential profiles at intake, release and WED. The WED subset only included offenders who had reached WED on or before April 10, 2011 and who had intake, release and WED assessment information for all 4 rating types (i.e. only offenders who had need, risk, motivation and reintegration scores for all 3 assessment periods were included in this analysis). A total of 16,277 offenders were overall included in this analysis.

unclear if offender change is a result of no demonstrated changes or simply because offender risk, need, motivation and reintegration levels are not always reviewed or updated in accordance with policy. The changes noted in this analysis are all headed in a positive direction.

In conclusion, Theme 3 (Supervision of Offenders in the Community) has demonstrated effectiveness across these sub-sections, when adequate resources are available in the community. It has been demonstrated that the tools and strategies used by CSC to manage and supervise offenders in the community are in accordance with offender risk and need profiles and have achieved a number of positive correctional outcomes. Indeed, community supervision tools and strategies appear to contribute to the safe reintegration of offenders into the community.

The following section of the report focuses on Theme 4: Community Staff Safety. This section will examine the effectiveness of measures that CSC has implemented to enhance the safety of community staff.

Community Staff Safety

The performance of Theme 4: Community staff safety is addressed in this section. The evaluation examined the community staff safety tools and measures developed by CSC. In addition, this section also examines the perceptions of CSC staff concerning their safety, and suggestions for improvements. Overall efficiency will be reported at the end of the report.

FINDING 7: Although staff perceived some threats to safety in the community, the majority of Parole Officers were not concerned with their safety, as tandem supervision and the use of technology were identified by staff as a means of enhancing their community staff safety.

Perceptions of Community Staff Safety

Staff were surveyed to determine their perceptions of their personal safety. Of those staff surveyed, the following factors posed the greatest concern to their safety in the community: offender substance abuse; unplanned visits to the offender's home; a lack of relationship with the offender; environmental factors in offender's homes such as dogs, cohabitants, second hand smoke, infectious diseases; confronting/announcing bad news to an offender; neighbourhoods where offenders live; and availability of security for staff delivering programs. A recent Audit of Community Supervision (CSC, 2010b) reported that while 83% of Parole Officers did not have any concerns with their safety when meeting offenders in the community, the majority indicated they were concerned about the neighbourhoods where they visit offenders (CSC, 2010b).

Staff perceptions of personal safety in the community varied. Overall, the majority of staff agreed that tandem supervision (70%) and the use of technology (73%) enhanced community staff safety. Some supervisors in focus group sessions reported that existing mechanisms have been effective in enhancing community staff safety, including mobile phones and removal of the official requirement for half of all visits to be conducted in an offender's own environment (e.g. home, work place, community visits).

Staff Training for CSC Community Staff

FINDING 8: While data indicated relatively high compliance rates for staff safety training, front-line staff desire more frequent staff safety refresher sessions.

Contents of Staff Safety Training are Appropriate for Community Staff

Training in the area of staff safety has been noted as an important issue for CSC staff and is included in many of CSC training courses. According to CSC's Mandatory Training 2010-11 manual (CSC 2010e), the following seven courses have specific content on safety for community staff: Parole Officer Orientation; Community Personal Safety; Community Personal Safety Training for Clerical Staff; Managing Community Incidents; Supervising Community Professionals; Managing Offenders with Long-Term Supervision Orders; and Parole Officer Continuous Development (POCD). For additional information on safety training provided to community staff please refer to Appendix B.

Staff Perceptions of Relevance/Effectiveness of Training

Staff were surveyed about the relevance and effectiveness of staff safety training provided by CSC. Questions examined the appropriateness and adequacy of training content, its perceived impact on awareness of staff safety measures, its effectiveness in improving staff safety, and its general usefulness in their daily work.

Almost half (44%) of staff indicated that the content of staff safety training is appropriate, but despite the aforementioned courses provided by CSC to increase staff safety in the community, more than one-quarter (29%) did not feel that the content of CSC's staff safety training is appropriate for community staff with some staff indicating that much of the content was related to working in the institution and often irrelevant to community staff. It was suggested that CSC should offer training specifically highlighting the needs and demands of institutional and community environments.

While 37% of staff surveyed indicated that staff in the community receive sufficient training related to staff safety, a slightly higher proportion (41%) indicated that the current training is insufficient. When asked in which areas specific safety training should be offered to

community staff, among those who indicated the current training is insufficient, 31% identified the need for more training in de-escalation and diffusion tactics, 29% identified crisis management, 22% indicated common safety practices, 19% highlighted the importance of training on building open relationships with offenders, and 17% highlighted the need for more common safety practices training.

Only half (52%) of staff surveyed reported that community staff safety training is effective in enhancing staff safety and that the information they learned in the training is useful in their daily work (53%). Almost one-quarter (24%) of staff indicated that the community staff safety training is ineffective in enhancing staff safety and 18% reported that the information learned is not useful in their daily work. Respondents who indicated a lack of satisfaction with the current staff safety training and refreshers were asked what changes to staff safety training are necessary to be more effective and/or useful. Almost half (40%) identified the need for enhanced availability of refresher courses and 15% indicated that more self-defense training is required.

Through focus group discussions, CSC staff and community partners provided many of the same suggestions to improve available training courses and also indicated the need for additional training in the following areas:

- Regular refresher courses on CPR;
- Identifying behaviour issues in offenders;
- Using professional judgment to assess situations;
- Developing relationships with collaterals and community contacts; and
- Using a team approach to safety.

Training/Refresher Courses are Completed in a Timely Manner and in Accordance With Policy

In 2011, Learning and Development implemented a new methodology³⁹ to calculate rates of training compliance. The evaluation team used this methodology to analyze the compliance

³⁹ Training compliance has been calculated in accordance with the following formula adopted by the Learning and Development Branch in FY 2010-11: [competencies granted / number of required competencies]. Therefore, overall compliance rates indicate the percentage of individuals who received the required training, but do not provide insight into whether or not the training was completed within the timeframes specified in policy.

for courses related to community staff safety for the fiscal years ending 2007 through to 2011. Table 14⁴⁰ provides data for FY 2010-11. The overall compliance for all courses was 91%. The two courses with the highest compliance rate were Managing Long-Term Supervision Orders (98%) and Parole Office Orientation (97%). The two courses with the lowest compliance rates were Managing Community Incidents (75%) and Parole Officer Continuous Development-formal (81%).

Since the new methodology differentiates the number of non-compliances within and outside a particular course's required timeframe for completion, it is possible to show the percentage of all accumulated non-compliances that are outside the timeframe and therefore where compliance policy has not been adhered to as of the end of a given fiscal year. This information is shown in the table below and reveals that the two courses with the highest rate of non-compliances outside the time limit were Parole Officer Orientation (100%) and Parole Officer Continuous Development-formal (82%), while the courses with the lowest rate were Parole Officer Continuous Development - Self-Study (31%) and Supervising Community Professionals (18%). A more detailed look at compliance and non-compliance rates outside the timeframe for each course by fiscal year and by region may be found in Appendix C.

⁴⁰ Table 15 is a snapshot of training compliance as of March 31, 2011. Please note that competencies not granted (within and outside time limits) are calculated in a cumulative manner; therefore do not necessarily represent new cases each fiscal year. For example, if an individual has not received the required training, this individual will be recorded as non-compliant each fiscal year until the training is received.

Table 14: National Training Compliance Rates for FY 2010-11

Course	National Compliance FY2010-11	Non-compliance FY 2010-11		
		Within time period (n)	Outside time period (n)	% of all non-compliance that are outside of time limit FY 2010-2011
All courses	91%	156	369	70%
Parole Officer orientation ^a	97%	0	19	100% ^b
Community personal safety phase I - awareness and personal safety	93%	18	54	75%
Community personal safety phase II: disengagement skills training	93%	16	54	77%
Parole Officer continuous development	81%	41	184	82%
Parole Officer continuous development - self-study	92%	35	16	31%
Community personal safety training for clerical staff	94%	9	7	44%
Managing long-term supervision orders	98%	6	13	68%
Managing community incidents	75%	22	20	48%
Supervising community professionals	89%	9	2	18%

Source: HRMS (March 31, 2011).

Notes: ^a Formerly known as Parole Officer Induction Training (POIT)

^b Although POs are required to complete PO orientation prior to assuming full responsibilities of the position, HRMS data revealed that nationally, in 2011, PO orientation had 19 non-compliances outside the allotted time period, which was also the highest number of such cases between 2007 and 2011. To provide context, however, the average number of required PO orientation competencies for the past five FYs was 685 per year. Furthermore, all of 2011 cases occurred in Quebec, which was also where most of these cases occurred in previous fiscal years. One reason for this may be that due to translation issues of course materials, the Quebec region at times takes longer to implement some training initiatives which may affect the granting of compete.

^c These statistics represent combined compliance for all three versions of POCD that were in 2007-11.

Equipment and Technological Changes/Modifications

While 67% of staff surveyed reported that CSC community staff have access to the appropriate technology to ensure their safety, 17% reported that they did not. When asked which technologies community staff should have access to in order to enhance their safety, the most common responses included: “adequate communication devices” such as Blackberries, satellite phones, two-way radios, and the need for increased and more effective cell phone coverage.

In a recent Audit of Community Staff Safety (CSC, 2007b), all Parole Officers agreed that proper communication equipment is necessary in reducing the risk to community Parole Officers. CSC has provided all Parole Officers with cell phones. However, in remote areas cell phone reception deteriorates and Parole Officers cannot make contact. In addition, it was noted that auto-locks and passwords required on Blackberries often make these devices difficult to use which may be problematic in emergency situations.

Staff Safety Assessments

FINDING 9: While initial staff safety assessments are largely completed in accordance with policy, staff safety re-assessments for tandem supervision cases are not consistently conducted within the required 90 day timeframe.

Staff safety assessments (SSA) assess the existence of any staff safety issues for each offender prior to any community supervision contact (CSC, 2012a). SSAs consider both offender factors (e.g. criminal history, mental health issues, instability of inmate relationships) and environmental factors (e.g. remote location, availability of police, restricted cell phone coverage, proximity to gang activity) to determine an appropriate community visit strategy (CSC, 2008a). For example, an alternative interview location, police notification prior to community visits or tandem supervision may be required to enhance staff safety in the community.

Parole Officers and Parole Officer Supervisors are required to conduct staff safety assessments (SSA) upon initial release and no later than 10 working days following release (CSC, 2008a)⁴¹.

⁴¹ These analyses were conducted based on the previous policy regarding staff safety assessments (CD 715: *Community Supervision Framework*). The new policy on staff safety (CD 715-1: *Community Supervision*) now states that SSAs are to be completed prior to any community supervision contact, excluding contacts at a

Analysis of OMS SSA data revealed that initial staff safety assessments were completed for 94% of eligible⁴² offenders. The median⁴³ number of days to completion of the SSA⁴⁴ was 5 days after release⁴⁵ with a range of 28 days prior to release to 850 days after release. Approximately 74% of initial SSAs were completed within 10 working days of release⁴⁶.

As part of the SSA, the requirement for tandem supervision is also determined (i.e. the requirement that all community supervision contacts, except those at a community-based residential facility or in public areas, will occur with a second authorized individual). As outlined in CD 715-1: *Community Supervision*, tandem supervision is a requirement in cases where one (or both) of the following criteria are met:

- 1) Offenders who have a criminal history involving any sexual offence and/or death and assessed as high risk at intake; and
- 2) Offenders who have a criminal history involving any sexual offence and/or death and classified as maximum security at release (offender security level; CSC, 2012a).

From the sub-sample release cohort used for the SSA analysis, 11% of eligible offenders with a staff safety assessment were flagged as requiring tandem supervision. The majority of offenders who met the tandem supervision criteria at release were rated as high risk at the time of their release (80% high risk vs. 18% medium risk vs. 2% low risk), suggesting that initial tandem supervision requirements are being assigned in accordance with risk as per the tandem supervision criteria outlined in policy.

community-based residential facility, and no later than 10 working days following: an offender's initial release, case reassignment, a change in release type, or at any time the PO determines that factors have arisen that may have a possible impact on staff safety (CSC, 2012a).

⁴² Since CD 715 only required SSAs to be completed from June 30, 2008 onward, only offenders released after this date were considered to be "eligible" offenders for this analysis of staff safety assessments ($n = 12,696$).

⁴³ Median measures are reported rather than means due to the presence of significant outliers impacting measures of central tendency.

⁴⁴ This was based on the review date associated with the assessment in OMS.

⁴⁵ 9 staff safety assessments were removed from this analysis because according to data extracted from OMS the assessment date occurred more than 30 days before the offender's release date. It is assumed that these data resulted from a data entry error.

⁴⁶ This SSA completion rate is comparable to (although slightly lower than) that found in the Audit of Community Supervision conducted in September 2010 which indicated that 86% of the required Staff Safety Assessments for an offender's initial release were completed in accordance with the policy (i.e. within 10 working days of release). Differences in percentages may be due to a smaller sample size for the audit and different timeframes (i.e. April 1, 2009 to January 31, 2010 for audit).

According to CD-715-1: *Community Supervision*, offenders who were flagged as requiring tandem supervision on their staff safety assessment must be reassessed within 90 days of their previous staff safety assessment date (CSC, 2012a). Approximately 62% of eligible⁴⁷ offenders had a staff safety reassessment. However, only 38% of these staff safety reassessments⁴⁸ took place in the required period of time (within 90 days⁴⁹ of the staff safety assessment date)⁵⁰.

SUMMARY FINDING 4: To ensure public safety, broad criteria are used to identify offenders requiring tandem supervision and overrides are then used to narrow the scope of the criteria to ensure that only offenders who pose a risk to staff safety are supervised in tandem.

An override⁵¹ to tandem supervision can be recommended by a Case Management Team (CMT) following a case conference. However, only an Area Director can approve an override for tandem supervision (CSC, 2008b). Approximately 36% of initial staff safety assessments had a tandem supervision override request with an approval rate of 90%. Additionally, 54% of staff safety reassessments had an override request, of which 90% were approved. Therefore, it appears that overrides on initial staff safety assessments occur one-third of the time, but on staff safety reassessments it seems that almost half of the assessments are ultimately overridden.

A recent review of tandem supervision also found a number of problematic issues regarding tandem supervision overrides, primarily: inconsistency in the content of Area

⁴⁷ To be consistent with the staff safety reassessment policy (i.e. CD-715), offenders were considered to be ‘eligible’ in our analyses for a reassessment, if they met the following conditions: (1) they were released after June 30, 2008 (when the staff safety assessment requirement came into effect), (2) they were on release for at least 90 days from their staff safety assessment date before the date of data collection (i.e. April 11, 2011), (3) they remained on release (i.e. without revocation or reaching their WED) under supervision in the community for at least 90 days from their staff safety assessment date, (4) they were flagged as requiring tandem supervision on their initial staff safety reassessment.

⁴⁸ 32 staff safety reassessments were removed from this analysis because according to data extracted from OMS the reassessment date occurred before the staff safety assessment date, which produced a negative number of days from the staff safety assessment date to the staff safety reassessment date. It is assumed that these data resulted from a data entry error.

⁴⁹ The median number of days between the offender’s staff safety assessment and staff safety reassessment was 95 days (with a range of 10 to 887 days).

⁵⁰ The Audit of Community Supervision conducted in September 2010 reports that 41% of offenders (included in their file review) who required tandem supervision had their staff safety reassessment completed in accordance with the policy. This is very similar to results reported in the present evaluation (39%).

⁵¹ The term override is no longer used in the revised CD 715-1: *Community Supervision*, which refers to exceptions to the tandem supervision requirement where Area Directors or Parole Officer Supervisors remove the tandem supervision requirement if there are no staff safety issues (CSC, 2012a)

Director's rationale for approving the override; no clear guideline or expectation as to what to include in the recommendations for overrides; an overall lack of consistency in the information provided for an override, and the use of copied write-ups from one SSA to the other for the same offender (CSC, 2011g).

Almost three-quarters (73%) of CSC staff responding to the questionnaire reported that the tandem supervision policy was clear, but some staff reported that Case Management Teams should have flexibility to use discretion and professional judgment to override the tandem supervision requirement where necessary. Some staff participating in focus group discussions suggested that the criteria for tandem supervision was too inclusive and that certain offenders did not require tandem supervision even though they meet established criteria. On the other hand, staff respondents also suggested that some offenders require tandem supervision but fail to meet the established criteria. Similarly, a recent Audit of Community Supervision (CSC, 2010b), reported that Parole Officers and Parole Officer Supervisors suggested that tandem supervision was not being applied to the appropriate offenders. For example, "Parole Officers stated that there is little staff safety concern from a pedophile, which would typically require tandem supervision, when compared to those with gang affiliations, which would not require tandem supervision" (CSC, 2010b, p.25).

In response to a recommendation in the recent Audit of Community Supervision (2010b), the Community Operations Division undertook a review of the tandem supervision policies and procedures, to ensure that staff safety remains the primary focus when completing Staff Safety Assessments. A recent review of tandem supervision (CSC, 2011g) found that tandem supervision continues to be a vital and necessary component of community supervision. The review of tandem supervision did recognize inconsistencies regarding rationale for overrides, and CD 715-1: *Community Supervision*, has been recently updated to reinforce the importance of tandem supervision and clarify the processes for overrides where appropriate. While the tandem supervision criteria will remain as is, the policy now clarifies that by overriding a tandem supervision flag, Area Directors are verifying that there are no staff safety concerns for the Parole Officer to see the offender in isolated areas, such as offender homes (CSC, 2012a).

According to *Commissioners Directive 715-1: Community Supervision*, the tandem partner refers to the second individual authorized by policy (or the District Director) to complete tandem supervision (CSC, 2012a). CD 715-1 outlines that authorized individuals may include

any CSC staff; Peace Officers (including Police Officers and Provincial Probation/Parole Officers); Community Assessment and Parole Supervision (CAPS) contractors in remote/isolated areas; and individuals authorized by the District Director by name. In addition, these persons must have enhanced reliability security clearance, and have been briefed on the offender's criminal history and case dynamics as they relate to staff safety risk factors (CSC, 2012a).

In focus group discussions for the current evaluation, staff respondents suggested a need for greater flexibility in terms of the accompanying person to complete tandem visits. More specifically, there seem to be questions pertaining to the qualifications of the second/accompanying person and whether the person should be a Police Officer, Parole Officer Supervisor, CRF staff, CCLO, correctional officer, or commissionaire in order to ensure the safety of staff and partners. Furthermore, the need for budgetary clarification on how to account for the participation of CSC employees in tandem supervision was noted. It is noteworthy that similar issues were raised in the Audit of Community Staff Safety (CSC, 2007b). As well, the audit indicated that a wide variety of personnel were being used as tandem supervision staff. It appears that some confusion still exists as to who should act in tandem, for tandem supervision visits, given that additional resources have not been allocated to account for the tandem partner.

Number and Type of Community Staff Safety Incidents Over the Last 5 Years

Staff safety is of critical importance to CSC. As was described in the background section of this report, CSC has significantly enhanced staff safety measures to include the implementation of sign-in and sign-out procedures for parole offices, requirements for tandem supervision to offender residences, introduction of staff safety assessments, cell phones issued to Parole Officers, etc. In addition, CSC removed the requirement for more than 50% of Parole Officer contacts with offenders to be in the community in August 2005 (CSC, 2007b).

All community staff safety incidents between April 1, 2005 to April 1, 2011 were extracted from OMS. A total of 34 community staff safety incidents were recorded. Approximately 65% of these incidents were threats against staff and the remaining 35% were assaults against staff. The majority of community staff safety incidents (94%) were committed by male and non-Aboriginal offenders (87%). Incidents most frequently occurred at a location coded as 'other' (68%), followed by the offender's residence (18%) and commercial locations or

private residences (14%). The majority of all incidents were committed by offenders supervised on statutory release (63%).

It should be noted that there are some concerns regarding the reliability of data reported in OMS on community staff safety incidents, which may have resulted in under-reporting of community staff safety incidents based on the OMS tables used to extract data for this report⁵². As described in the limitations section, CSC has significantly enhanced the manner in which incidents are recorded in OMS⁵³.

⁵² Community staff safety incidents were extracted from the Sensational Incidents Table in OMS. It should be noted that the common use of the 'other incident' category in the sensational incident table suggests that incidents are being inaccurately recorded in this incident type (e.g. from April 1, 2005 to April 1, 2011, there were 1,690 'other' incidents in the community, which were not factored into the number the staff safety incidents recorded above, suggesting that the number of community staff safety incidents reported above may have been underestimated). There also appears to be some potential inconsistent recording of incidents (e.g. the Quebec region had more community staff safety incidents recorded than the other regions, which may be a result of a higher number of incidents, or simply different operational data entry practices). Finally, there is no ability to update community incident information in OMS (i.e. following data entry of a community incident, if additional information is obtained, there is no provision to enter an 'update' to the initial sensational incident report. Therefore, staff must enter a second or even a third incident report in relation to the same event in order to update the information. This difficulty could result in duplicate entries for the same event, thus resulting in an overestimation of the number of community staff safety incidents).

⁵³ Offender Management System (2011). Incident Report and Use of Force: Project Charter (v0.8).

Community Staff Safety Program (CSSP)

FINDING 10: While technical challenges were identified in the Community Staff Safety Program pilot project conducted in 2008-2009, the program was assessed by a management review as being cost effective and providing timely responses.

Recently, CSC launched the Community Staff Safety Program (CSSP) to enhance the safety of staff who supervise offenders and perform related duties in the community. CSSP is currently being piloted at the Ottawa Parole Office and the Sault-Ste. Marie Parole Sub-office in the Ontario region. Community staff involved in CSSP include: Parole Officers, Parole Officer Supervisors, Mental Health Staff, Program Officers, Psychologists, Community Employment Coordinators, Volunteer Coordinators, Aboriginal Community Liaison Officers, and Community Correctional Liaison Officers.

All staff involved in CSSP were provided a blackberry device with an alarm feature, and GPS capabilities. When performing daily duties in the community, staff are responsible for using an electronic sign-in/sign-out system, providing a detailed daily itinerary, and maintaining contact with the National Monitoring Centre (NMC) upon the arrival and conclusion of a community visit.

It should be noted that the Community Reintegration Branch in 2009 conducted a management review of the CSSP (CSC, 2009c). Results of the review indicated that while the technology contributed to timely response to urgent actions, challenges existed concerning the system's overall accuracy.⁵⁴ Finally, at an estimated cost of \$152,357⁵⁵ and given the scope and type of the project, the pilot project was considered to be cost-effective. The management review recommended that CSC continue to address the technical challenges mentioned above and consider not expanding the program until these challenges were resolved. Furthermore, the Community Reintegration Branch is currently piloting a real time reporting application in 18 area offices in the Atlantic, Ontario and Pacific Regions. This application leverages technology

⁵⁴ The main technological challenge, which persisted throughout the pilot testing, was related to the GPS coordinates being limited to 85-90%. Other hardware problems occurred that resulted in inconvenience and in turn raised concerns over what could happen during an actual emergency situation in the field.

⁵⁵ This estimate included a Privacy Impact Assessment, Threat Risk Assessment, equipment, professional services, and salary.

through the use of a desktop application that allows community staff to input community supervisions and have those supervisions overseen by the National Monitoring Centre.

A review of community staff safety practices in other countries and within Canadian provinces was conducted to determine whether CSC's community corrections is consistent with what is being performed in other jurisdictions. Overall, based on the environmental scan conducted for this evaluation, community staff safety strategies and tools used by CSC appear to be generally consistent with those used in other countries/jurisdictions. For example, the use of comprehensive staff safety training, risk assessment tools, sign-in/sign-out procedures, tandem supervision or "buddy systems" seem to be common elements of both CSC's staff safety initiatives as well as most of the staff safety programs reviewed through the scan.

Evaluation Objective 3: Efficiency and Economy

Efficiency and economy are demonstrated through the assessment of resource use in relation to the production of outputs and progress toward expected outcomes

SUMMARY FINDING 5: Financial and operational efficiencies can be made by increasing parole applications through a greater emphasis on preparing offenders for discretionary release (i.e. through the completion of correctional interventions).

FINDING 11: Only one third of parole applications result in a decision and approximately 20% of applications are withdrawn, postponed or adjourned at the offender's request.

Frequency of Rates of Parole Applications, Withdrawals, Postponements, Adjournments

Day and full parole are considered early and discretionary release, with an application requesting this type of release being made to PBC. Once the application has been made, a number of outcomes can occur. For instance, an offender may withdraw their application, or a decision may be made where PBC approves or denies the request. Should a request be approved, a number of conditions may be imposed that the offender is required to follow in order to be granted release and remain on release. From April 1, 2010 to March 30, 2011, 24,677 applications were made for day parole and full parole decisions⁵⁶.

As Table 15 below demonstrates, 35% of these applications for decision resulted in a parole decision recorded in OMS. Of the remaining 65% of applications, 29% resulted in a pending decision, 5% of applications were withdrawn, 9% were postponed, 7% were waived, and 15% of applications resulted in an alternative⁵⁷ action. Significant differences in the data

⁵⁶ Day and full parole applications were examined together for analyses in this section. As a result, any differences related to day or full parole application decisions (e.g. the implication of residency in day parole releases), were not examined in this evaluation. It is also important to note that in 8% (n = 1,920) of day and full parole applications, 10% (n = 373) of day and full parole waivers and 19% (n = 1,645) of day and full parole recorded decisions, offenders applied for, waived or had their parole decided for both paroles (day and full parole) on the same day

⁵⁷ An alternative action could include: application rejected, attached, cancelled, cancelled in error, decision advanced, recalculation or rescheduled.

were found for women and Aboriginal offenders. Women offenders had a lower percentage of waivers, postponements and withdraws, and a higher number of recorded decisions, in contrast to men offenders. Aboriginal offenders had a greater percentage of waivers, postponements and withdrawals, and a lower number of recorded decisions, relative to non-Aboriginal offenders.

Table 15: Decision Status for Day Parole and Full Parole Applications for Offenders in the Release Cohort

Decisions Applications (DP/FP)	Waivers	Postponements	Withdrawals	Decision Recorded	Other ^a
All offenders (<i>n</i> = 24,677)	7%	9%	5%	35%	44%
Men ^b (<i>n</i> = 23,214)	7%	9%	5%	35%	44%
Women ^b (<i>n</i> = 1,463)	5%	7%	4%	42%	42%
Aboriginal ^c (<i>n</i> = 4,347)	10%	10%	5%	32%	43%
Non-Aboriginal ^c (<i>n</i> = 20,330)	7%	9%	4%	36%	44%

Source: OMS (2011).

Notes: ^a The ‘other’ category includes the following actions: application rejected, cancelled, in error, recalculation, rescheduled attached, release maintained.

^b $X^2(11) = 94.4474, p < .001, V = .0619$

^c $X^2(11) = 137.3442, p < .001, V = .0746$

Approximately 93% of the postponements, waivers and withdrawals indicated a reason for the decision to postpone, waive or withdrawal the parole application. It is interesting to note that in almost all (99.6%) postponements, waivers or withdrawals where a reason was indicated, the request for a postponement, waiver or withdrawal was made by the offender (as opposed to CSC or PBC). The most common reason given for a postponement, waiver or withdrawal was “Programs incomplete”, which accounted for 30% of the reasons for a postponement, waiver or withdrawal. Other reasons included to “Avoid a negative recommendation or decision” (15%) and “Other plan” (11%), “Other” (27%), and simply “Not interested in release” (5%), which were also noted as reasons for full parole or day parole decision postponements, waivers or withdrawals. This pattern was consistent for Women and Aboriginal offenders (refer to Table II in Appendix I for additional information).

A recent research report examined parole review delays and cancellations. Where an offender’s decision to not appear before PBC was because of incomplete programming, it was found that although program participation was implicated in 19% of all parole delays, 41% of these offenders were in progress at the time of delay, of which the majority (92%) subsequently completed the program (Cabana, Wilton and Stewart, 2011). File reviews were also conducted as

part of this research study and found both operational and offender-based factors contributed to the delays. Furthermore, in almost one-quarter of cases reviewed, no link between program participation and parole delays was found even though programming was originally coded as the cause of the delay (Cabana, Wilton and Stewart, 2011). Although ‘programs incomplete’ was the most common reason listed for a postponement, waiver or withdrawal, the findings of this research report shed light on the reasons for this response and some of the contingencies related to this data.

Although there is a high number of day and full parole applications being initiated only one-third (35%) resulted in a parole board decision. While the vast majority of these were terminated by offenders (99.6%), large efficiencies could be made if the parole application rate were increased. CSC is expected to prepare offenders for discretionary release, for PBC to make the final decision. However, if applications are not submitted, then it is impossible for offenders to be conditionally released on day or full parole.

Concordance Between CSC and PBC

FINDING 12: There is concordance between CSC and PBC in the majority of discretionary release decisions.

There are two types of concordance and two types of discordance.⁵⁸ For a table depiction of concordance/discordance see Table 16.

Table 16: CSC and PBC Concordance and Discordance Outcomes

	PBC Grants Release	PBC Denies Release
CSC Recommends Release	Concordant outcome A	Discordant outcome A
CSC does not Recommend Release	Discordant outcome B	Concordant outcome B

Analysis⁵⁹ of OMS data revealed that in 82% of day and full parole decisions CSC recommendations were in agreement with PBC decisions (see Table 17). As reported in

⁵⁸ Effectiveness of discordant outcomes can only be examined for discordant outcome B and not discordant outcome A because the offenders in discordant outcome A were not released. Therefore, we are examining the discordance where CSC did not recommend release, but PBC granted release.

Table 18, in 80% of day and full parole decisions specifically relating to women offenders CSC recommendations were in agreement with PBC decisions. As demonstrated in Table 19, in 78% of day and full parole decisions relating to Aboriginal offenders in particular, CSC recommendations were in agreement with PBC decisions.

Table 17: Concordance Between CSC and PBC Decisions for Full and Day Parole

Overall Concordance Rates ^a (n = 6,832)		
	PBC Grants Release (n = 2,998)	PBC Denies Release (n = 3,834)
CSC Recommends Release	41% (concordance)	15%
CSC does not Recommend Release	3%	41% (concordance)

Source: OMS (2011).

Note: ^a S (1) = 602.2647, p < .001, K = 0.6558

Table 18: Concordance Rates for Women

Concordance Rates for Women Offenders ^a (n = 471)		
	PBC Grants Release (n = 300)	PBC Denies Release (n = 171)
CSC Recommends Release	62% (concordance)	18%
CSC does not Recommend Release	2%	18% (concordance)

Source: OMS (2011).

Note: ^a S (1) = 66.1304, p < .001, K = 0.5317

Table 19: Concordance Rates for Aboriginal Offenders

Concordance Rates for Aboriginal Offenders ^a (n = 1,053)		
	PBC Grants Release (n = 320)	PBC Denies Release (n = 733)
CSC Recommends Release	28% (concordance)	20%
CSC does not Recommend Release	2%	50% (concordance)

Source: OMS (2011).

Note: ^a S (1) = 154.0485, p < .001 K = 0.5625

⁵⁹ Analyses were conducted using the McNemar's test, reporting an S statistic and Kappa coefficient to measure inter-observer agreement.

Concordance Between CSC and PBC Regarding Residency Condition

FINDING 13: Most residency conditions are recommended by CSC before being imposed by PBC, and almost all offenders released with a residency condition are released on statutory release.

The evaluation team examined the extent that there was agreement between the residency conditions recommended by CSC and those imposed by PBC. Overall, 22% of the release cohort had a residency condition with 79% recommended first by CSC and the remaining 21% imposed by PBC without having been recommended first by CSC. Excluding offenders released on day parole⁶⁰, 94% of offenders with a residency condition at the time of their release were released on statutory release. As demonstrated in Table 20, the majority of offenders who had a residency condition on release were high need and high risk.

Significant differences were found in the risk and need profiles of offenders for whom a residency condition was imposed by PBC, without a recommendation by CSC⁶¹. Offenders who had a residency condition imposed by PBC without a recommendation first from CSC were generally lower risk.

Table 20: Residency Conditions Imposed by PBC at Release by Need and Risk Profile

Ratings	CSC Recommended Condition (n = 3,791)	CSC did not Recommended Condition (n = 954)
Need ^a		
Low	1%	2%
Medium	14%	22%
High	85%	76%
Risk ^b		
Low	2%	4%
Medium	24%	36%
High	74%	60%

Source: OMS (2011).

Notes: ^a $X^2(2) = 49.9305, p < .001, V = 0.1026$

^b $X^2(2) = 67.5420, p < .001, V = 0.1193$

⁶⁰ Offenders released on day parole were excluded from this analysis because residency data was unreliable for this group. For example, day parole is a conditional release explicitly requiring a residency condition and the offender returns to a CRF or CCC or minimum institution at night for a maximum period of 6 months where day parole is continued or the offender is granted full parole or at two-thirds of their sentence. As a result, offenders released on day parole cannot have a condition to reside because it is a requirement of the release, but 13% of offenders released on day parole in the release cohort did have a special condition ‘to reside.

⁶¹ Analyses were conducted using chi-square tests for independence and Day parole cases excluded for reasons noted above.

CSC staff were asked what they perceived as the possible reasons for PBC not granting release of an offender when CSC has recommended release. Over half (55%; $n=56$) of staff surveyed reported that this occurred due to conflicting risk assessments or differing opinions of risk between CSC and PBC. Other suggested reasons included: insufficient or incomplete programming and/or availability of community resources (25%; $n=25$); insufficient progress and/or poor presentation of offenders during PBC hearing (25%; $n=25$); insufficient/incomplete casework/release planning (18%; $n=18$); political pressure (10%; $n=10$); the offenders criminal history (i.e. a history of violence and recidivism) (7%; $n=7$); and presentation of new information during PBC hearing (7% $n=7$). Similarly, reasons provided by PBC Board Members for not granting release of an offender when CSC has recommended release were inadequate assessments of risk (57%; $n=8$) followed by criminogenic factors not having been addressed (36%; $n=5$).

It is unlikely that this difference in risk assessment is a result of inadequate training as both PBC Board Members and CSC Parole Officers have been trained in structured risk assessment using the 'Structured Parole Decision Making Framework'. The Framework requires the consideration of seven specific factors⁶². It does not provide a risk rating scale, it merely provides a structure for the reviewer to consider the seven factors as favorable, neutral or negative. Then, based on their determination, the reviewers will use their professional judgment to make the decision regarding parole and hopefully reduce decision errors and introduce consistency in the assessment of risk (Serin, Gobeil & Sutton, 2009).

PBC Board Members received training on the Framework at PBC's Annual Training on Risk Assessment (ATRA) on Feb 17-18, 2011. In 2011, PBC adopted the Framework as a standard approach for parole decisions and formally accepted the Framework into PBC policy. As a result, the Framework is now part of new member training (Gobeil, 2012).

CSC Parole Officers were trained in the use of the Framework as part of their continuous development plan in 2009-10. The focus of the training was to encourage the use of the Framework to increase the quality of the parole recommendations made by Parole Officers and decrease the considerable variability in Parole Officer recommendations (Gobeil, 2012). During

⁶² These factors are criminal/parole history, ability to control behaviour, responsivity, institutional/community behaviour, offender change, release plan and case-specific factors. Each factor is assessed as either aggravating (i.e. increased risk), mitigating (i.e., decreased risk) or no impact (Serin et al., 2009).

the Parole Officer training, Parole Officers were encouraged to structure the assessment for decision reports to include each of the seven specific factors listed in the framework.

Over the past six years, research on the Framework has been conducted to refine and validate the Framework (Gobeil, 2012). Based on a pilot and four subsequent studies, the Framework has been demonstrated to be reliable, applicable to all offenders, and to increase decision-making accuracy. However, an evaluation of the Parole Officer training revealed that while Parole Officers perceived the training as interesting, informative, and useful, the training did not lead to changes in the Parole Officers' recommendations (Gobeil, 2012).

The proposed Report Outline for the Assessment for Decision found in the Commissioner's Directives incorporates elements of the Structured Decision Making Framework model without necessarily using the same terminology. Both static and dynamic factors are considered along with aggravating and favourable factors. The report outlines provide for increased staff judgment to maximize focus on the essential elements of risk management and assessment while ensuring important factors are not omitted.

Staff Perceptions of the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Information Sharing Between CSC and PBC in Relation to Concordance Rates

CSC staff and PBC Board Members were asked about the effectiveness of information sharing between CSC and PBC in regards to concordance rates and potential suggestions for improving concordance. The majority of CSC (85%; $n= 166$) staff and PBC Board Members (77%; $n= 4$) agreed that CSC provides PBC sufficient information to appropriately determine an offender's initial release.⁶³ However, 20% ($n= 21$) of CSC staff reported that CSC could provide PBC with additional information to improve concordance rates, including providing PBC with appropriate and up-to-date reports for decision-making such as police reports, victims' reports, and Elders' reports (54%; $n= 7$). A further 46% ($n= 6$) identified the need to provide PBC with detailed and reliable information related to programs/resources/support in the community such as the availability of programs (e.g. offenders should not be penalized because a program is not available). Over half (64%; $n= 9$) of PBC Board Members surveyed reported that additional information could be provided by CSC to increase concordance rates for release decisions.

⁶³ Due to small sample size among those who reported that CSC does not provide PBC with sufficient information ($n = 4$), it was not possible to examine qualitative responses for improvement.

Among those PBC Board Members who identified the need for additional information, the provision of adequate and updated assessments of the offender (risk, history, attitude, behavior, etc.) was the main source of additional information PBC respondents reported that CSC could provide them with to improve concordance⁶⁴.

One in five (20%; $n= 17$) CSC staff surveyed reported that there is additional information that PBC could provide CSC to improve concordance rates regarding release decisions. Among these staff, approximately three-quarters (76%; $n= 7$) stated a need for PBC to provide CSC with clear criteria used in release decision-making, and 67% ($n= 6$) indicated a need for PBC to provide CSC with specific reasons for denying release.

CSC staff were asked about what additional information could be provided to PBC to improve concordance rates for offender residency conditions, and CSC staff provided the following suggestions: increased information on offenders risk factors and the release strategy for dealing with their risk, increased accurate feedback/recommendations on offender performance, and more knowledge of the environment to which the offender is being released and the services available and suitability of the environment for the offender.⁶⁵ Almost half (45%; $n= 5$) of PBC Board Members surveyed however, reported that there is additional information that CSC can provide to PBC Board Members to increase concordance pertaining to residency conditions. Some suggestions of additional information to include made by PBC Board Members were to provide an adequate assessment of offender risk and to provide alternatives to manage risk when not recommending residency.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Due to small sample size among those who reported that CSC could provide additional information to improve concordance rates ($n = 9$), other qualitative responses cannot be presented.

⁶⁵ Note, due to small sample size for this question, themes were not developed, therefore it is not possible to present percentages

⁶⁶ Note, due to small sample size of PBC Board Members who responded to this question , themes were not developed, therefore it is not possible to present percentages

Use of CCC and CRF Resources

FINDING 14: Although voluntary stays in CCCs and CRFs were not associated with improved correctional outcomes, placement in a structured environment with increased monitoring may be used as an alternative to revocation for offenders. This would allow offenders to continue to be supervised in the community. The result of voluntary stays from this perspective could result in a cost savings.

Number of Non-PBC Imposed Residency Days in a CRF or CCC and the Potential Cost-Savings Associated with the Placement of Offenders in CCCs or CRFs

Approximately 5% of offenders in the release cohort had a voluntary/non-imposed PBC residency stay⁶⁷ in a CRF. Less than 1% of offenders in the release cohort had a non-PBC/voluntary stay imposed residency stay in a CCC.

The COMO in the community is significantly less than in the institution (\$31,148 versus \$95,034). COMO data showed that in FY 2010-11 it cost CSC \$69,608 to maintain an offender in a CCC and \$29,039 to maintain an offender in the community on parole (living independently).

Voluntary residency stays⁶⁸ (i.e. residency stays in a CRF or CCC that were not imposed by PBC through a residency condition) in the release cohort for FY 2008-09 cost CSC approximately \$1,759,507 (CCC and CRF stays combined) or between \$5,122 and 16,351 per offender (see Table 21).

⁶⁷ Considered number of days on first stay only. Excluded offenders who had a residency condition at any point during their sentence. Also excluded day parole because a residency stay is required for offenders on day parole. Only CCC and CRF stays were examined. The length of stay for offenders residing in a CRF or CCC was calculated by subtracting the offender's first day in the facility/centre, from their last day in the facility/centre. As a result, a length of stay of 0 days was possible if the offender entered and exited the facility/centre on the same day. These analyses included only CRF or CCC stays where the date the offender exited the facility/centre was entered in OMS. Stay end dates were missing for a number of CRF and CCC stays, as a result of offenders continuing to reside in the facility/centre on the date of data extraction (April 10, 2011), or because end dates were not entered into OMS when an offender left the facility/centre. Since it is not possible to determine which scenario is more likely, the data were not used.

⁶⁸ Only offenders in the release cohort who had a residency stay, but did not have a residency condition at anytime in their release were considered in this analysis.

Table 21: Costs of Residency Stays where a Residency Condition was Not Imposed (FY 08-09)

Non-PBC imposed Residential Stays	CRF Total	CRF per offender (with avg.)	CCC Total	CCC per offender (with avg.)
Total # offenders	318		8	
# days on first stay	25,435	80	754	94
Facility costs per offender, per day	\$64.02		\$173.95	
Voluntary residency stay costs	\$1,628,348.70	\$5,121.60	\$131,158.30	\$16,351.30
Total Voluntary Cost			\$1,759,507.00	

Source: OMS (2011), COMO 2008-2009, CSC (2008).

Notes: CRF costs could only be calculated for FY 2008-09, because that was the only time period for which we had data on CRF bed occupancy, which is required to calculate per offender costs. CCC costs were taken from COMO 2008-2009. For CRF costs the bed occupancy rate reported by all regions on June 3, 2008 was used. This rate was presented in the review of CRFs and CCCs in Canada conducted by CSC (2008). Consistent with COMO procedures, the CRF expenditures for FY 2008-09 (presented in the financial information section of this report) were divided by the population of CRF offenders that was found in the CRF and CCC review, which produced a yearly CRF cost per offender for FY 2008-09, that was then divided by the number of days in a year to produce a per offender daily cost. The 2-step calculation was as follows:

$$\text{Step 1: } \frac{\$61,136,209 \text{ (CRF Expenditures)}}{2,6145 \text{ (CRF occupancy)}} = \$23,383 \text{ (CRF cost per offender, per year)}$$

$$\text{Step 2: } \frac{\$23,383 \text{ (CRF cost per offender)}}{365.25 \text{ days in a year}} = \$64.02 \text{ (CRF cost per offender, per day)}$$

Analyses presented in an earlier section of this report (i.e. CRFs and CCCs) demonstrated that these offenders have more revocations for a technical violation, and voluntary residency stay were not found to have an impact on the likelihood of revocations with a new offence. While the evaluation found that voluntary stays in a CCC or CRF were not associated with improved correctional outcomes, it is believed that placement in a structured environment with increased monitoring can have positive impacts on public safety. For instance, CSC imposed residency may provide short-term stability to offenders so that their supervision may be continued in the community, rather than back in an institution. This will provide CSC with significant cost savings since maintaining an offender in the community rather than an institution is markedly cost effective and a fiscally viable alternative to suspension.

Overall Efficiency and Economy of Community Supervision

In addition to public safety, an important consideration for community corrections is the varying cost of managing offenders in the community. The cost of incarceration at a minimum

security facility per offender, per day is \$260⁶⁹, while the cost of maintaining an offender in the community is \$85⁷⁰ each day. Therefore, it can be demonstrated that each day CSC keeps an offender in the community safely, there is a cost savings of \$175. There are many documented and demonstrated benefits of a gradual transition of offenders back into the community along with significant cost savings.

⁶⁹ Source: COMO (2010-2011).

Source : Community costs (i.e. parole + CCC costs), COMO (2010-11).

Conclusion on Performance

Community Supervision (Theme 3) examined the use of supervision practices and tools used to monitor and supervise offenders in the community. Given the changing federal offender population and profile, CSC has adopted several measures and supervision practices to ensure the safety of community staff and safely reintegrate offenders into the community. Staff safety measures were found to be used in accordance with policy and enhance community staff safety. Moreover, tools and strategies used to monitor and supervise offenders in the community are being applied according to offender risk and need profiles and have achieved positive correctional results.

This evaluation demonstrates that there is a continued need for community correctional activities and specialized supervision strategies to safely reintegrate offenders into the community. However, gaps in service delivery were found in the areas of employment and mental health services. Community partners, stakeholders and volunteers play an integral role in assisting CSC to monitor and supervise offenders in the community and achieve positive correctional results. Ways CSC can enhance these partnerships to strengthen the transition from institutions to the community will be addressed in Chapter 3 - Community Engagement.

The main activities identified for enhancement include strengthening the continuum of care from the institution to the community in order to facilitate the safe transition and reintegration of offenders back into the community and enhancing staff safety measures to ensure the safety of staff working in the community. Specifically, Chapter 1 (Correctional Interventions) and Chapter 2 (Community Supervision Strategies and Staff Safety) have identified the following opportunities for enhancement: (1) increasing communication between institutional and community staff, and between CSC and community partners; (2) enhancing release planning; (3) increasing the availability of programs and services in the community (including employment and mental health services); (4) enhanced consideration of specialized risk management tools in the community (i.e. assignment to intensive supervision units, imposition of special conditions and voluntary residency); and (5) reviewing the frequency of refresher staff safety training to enhance the safety of staff in the community. These areas will be further explored in Chapter 4 where summaries of key findings and specific recommendations to address all community program activities will be presented.

List of References

- Cabana, T., & Wilton, G. & Stewart, L. (2011). Parole Reviews, Delays and Cancellations and Correctional Programs. (Research Report R-248). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the Canada Act 1982 (UK), 1982. Retrieved from <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/>
- Correctional Service Canada (n.d.). *Supervising Community Professionals, Module 4, Operational Realities*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2007a). *Commissioner's Directive 705-6: Correctional Planning and criminal profile*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2007b). *Community Staff Safety Audit*. (File 378-1-225). Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2008a). *Commissioner's Directive 715: Community Supervision Framework*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2008b). *Commissioner's Directive 715-1: Community Transition and Post-Release Assessment*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2008c). *Commissioner's Directive 715-2: Community Supervision and Monitoring*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2008d). *Review of Community-based Residential Facilities in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2008e). *Commissioner's Directive 715-3: Community Assessments*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2009a). *Commissioner's Directive 712-1: Pre-Release Decision Making*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2009b). *Details on changes to Parole Officer induction training (POIT). Interim Report*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Services of Canada (2009c). *Management review: Community staff safety pilot project (CSSPP)*. Ottawa, ON: Author.

- Correctional Service Canada (2009d). *Parole Officer induction training facilitator's manual, interim version, revised 2008*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2010a). *2010-2011 Report on Plans and Priorities*. Ottawa, ON: Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat.
- Correctional Service Canada (2010b). *Audit of Community Supervision. Internal Audit (378-1-258)*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2010c). *CSC's Populations Management Strategy: "It's Everyone's Business"*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2010e). *Mandatory training (NTS) 2010-2011*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2011a). *2010-2011 Departmental Performance Report*. Ottawa, ON: Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat.
- Correctional Service Canada (2011b). *2011-2012 Report on Plans and Priorities*. Ottawa, ON: Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat.
- Correctional Service Canada (2011e). *Federal Community Corrections Strategy: Vision to 2020*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2011f). Montreal Metropolitan District: Intensive Supervision Unit.
- Correctional Service Canada (2011g). *Review of Tandem Supervision, Community Operations*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2012a). *Commissioner's Directive 715-1: Community Supervision*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2012b). *Commissioner's Directive 715-2: Post-Release Decision Process*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2012c). *Commissioner's Directive 715-3: Community Assessments*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2012d). *Commissioner's Directive 718: Designation of Persons with Authority for Suspension*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada Review Panel (2007). *A Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety*. (Cat. No. PS84-14/2007E), Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

- Corrections and Conditional Release Act*, R.S.C. 1992, c.20.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations*, SOR/92-620, [1992]
- Criminal Code, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46.
- Delveaux, K., Batten, D., Fabisiak, A., Henighan, M., Jensen, T., Loree, E., Nolan, A., & Rastin, C. (2008). *Evaluation Report: Integrated Police and parole initiative*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Gobeil, R. (2012). "Understanding Parole Recommendations: The Contribution of Parole Officers". Doctoral Thesis. Ottawa, ON: Carleton University.
- Luong, D., Nafekh, M., Verbrugge, P., & Didenko, E. (2010). *Evaluation Report: Community Maintenance Program* (File # 394-2-45). Ottawa, ON: CSC.
- Parole Board of Canada (PBC) (2011). *NPB Policy Manual. Electronic Version-Vol. 1, No.18*. Retrieved from: <http://pbc-clcc.gc.ca/infocntr/policym/polman-eng.shtml>
- Public Safety Canada (2010). *Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview. Annual Report 2010* (Cat no. PS1-3/2010E-PDF). Ottawa, ON: Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Serin, R. C., Gobeil, R., & Sutton, J. (2009). Practice Manual for Use with Release Decision Making Worksheet (National Parole Board of Canada & Correctional Service Canada). Unpublished manuscript. Ottawa, ON: Carleton University.
- Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (2009). *Policy on Evaluation*. Ottawa, ON: Author. Retrieved from : <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=15024§ions=text>

Appendices

Appendix A: Constructs and Measures

Constructs and Measures

Offender Timeline

Conditional release planning starts at intake. There are two types of conditional release – day parole and full parole. Day Parole provides offenders with the opportunity to participate in on-going community based activities. Ordinarily, the offender resides at a correctional institution or community residential facility/centre. Offenders are also granted day parole in order to prepare for full parole and statutory release. Offenders who are: serving sentences of two to three years are eligible for day parole after serving six months of their sentence, serving sentences of three years or more are eligible to apply for day parole six months prior to full parole eligibility, or serving life sentences are eligible to apply for day parole three years before their full parole eligibility date.⁷¹

Full Parole is another form of conditional release. The offender is placed under supervision and may be required to abide by conditions designed to reduce the risk of re-offending, and to foster reintegration into the community. Under full parole, the person does not have to return nightly to an institution, but must report regularly to a Parole Officer Supervisor. Offenders (except those serving life sentences for murder) are eligible to apply for Full Parole after serving either one-third of their sentence, or seven years. Offenders serving life sentences for first-degree murder are eligible to apply for parole, after serving 25 years. Parole dates for offenders serving life sentences are set between 10 and 25 years by the court.⁷²

Offenders who do not apply for or are granted conditional release are released on statutory release at two-thirds of their sentence. Until the end of the offender's sentence (referred to as the offender's "warrant expiry date" (WED), the offender remains under supervision of CSC. As a result, offenders can have their release suspended and revoked as a result of a

⁷¹ <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/faits/03-03-eng.shtml>

⁷² <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/faits/03-03-eng.shtml>

technical violation or new offence. More information on the suspension and revocation process can be found in the alternatives to suspension/revocation section of this report.

Statutory Release Residency

Offenders who were released on statutory release with a residential condition that was set to begin within a day of release were referred to as statutory release residency cases.

Static Risk, Dynamic Need, Reintegration Potential and Motivation for Intervention Ratings

Through a variety of assessments including intake assessments, correctional plans, correctional plan updates, and the static factors assessment, offenders are assessed as low, medium or high on risk, need, reintegration potential and motivation for intervention. These assessments are updated by the case management officer prior to release as well as throughout the offender's sentence. Below is a description of how static risk, need, reintegration potential and motivation levels are assessed.

Static Risk

According to SOP 700-04: Offender Intake Assessment and Correctional Planning (2003), once key offender information has been collected through the review of official documents (e.g. court documents, police reports, criminal history, post-sentence community assessments) and interviews through the intake assessment process, this information must be reviewed and analyzed to measure the offender's risk of reoffending.

To assess the static factors that are correlated with the offender's risk of reoffending, the following risk assessment tools must be completed:

- The Criminal History Record;
- The Offence Severity Record;
- The Sex Offence History Checklist;
- Guidelines to assess "serious harm"; and
- The Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale.

The Parole Officer will determine an overall rating for Level of intervention Based on Static Factors. This is based on the results of the analytical tools and policy instruments noted in the above.

A score of "high", "medium" or "low" on Static Factors is obtained by applying the following guidelines:

HIGH:

- the Criminal History Record summary index reflects considerable involvement with the criminal justice system; or
- the Offence Severity Record summary index reflects considerable harm to society in general, and victims in particular; or
- the Sex Offender History summary index reflects considerable sex offending

LOW:

- the Criminal History Record summary index reflects little or no involvement with the criminal justice system
- the Offence Severity Record summary index reflects little or no harm to society in general, and victims in particular
- the Sex Offender History summary index reflects little or no sex offending; and
- a review of the detention criteria, as well as the SIR-R1 score, supports all of the aforementioned indices

MEDIUM:

- a rating of "MEDIUM" signifies that the offender is clearly not a "LOW" criminal risk and there exists sufficient latitude to not rate the offender as "HIGH".

Need Domains

CSC uses the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis-Revised (DFIA-R) tool to assess dynamic factors during the intake process. This tool identifies and prioritizes offender criminogenic needs using seven domains. Offenders are assessed and given one of four ratings in

each of seven domains. The ratings are: Asset (not applicable for the substance abuse domain), No need, Some need, and Considerable Need. The seven domains are as follows:

- Criminal attitudes;
- Community Functioning;
- Education/Employment;
- Marital/family;
- Personal/emotional;
- Associates; and
- Substance Abuse.

In September 2009, CSC implemented the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Prior to September 2009, need domains were measured and analyzed using the DFIA. Major changes from the previous tool (DFIA) included:

- The addition of interview prompts, help messages and criteria for scoring the individual indicators;
- Altered wording of indicators;
- A decline in the number of indicators per need domain from 197 in total to 100; and
- A change in the rating scale used to quantify the overall need in the domains.

As a result of these changes, the new need domain classifications were not consistent with the old need domain classifications/definitions, making it was necessary to reconcile the new rating levels with those of the original DFIA, in order to have comparable data for valid analyses.

CSC’s Research Branch developed a method of analyzing and comparing these classifications by recoding the five level rating categories of the DFIA-R into the four level rating categories of the DFIA. Using this method, categories 2 “No immediate need for improvement” and 3 “low need for improvement” from the new rating system were merged to

match the group “No immediate need for improvement” from the old rating system. The method is presented in and it has been applied to the release cohort analyses presented in the report.⁷³

Figure A 1: Reconciliation of DFIA and DFIA-R Scores

<u>DFIA</u>		<u>DFIA-R</u>
1) Factor seen as an Asset to community adjustment		1) Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment
2) No immediate need for improvement	←	2) No immediate need for improvement
	←	3) Low need for improvement
3) Some need for improvement		4) Moderate need for improvement
4) Considerable need for improvement		5) High need for improvement

Source: Zakaria, 2010⁷⁴

Reintegration Potential

According to *CD: 705-6: Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile (CSC, 2007a)*, reintegration potential is assessed at intake for all offenders and is automatically calculated in OMS. For male non-Aboriginal offenders, reintegration potential is determined using the offender’s individual scores on the Custody Rating Scale (CRS), General Statistical Information on Recidivism (GSIR) and the Static Factor Rating. For women and all aboriginal offenders, the reintegration potential is determined using the offender’s individual scores on the Custody Rating Scale, Dynamic Factor Rating and Static Factor Rating.

Motivation Level

According to *CD: 705-6: Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile (CSC, 2007a)*, motivation level takes into account information collected and analyzed through the Offender Intake Assessment process, and is evaluated against the following criteria:

- Recognition that a problem exists with lifestyle, behaviour and resulting consequences;

⁷³ For the majority of analyses, this method was used. For one specific analysis related to changes in need domains from release to WED were conducted using the WED cohort and data were examined before and after changes were made to the DFIA, to ensure that the offender is being assessed using the same instrument in definition at release and WED.

⁷⁴ Zakaria, D. (2010). Dynamic Factor Domain Scores: Linking the DFIA with the DFIA-R. Power Point Presentation, Correctional Service of Canada.

- Level of comfort with problem(s) and its impact on the offender's life;
- Level of feeling of personal responsibility for the problem(s);
- Willingness to change (i.e. expression of wish to change, or of intention to fully participate in Correctional Plan);
- Possession of skills, knowledge required to effect change in behaviour (i.e. is ready to change);
- Level of external support from family, friends or other community members;
- The Case Management Strategy group the offender falls into;
- The offender's past history related to demonstrating change.

A level of "high", "medium" or "low" is subsequently assigned according to the following guidelines:

- HIGH – offender is self-motivated, will actively address problem areas.
- MEDIUM– offender may not fully accept overall assessment but will participate in recommended programs or other interventions.
- LOW – offender strongly rejects the need for change / is unwilling to participate in recommended programs or other interventions.

Appendix B: Staff Training Descriptions

Parole Officer Induction Training (POIT) is a one-time 14 day mandatory training course on a variety of topics concerning safety and risk management that all Parole Officers must complete upon being hired. POIT has undergone a number of changes in recent years. The 2007 Community Staff Safety Audit indicated that institutional and community Parole Officers received the same program despite the differences in their responsibilities, and recommended that CSC review and reorganize the existing Parole Officer Induction Training. Following this, CSC responded by undertaking a significant revision of POIT. As of June 2009, more of a focus of the training was placed on matters concerning staff safety as discussed in *Commissioners Directive 715: Community Supervision Framework* (CSC, 2009b). The personal safety component of the 2009 revised POIT training manual contains the following sections: the participants' inventory of skills; caseload awareness; a safe working environment; hazard awareness factors; conflict awareness; conflict management and conflict resolution; and, crisis awareness (CSC, 2009d). Participants' begin by assessing their inventory of skills related to personal safety in order to identify the skills they possess or that they need to acquire as they continue as Parole Officers. The Parole Officer Induction Training is the new pilot course for the NTS Parole Officer Orientation course, and Parole Officer Orientation has always been referred to as POIT. Now that the training course code has been amended via the POIT-Pilot, a new course code has been created by calling it POIT.

Community Personal Safety Training, offered since FY2005, is a one-time three day course for staff in the community and community correctional centers including newly appointed Parole Officers, Parole Officer Supervisors, Community Correctional Program Officers, staff Psychologists, Health Professionals (i.e. nurses and social workers), and CORCAN staff (Community Employment Coordinators) (CSC, 2010e). The course is intended to enable participants to demonstrate skills and confidence in their ability to maintain personal safety within their interactions with offenders. The course was offered to these groups in response to the Board of Investigation recommendation in the community staff safety audit that this course be offered to all community staff (CSC, 2007b).

The Community Personal Safety Training for Clerical Staff, offered since FY2008, is a one-time 1 day training offered to all clerical staff working in community operations to enhance their safety within the community corrections setting.

The Managing Offenders with Long-Term Supervision Orders offered since FY2008 is a one-time three hour course for all newly appointed community Parole Officers, Parole Officer Supervisors and Community Corrections Liaison Offers aimed at increasing the knowledge of legislation, policy, legal opinions, best practices and sharing of national experience in the management of offenders serving LTSOs in the interest of public safety.

The Managing Community Incidents course offered since FY2005 is a one-time 3.5 day course targeted at District Directors; Associate District Directors, Area Directors, Directors, Community Correctional Centre; Community Security Intelligence Officers (SIOs); Parole Officer Supervisors; and staff acting in those positions for more than four months. The objective of the course is to provide participants with the knowledge and skills required to safely and effectively manage incidents in the community, including conducting threat risk assessments, utilizing contingency planning and employing strategies to respond, manage and recover from community incidents.

The Supervising Community Professionals Training, offered since FY2009, is a one-time 4.5 day training for all Community Parole Officer supervisors to assist them in improving their understanding and application of supervisory tasks, as well as the numerous stakes and challenges encountered in the community environment. This is a revised program of the previous Supervising Community Professionals and Community Clinical Supervision courses.

The Parole Officer Continuous Development (POCD), offered since FY2005, an ongoing 5 day course that all Parole Officers must take on an annual basis, is geared to prepare Parole Officers with a sound knowledge of the case management process so that they are able to apply relevant laws, policies, and procedures related to the duties of their position.

Appendix C: HRMS Staff Safety Training

Table C1: Compliance rates (%), non-compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non-compliances outside time limit for Parole Officer Orientation / Parole Officer Induction Training

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Within time limit (WTL) (n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	97%	0	19	100%	97%	5	7	58%	95%	34	0	0% ^a	98%	3	11	79%	99%	0	4	100%
Atlantic	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA
Quebec	90%	0	19	100% ^b	90%	1	7	88%	82%	33	0	0%	93%	2	9	82%	98%	0	2	100%
Ontario	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA
Prairies	100%	0	0	NA	100%	3	0	0%	99%	1	0	0%	98%	1	2	67%	99%	0	2	100%
Pacific	100%	0	0	NA	100%	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA

Sources: HRMS (March 31, 2011).

Notes: ^a % in the second column indicates that although there were cases that were non-compliant, none of these cases were outside of the prescribed grace period.

^b Due to translation issues of course materials, the Quebec region at times takes longer to implement some training initiatives which may affect the granting of competencies.

Table C2: Compliance rates (%), non-compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non-compliances outside time limit for Community Personal Safety- Awareness and Personal Safety Phase I

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Within time limit (WTL) (n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	93%	18	54	75%	95%	19	31	62%	89%	89	7	7%	93%	32	22	41%	92%	50	5	9%
Atlantic	94%	0	1	100%	100%	0	0	NA	98%	1	1	50%	97%	0	3	100%	94%	6	0	0%
Quebec	81%	0	47	100%	87%	0	29	100%	72%	66	1	1%	83%	15	13	46%	95%	4	4	50%
Ontario	99%	0	2	100%	98%	4	1	20%	98%	1	2	67%	97%	0	5	100%	84%	24	1	4%
Prairies	95%	13	0	0%	94%	15	0	0%	94%	13	1	7%	95%	10	0	0%	97%	6	0	0%
Pacific	94%	5	4	44%	99%	0	1	100%	91%	8	2	20%	93%	7	1	13%	90%	10	0	0%

Table C3: Compliance rates (%), non-compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non-compliances outside time limit for community Personal Safety-Disengagement Skills Training Phase II

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances		
		Within time limit (WTL)(n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	93%	16	54	77%	92%	15	60	80%	91%	68	9	12%	92%	30	21	41%	0%	491	3	1%
Atlantic	0% ^a	1	1	50%	100%	0	0	NA	98%	1	1	50%	98%	0	2	100%	0%	97	0	0%
Quebec	81%	0	48	100%	86%	0	31	100%	84%	38	1	3%	90%	8	10	56%	0%	156	2	1%
Ontario	99%	0	3	100%	97%	4	2	33%	98%	1	3	75%	93%	3	7	70%	0%	150	1	1%
Prairies	95%	13	0	0%	95%	11	1	8%	94%	12	1	8%	91%	11	0	0%	0%	3	0	0%
Pacific	97%	2	2	50%	80%	0	26	100%	81%	16	3	16%	90%	8	2	20%	0%	85	0	0%

Note: ^a Compliance in 2011 for the Atlantic region was 0% for several courses. According to the CSC's 2011 report on mandatory training compliance, sick leave taken by number of employees due to two murders during the year as well as safety-related work stoppages affected the delivery of training (CSC, 2011).

Table C4: Compliance rates (%), non-compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non-compliances outside time limit for Parole Officer Continuous Development-Formal (all versions)

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances		
		Within time limit (WTL)(n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	81%	81%	41	82%	92%	28	22	44%	90%	64	2	3%	96%	15	5	25%	95%	21	2	9%
Atlantic	95%	95%	0	100%	98%	1	1	50%	96%	3	0	0%	97%	0	2	100%	97%	0	2	100%
Quebec	53%	53%	21	87%	82%	14	13	48%	78%	40	0	0%	92%	8	2	20%	94%	5	0	0%
Ontario	86%	86%	6	77%	93%	6	5	45%	92%	11	0	0%	97%	2	1	33%	96%	5	0	0%
Prairies	91%	91%	14	48%	96%	6	1	14%	92%	10	2	17%	96%	5	0	0%	94%	5	0	0%
Pacific	98%	98%	0	100%	97%	1	2	67%	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	91%	6	0	0%

Table C5: Compliance rates (%), non-compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non compliances outside time limit for Parole Officer Continuous Development-Self-Study

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances		
		Within time limit (WTL) (n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	92%	35	16	31%	73%	101	67	40%	66%	186	27	13%	71%	98	47	32%	25%	244	60	20%
Atlantic	0%	0	0	NA	98%	1	1	50%	94%	4	1	20%	100%	0	0	NA	0%	69	3	4%
Quebec	77%	28	13	32%	73%	11	30	73%	65%	61	3	5%	85%	13	6	32%	49%	34	0	0%
Ontario	95%	5	3	38%	98%	3	0	0%	95%	5	2	29%	85%	2	16	89%	39%	19	57	75%
Prairies	99%	2	0	0%	22%	85	35	29%	12%	116	21	15%	5%	73	24	25%	3%	74	0	0%
Pacific	100%	0	0	NA	98%	1	1	50%	100%	0	0	NA	86%	10	1	9%	29%	48	0	0%

Table C6: Compliance rates (%), non-compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non-compliances outside time limit for community Personal Safety Training for Clerical Staff

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances			CR (%)	Non-compliances		
		Within time limit (WTL) (n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)		WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	94%	9	7	44%	90%	13	12	48%	71%	45	28	38%	7%	13	0	0%	0%	6	0	0%
Atlantic	0%	0	1	100%	91%	3	0	0%	19%	25	4	14%	0%	2	0	0%	0%	1	0	0%
Quebec	92%	0	5	100%	94%	0	4	100%	88%	4	4	50%	0%	5	0	0%	0%	4	0	0%
Ontario	94%	2	1	33%	83%	2	7	78%	90%	0	5	100%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Prairies	92%	6	0	0%	88%	8	0	0%	95%	3	0	0%	25%	3	0	0%	0%	1	0	0%
Pacific	98%	1	0	0%	97%	0	1	100%	18%	13	15	54%	0%	3	0	0%	NA	0	0	NA

Table C7: Compliance rates (%), non compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non-compliances outside time limit for Managing Long-Term Supervision orders (CBT)

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Within time limit (WTL) (n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	98%	6	13	68%	95%	21	18	46%	92%	15	44	75%	0%	49	0	0%	0%	10	0	0%
Atlantic	0%	0	0	NA	94%	4	2	33%	88%	3	8	73%	0%	4	0	0%	0%	3	0	0%
Quebec	96%	0	9	100%	92%	7	8	53%	82%	7	29	81%	0%	21	0	0%	0%	1	0	0%
Ontario	95%	5	4	44%	96%	5	3	38%	98%	1	2	67%	0%	4	0	0%	0%	1	0	0%
Prairies	100%	0	0	NA	97%	5	1	17%	97%	2	4	67%	0%	9	0	0%	0%	1	0	0%
Pacific	99%	1	0	0%	96%	0	4	100%	95%	2	1	33%	0%	11	0	0%	0%	4	0	0%

Table C8: Compliance rates (%), non-compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non compliances outside time limit for Managing Community Incidents

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Within time limit (WTL) (n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	75%	22	20	48%	53%	60	16	21%	25%	3	0	0%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Atlantic	NA	1	1	50%	63%	6	3	33%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Quebec	69%	4	9	69%	64%	4	9	69%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Ontario	82%	3	5	63%	42%	18	3	14%	100%	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Prairies	80%	7	1	13%	50%	20	0	0%	0%	1	0	0%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Pacific	35%	7	4	36%	48%	12	1	8%	0%	2	0	0%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA

Table C9: Compliance rates (%), non-compliances within and outside time limit, and percentage (%) of non-compliances outside time limit for Supervising Community Professionals

Region	2011				2010				2009				2008				2007			
	Compliance rate (CR) (%)	Non-compliances			Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances				Non-compliances			
		Within time limit (WTL) (n)	Outside time limit (OST) (n)	All non-compliances that are outside of time limit (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)	CR (%)	WTL (n)	OTL (n)	OST (%)
National	89%	9	2	18%	81%	7	11	61%	67%	1	0	0%	100%	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Atlantic	NA	0	0	NA	89%	0	2	100%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Quebec	97%	1	0	0%	88%	1	2	67%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Ontario	96%	0	1	100%	96%	0	1	100%	100%	0	0	NA	100%	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Prairies	68%	6	1	14%	45%	5	1	17%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Pacific	88%	2	0	0%	67%	1	5	83%	50%	1	0	0%	NA	0	0	NA	NA	0	0	NA

Appendix D: Level of Intervention

Table D1: Offender: Risk Ratings at Release and Level of Intervention including Women and Aboriginal offenders

Level of Intervention (LOI)	All Offenders ^a			Women Offenders ^b			Aboriginal Offenders ^c		
	Low Risk (n = 4,825)	Medium Risk (n = 11,572)	High Risk (n = 10,016)	Low Risk (n = 689)	Medium Risk (n = 646)	High Risk (n = 306)	Low Risk (n = 362)	Medium Risk (n = 1,796)	High Risk (n = 2,515)
Level I	0%	3%	28%	0%	1%	19%	1%	3%	34%
Level A	25%	57%	59%	28%	62%	66%	32%	59%	55%
Level B	43%	36%	10%	41%	34%	12%	50%	35%	10%
Level C, D, E	32%	4%	3%	31%	3%	4%	17%	2%	1%

Source: OMS (2011).

Notes: ^a $\chi^2(6) = 1303.4$, $p < .0001$, $V(6) = .37$

LOI and/or risk data were missing for 161 offenders

^c $\chi^2(6) = 581.4$, $p < .0001$, $V(6) = .42$

LOI and/or risk data were missing for 67 offenders

Appendix E: Community Supervision Strategies Tables

Table E1: Frequency of use of the following strategies by CSC staff to monitor offenders and manage their risk in the community

	Frequency		
	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently
Community contacts with offenders (<i>n</i> = 310)	12%	11%	77%
Case conferences with staff (<i>n</i> = 324)	5%	23%	72%
Communication with collateral contact (<i>n</i> = 314)	11%	21%	68%
Curfew checks (<i>n</i> = 234)	48%	22%	30%
Monitor sign in and sign out log at Community based Residential facility (CRF or CCC) (<i>n</i> = 224)	36%	20%	44%
Use of reporting center (<i>n</i> = 216)	64%	21%	15%
Contacting Community Correctional Liaison Officers (<i>n</i> = 274)	32%	25%	43%
Assigning offenders to an Intensive Supervision Unit (<i>n</i> = 222)	50%	31%	19%
Assigning offenders to an Enhanced Supervision Team (<i>n</i> = 222)	50%	29%	21%
Assigning women offenders to a Women's Supervision Unit (<i>n</i> = 159)	69%	8%	23%
Monitoring program participation (<i>n</i> = 233)	9%	14%	77%
Establishing relationships/rapport with offenders to monitor their behaviour (<i>n</i> = 319)	5%	5%	90%
Urinalysis (<i>n</i> = 289)	14%	12%	74%
Other (<i>n</i> = 38)	39%	16%	45%

Source: CSC Staff Questionnaire (2011).

Table: E2. Strategies identified by staff* for managing risk among specific offender populations

	"High Risk Offenders" (n = 182)	"Mental Disorders" (n = 168)	"Aboriginal Offenders" (n = 110)	"Women Offenders" (n = 71)
"Specialized strategies"				
Increased frequency of contact with collaterals	31%	7%	5%	10%
Increased tandem supervision	13%	--	--	--
Increased urinalysis testing	12%	--	--	--
Changes to curfew (increased checks/earlier curfew)	11%	--	--	--
Increased collaboration with staff	10%	--	--	--
Assignment of offender to Intensive Supervision Unit (ISU) or Intensive Supervision Program (ISP)	10%	--	--	--
Use of Supervision Strategy for High Risk Offenders in the Community (SSHROC)	7%	--	--	--
Increased contact with the offender	6%	--	--	--
Increased mental health intervention	5%	--	--	7%
Assignment to CRF/CCC	5%	--	--	--
Utilize CCLO	5%	--	--	--
Use of Community Mental Health Initiative (CMHI) resources	--	19%	--	--
Involvement of mental health professionals/contacts	--	19%	--	--
Use of case conferences with the Case Management Team	--	4%	--	17%
Engage Aboriginal community in offender reintegration	--	--	13%	--
Contact with ACDO/ALO/ACLO	--	--	15%	--
Contact with Elders	--	--	17%	--
Use of the Aboriginal Reintegration Team	--	--	7%	--
Use of specialized women's supervision units	--	--	--	17%
Use of the Child/Parenting focused strategy	--	--	--	7%
Building a rapport with the offender	--	--	--	9%

Source: CSC Staff Questionnaire (2011).

Note: The percentages in this table don't add to 100%.

* Responses are among those staff who reported the use of specialized strategies for managing risk among each specific offender profile.

Table: E3: Frequency of use of the following methods by institutional Parole Officers to share information with community Parole Officers

	Methods used by institutional Parole Officers				Methods used by community Parole Officers		
	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently		Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently
Case Conferences (n = 52)	11%	31%	58%	Case Conferences (n = 173)	13%	37%	50%
Enter the information into OMS (n = 54)	2%	11%	87%	Enter the information into OMS (n = 171)	6%	25%	69%
Telephone calls (n = 54)	6%	26%	68%	Telephone calls (n = 173)	3%	32%	65%
Face-to-face meetings (n = 53)	75%	19%	6%	Face-to-face meetings (n = 167)	80%	16%	4%
Email (n = 54)	--	13%	87%	Email (n = 174)	2%	16%	82%

Source: CSC Staff Questionnaire (2011).

Table E4: ISU Supervision Outcomes

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)	0.30986	.10617	8.5179	1	.0035	1.363
Revocation (technical violation only)	.41913	.12767	10.7775	1	.0010	1.521
Revocation (with offence/outstanding charges)	.03181	.19481	.0267	1	.8703	1.032
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED	.28831	.29550	0.9519	1	.3292	1.334

Source: OMS (2011).

Table E5: ISU Supervision Outcomes – Aboriginal

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)	0.63492	0.32926	3.7184	1	0.0538	1.887
Revocation (technical violation only)	0.66479	0.38801	2.9356	1	0.0866	1.944
Revocation (with offence/outstanding charges)	0.26666	0.6362	0.1757	1	0.6751	1.306
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED	-0.09235	0.63331	0.0213	1	0.8841	0.912

Source: OMS (2011).

Table E6: Likelihood of Supervision Outcome based on the Number of Condition Types

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)	-0.03064	0.0041	48.2015	1	<.0001	0.97
Revocation (technical violation only)	-0.01856	0.00521	12.7115	1	0.0004	0.982
Revocation (with offence/outstanding charges)	-0.08078	0.0829	95.0434	1	<.0001	0.922
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED	-0.04651	0.01237	14.1447	1	0.0002	0.955

Source: OMS (2011).

Table E7: Likelihood of Supervision Outcome based on the Number of Condition Types – Aboriginal

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)	-0.03834	0.00946	16.4189	1	<.0001	0.962
Revocation (technical violation only)	-0.0298	0.01132	6.9265	1	0.0085	0.971
Revocation (with offence/outstanding charges)	-0.08236	0.01708	23.2614	1	<.0001	0.921
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED	-0.03421	0.02658	1.657	1	0.198	0.966

Source: OMS (2011).

Table E9: Needs and Conditions – Cluster 1: Condition to Avoid Certain Persons, Places or Residency

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.39996	0.03157	160.4969	1	<.0001	0.67
D2 - Community functioning	-0.22089	0.04310	26.2669	1	<.0001	0.802
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.29826	0.03011	98.1504	1	<.0001	0.742
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.259	0.03797	46.5257	1	<.0001	0.772
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.33594	0.02662	159.2333	1	<.0001	0.715
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.40124	0.02894	192.28	1	<.0001	0.669
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.14794	0.03039	23.6915	1	<.0001	0.862
Revocation (technical violation only)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.41019	0.03848	113.6389	1	<.0001	0.664
D2 - Community functioning	-0.13558	0.04827	7.8896	1	<.0001	0.787
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.30652	0.03679	69.4011	1	<.0001	0.736
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.26972	0.04529	35.4681	1	<.0001	0.764
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.34888	0.03207	118.3838	1	<.0001	0.705
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.41460	0.03541	137.0538	1	<.0001	0.661
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.12939	0.03686	12.3219	1	0.0004	0.879
Revocation (with offence/ outstanding charges)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.48445	0.55510	76.1660	1	<.0001	0.616
D2 - Community functioning	-0.27018	0.07418	13.2643	1	0.0003	0.763
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.33105	0.05220	40.2241	1	<.0001	0.718
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.26948	0.06920	15.1634	1	<.0001	0.764
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.39116	0.04777	67.0483	1	<.0001	0.676
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.45986	0.05031	83.5500	1	<.0001	0.631
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.27701	0.05368	26.6278	1	<.0001	0.758
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.37358	0.08466	19.4706	1	<.0001	0.688
D2 - Community functioning	-0.19986	0.10970	3.1930	1	0.0685	0.819
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.21373	0.08325	6.5917	1	0.0102	0.808
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.25890	0.10390	6.2093	1	0.0127	0.772
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.25285	0.07307	11.9757	1	0.0005	0.777
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.26440	0.07984	10.9668	1	0.0009	0.768
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.05239	0.08117	0.4165	1	0.5187	0.949

Source: OMS (2011).

Table E10: Needs and Conditions - Cluster 1: Condition to Avoid Certain Persons, Places or Residency - Aboriginal

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.20571	0.06725	9.3551	1	0.0022	0.814
D2 - Community functioning	-0.20402	0.08045	6.4320	1	0.0112	0.815
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.12508	0.05519	5.1361	1	0.0234	0.882
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.12558	0.06633	3.5840	1	0.0583	0.882
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.17154	0.05253	10.6620	1	0.0011	0.842
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.19100	0.05666	11.3629	1	0.0007	0.826
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.05643	0.05500	1.0527	1	0.3049	0.945
Revocation (technical violation only)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.22768	0.08329	7.4723	1	0.0063	0.796
D2 - Community functioning	-0.27959	0.09866	8.0317	1	0.0046	0.756
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.16951	0.06808	6.1987	1	0.0128	0.844
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.15419	0.07876	3.8329	1	0.0503	0.857
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.19796	0.06407	9.5467	1	0.0020	0.820
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.22609	0.06967	10.5307	1	0.0012	0.798
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.08595	0.06695	1.6485	1	0.1992	0.918
Revocation (with offence/ outstanding charges)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.29456	0.11437	6.6334	1	0.01	0.745
D2 - Community functioning	-0.19485	0.13787	1.9974	1	0.1576	0.823
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.07981	0.09328	0.7321	1	0.3922	0.923
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.10469	0.11968	0.7652	1	0.3817	0.901
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.19238	0.09062	4.5066	1	0.0338	0.825
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.18842	0.09621	3.8352	1	0.0502	0.828
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.07185	0.09514	0.5703	1	0.4501	0.931
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.02415	0.17748	0.0185	1	0.8918	0.976
D2 - Community functioning	-0.11089	0.21684	0.2615	1	0.6091	0.895
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.0001449	0.16127	0.0000	1	0.9993	1.000
D4 - Marital/ Family	0.01863	0.18735	0.0099	1	0.9208	1.019
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	0.08821	0.14911	0.3500	1	0.5541	1.092
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.05241	0.15773	0.1104	1	0.7397	1.054
D7 - Substance Abuse	0.20601	0.15608	1.7422	1	0.1869	1.229

Table E11: Needs and Conditions - Cluster 2: Abstain from Intoxicants, Drugs and Alcohol

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)						
D1 - Attitudes	0.39348	0.03079	160.4969	1	<.0001	1.482
D2 - Community functioning	0.25077	0.04297	34.0556	1	<.0001	0.802
D3 - Education/ Employment	0.30744	0.02965	107.5263	1	<.0001	1.36
D4 - Marital/ Family	0.35858	0.03781	89.9424	1	<.0001	1.431
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	0.37316	0.02613	203.8896	1	<.0001	1.452
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.39801	0.02862	193.3671	1	<.0001	1.489
D7 - Substance Abuse	0.04783	0.03106	2.3718	1	0.1235	1.049
Revocation (technical violation only)						
D1 - Attitudes	0.41361	0.03767	120.5327	1	<.0001	1.512
D2 - Community functioning	0.25715	0.05315	23.409	1	<.0001	1.293
D3 - Education/ Employment	0.33093	0.03643	82.5000	1	<.0001	1.392
D4 - Marital/ Family	0.39932	0.04535	77.5472	1	<.0001	1.491
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	0.40409	0.03162	163.2872	1	<.0001	1.498
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.43391	0.03532	150.9342	1	<.0001	1.543
D7 - Substance Abuse	0.02503	0.03802	0.4335	1	0.5103	1.025
Revocation (with offence/ outstanding charges)						
D1 - Attitudes	0.45925	0.05388	72.6561	1	<.0001	1.424
D2 - Community functioning	0.31291	0.07370	18.0272	1	<.0001	1.367
D3 - Education/ Employment	0.32976	0.05112	41.6059	1	<.0001	1.391
D4 - Marital/ Family	0.36149	0.06885	27.5670	1	<.0001	1.435
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	0.40163	0.04682	73.5875	1	<.0001	1.494
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.39812	0.04932	66.1603	1	<.0001	1.489
D7 - Substance Abuse	0.17803	0.05421	10.7842	1	0.0010	1.195
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED						
D1 - Attitudes	0.25841	0.07940	10.5917	1	0.0011	1.295
D2 - Community functioning	0.08276	0.10470	0.6248	1	0.4293	1.086
D3 - Education/ Employment	0.08652	0.0784	1.2179	1	0.2698	1.090
D4 - Marital/ Family	0.11874	0.09777	1.4749	1	0.2246	1.126
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.25285	0.07307	11.9757	1	0.0005	0.777
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.13869	0.07545	3.3789	1	0.0660	1.149
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.08303	0.07770	1.1417	1	0.2853	0.920

Source: OMS (2011).

Table E12: Needs and Conditions - Cluster 2: Abstain from Intoxicants, Drugs and Alcohol – Aboriginal Offenders

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)						
D1 - Attitudes	0.14625	0.06403	5.2167	1	0.0224	1.157
D2 - Community functioning	0.18241	0.08122	5.0434	1	0.0247	1.200
D3 - Education/ Employment	0.06794	0.05493	1.5301	1	0.2161	1.070
D4 - Marital/ Family	0.04793	0.06908	0.4814	1	0.4878	1.049
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	0.11097	0.05310	4.3664	1	0.0367	1.117
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.13466	0.05679	5.6230	1	0.0177	1.144
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.02970	0.05677	0.2737	1	0.6008	0.971
Revocation (technical violation only)						
D1 - Attitudes	0.19236	0.07969	5.8263	1	0.0158	1.212
D2 - Community functioning	0.24835	0.10005	6.1622	1	0.0131	1.282
D3 - Education/ Employment	0.12239	0.06845	3.1969	1	0.0738	1.130
D4 - Marital/ Family	0.10337	0.08309	1.5478	1	0.2135	1.109
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	0.16013	0.06547	5.9822	1	0.0145	1.174
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.19139	0.07071	7.3271	1	0.0068	1.211
D7 - Substance Abuse	0.00885	0.07002	0.0160	1	0.8994	1.009
Revocation (with offence/ outstanding charges)						
D1 - Attitudes	0.16718	0.10779	2.4057	1	0.1209	1.182
D2 - Community functioning	0.22612	0.13932	2.6342	1	0.1046	1.254
D3 - Education/ Employment	0.04137	0.09243	0.2003	1	0.6545	1.042
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.00737	0.12385	0.0035	1	0.9525	0.993
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	0.10764	0.09113	1.3953	1	0.2375	1.114
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.08279	0.09556	0.7506	1	0.3863	1.086
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.01701	0.09741	0.0305	1	0.8614	0.983
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.17525	0.16239	1.1646	1	0.2805	0.839
D2 - Community functioning	-0.15353	0.20527	0.5594	1	0.4545	0.858
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.21912	0.15074	2.1130	1	0.1461	0.803
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.03569	0.17982	0.0394	1	0.8427	0.965
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.24940	0.13855	3.2404	1	0.0718	0.779
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.26822	0.14718	3.3210	1	0.0684	0.765
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.37673	0.14740	6.5319	1	0.0106	0.686

Table E13: Needs and Conditions - Cluster 3: Follow Treatment Plan or Psychological Counsel or Psychiatric Counsel

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.11107	0.02967	14.0108	1	0.0002	0.895
D2 - Community functioning	-0.19102	0.04007	22.7216	1	<.0001	0.826
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.16467	0.03011	29.9085	1	<.0001	0.848
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.28006	0.03695	57.4597	1	<.0001	0.756
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.20301	0.02562	62.8011	1	<.0001	0.816
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.06207	0.0281	4.8809	1	0.0272	0.94
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.14871	0.02658	31.3036	1	<.0001	0.862
Revocation (technical violation only)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.07129	0.03544	4.0466	1	0.0443	0.931
D2 - Community functioning	-0.13558	0.04827	7.8896	1	0.005	0.873
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.11041	0.03606	9.3730	1	0.0022	0.895
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.25349	0.04346	34.0155	1	<.0001	0.776
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.16269	0.03030	28.8242	1	<.0001	0.850
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.00522	0.03366	0.0241	1	0.8766	0.995
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.10222	0.03146	10.5569	1	0.0012	0.903
Revocation (with offence/ outstanding charges)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.48445	0.05551	76.1660	1	<.0001	0.616
D2 - Community functioning	-0.44758	0.07203	38.6144	1	<.0001	0.639
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.43191	0.05521	61.2058	1	<.0001	0.649
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.50521	0.07037	51.5467	1	<.0001	0.603
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.43214	0.04818	80.4543	1	<.0001	0.649
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.29704	0.05143	33.3534	1	<.0001	0.743
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.38112	0.05007	57.9492	1	<.0001	0.683
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.04799	0.08181	0.344	1	0.5575	0.953
D2 - Community functioning	-0.06698	0.10404	0.4145	1	0.5197	0.935
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.00159	0.08345	0.0004	1	0.9848	0.998
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.07710	0.10354	0.5545	1	0.4565	0.926
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.07754	0.07175	1.1680	1	0.2798	0.925
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.01105	0.07880	0.0197	1	0.8885	0.989
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.04316	0.07394	0.3407	1	0.5594	0.958

Source: OMS (2011).

Table E14 AB: Needs and Conditions - Cluster 3: Follow Treatment Plan or Psychological Counsel or Psychiatric Counsel - Aboriginal Offenders

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig.	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.14155	0.06728	4.4266	1	0.0354	0.868
D2 - Community functioning	-0.20576	0.07909	6.7689	1	0.0093	0.814
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.21331	0.06025	12.5331	1	0.0004	0.808
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.22372	0.06982	10.2675	1	0.0014	0.800
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.20413	0.05535	13.6025	1	0.0002	0.815
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.20219	0.06052	11.1610	1	0.0008	0.817
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.21044	0.05593	14.1570	1	0.0002	0.810
Revocation (technical violation only)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.14028	0.08142	2.9686	1	0.0849	0.869
D2 - Community functioning	-0.19422	0.09599	4.0941	1	0.043	0.823
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.19101	0.07265	6.9121	1	0.0086	0.826
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.23634	0.08223	8.2599	1	0.0041	0.790
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.19173	0.06605	8.4268	1	0.0037	0.826
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.21399	0.07324	8.5369	1	0.0035	0.807
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.18949	0.06670	8.0701	1	0.0045	0.827
Revocation (with offence/ outstanding charges)						
D1 - Attitudes	-0.26910	0.12017	5.0147	1	0.0251	0.764
D2 - Community functioning	-0.35071	0.13954	6.3172	1	0.0120	0.704
D3 - Education/ Employment	-0.45254	0.10790	17.5902	1	<.0001	0.636
D4 - Marital/ Family	-0.35723	0.13113	7.4214	1	0.0064	0.700
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	-0.43062	0.10146	18.0130	1	<.0001	0.650
D6 - Associates/ Social	-0.35083	0.10740	10.6710	1	0.0011	0.704
D7 - Substance Abuse	-0.45060	0.10303	19.1273	1	<.0001	0.637
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED						
D1 - Attitudes	0.22492	0.17437	1.6638	1	0.1971	1.252
D2 - Community functioning	0.31685	0.20460	2.3983	1	0.1215	1.373
D3 - Education/ Employment	0.35624	0.16607	4.6015	1	0.0319	1.428
D4 - Marital/ Family	0.16621	0.19180	0.7509	1	0.3862	1.181
D5 - Personal/ Emotional	0.21300	0.15285	1.9420	1	0.1634	1.237
D6 - Associates/ Social	0.24047	0.16230	2.1952	1	0.1384	1.272
D7 - Substance Abuse	0.22688	0.15399	2.1710	1	0.1406	1.255

Table E15: CSC Staff Survey Responses to the Frequent/Very Frequent Use of Alternative Strategies

Strategy	Frequent/Very Frequent Use
Disciplinary interview (<i>n</i> = 227)	82%
Urinalysis testing (<i>n</i> = 203)	76%
Increased level of intervention (<i>n</i> = 211)	76%
Additional treatment/programming (<i>n</i> = 206)	74%
Removal of weekend/overnight pass privilege (<i>n</i> = 131)	55%
Monitor sign in and sign out log at CRF or CCC (<i>n</i> = 120)	53%
Imposition of a curfew (<i>n</i> = 116)	45%
Amendments to special conditions (<i>n</i> = 99)	38%
Short term voluntary residency at a CRF or CCC (<i>n</i> = 84)	35%
House confinement (<i>n</i> = 56)	24%
Suitable cultural alternatives or interventions (<i>n</i> = 52)	23%
Use of a reporting centre (<i>n</i> = 43)	22%
Imposition of a residency condition (<i>n</i> = 51)	20%

Source: CSC Staff Questionnaire (2011).

Appendix F: Changes from Release to WED

Table F1: Difference between Release and WED – All offenders

Difference between Release and WED for All offenders for offenders who changed			
Ratings	Frequency		
	% Changed	Of Changed % Improved	Of Changed % deteriorated
Need	25%	77%	23%
Risk	14%	88%	12%
Motivation	24%	61%	39%
Reintegration	20%	55%	45%

Source: OMS (2011).

Table F2: Change in Women Offender Need, Risk, Motivation and Reintegration Potential from Release to WED

Difference between Release and WED for Women Offenders			
Ratings	Frequency		
	% Changed	Of Changed % Improved	Of Changed % deteriorated
Need	31%	75%	25%
Risk	14%	82%	18%
Motivation	25%	47%	53%
Reintegratio	19%	47%	53%

Source: OMS (2011).

Table F3: Change in Aboriginal Offender Need, Risk, Motivation and Reintegration Potential from Release to WED

Difference between Release and WED for Aboriginal Offenders			
Ratings	Frequency		
	% Changed	Of Changed % Improved	Of Changed % deteriorated
Need	22%	79%	21%
Risk	14%	90%	10%
Motivation	23%	50%	50%
Reintegration	22%	67%	33%

Source: OMS (2011).

TableF6: Ratings at Intake, Release and WED for the WED subset

Rating	All Offenders (n = 16,277)				Women Offenders (n = 1,057)				Aboriginal Offenders (n = 2,999)			
	Intake	Release	WED	Trend	Intake	Release	WED	Trend	Intake	Release	WED	Trend
Need												
Low	10%	10%	17%	+	17%	16%	27%	+	4%	4%	9%	+
Medium	34%	37%	38%	+	41%	43%	40%	~	26%	33%	38%	+
High	56%	53%	45%	-	43%	41%	33%	-	71%	63%	54%	-
Risk												
Low	17%	16%	22%	+	40%	39%	44%	+	8%	8%	11%	+
Medium	45%	45%	47%	+	42%	43%	42%	~	39%	39%	45%	+
High	38%	39%	32%	-	18%	18%	13%	-	52%	53%	44%	-
Motivation												
Low	12%	13%	13%	~	5%	4%	5%	~	14%	13%	13%	~
Medium	65%	59%	55%	-	40%	35%	36%	-	66%	59%	59%	-
High	23%	27%	32%	+	56%	60%	59%	+	20%	28%	28%	+
Reintegration												
Low	27%	25%	21%	-	15%	10%	8%	-	46%	37%	29%	-
Medium	30%	40%	47%	+	31%	37%	43%	+	32%	44%	51%	+
High	43%	34%	32%	-	54%	52%	49%	-	21%	19%	19%	~

Source: OMS (2011).

Appendix G: Mandatory Training in Risk Assessment for Operational Staff

CSC offers a wide variety of training to operational staff to provide them with the knowledge and skills necessary to provide effective assessment and supervision of offenders to assist them in safely reintegrating into society.

The *Supervising Community Professionals* course enables participants to improve their understanding of the legal framework related to case management, risk management and community staff safety. They learn to improve their overall skills in analyzing risks and enhance their clinical supervision skills (CSC, n.d). The *Parole Officer Induction Training (POIT)* contains a number of modules that address community supervision and risk management strategies (CSC, 2010a). Throughout the training participants gain the ability to make specific predictive statements regarding the type/level of risk by using assessment tools; gain an understanding of the principles of risk management; learn the dynamic process of risk analysis and gain an understanding of how static and dynamic factors are related to the assessment, management and reintegration of offenders. In the *Parole Officer Continuous Development (POCD)* training, participants are provided with a reference package containing relevant Commissioner's Directives (CD 702, CD 712, CD 712-1, CD 712-1-1, CD 726, and CD 726-2) which address, either explicitly or implicitly, a number of matters related to safe reintegration and public safety, both of which entail effective risk management and community supervision practices. These matters include but are not limited to: provision of effective interventions; clear and concise direction regarding case preparation and release process; effective, appropriate, and timely correctional program referral; addressing risk factors; correctional program referral based on risk assessment, and needs assessment through the use of actuarial tools, selection criteria, or social history. Furthermore, the Responsivity Portal provides a centralized services of resources available to CSC staff to engage special needs, women, Aboriginal and ethno-cultural offenders, and how to respond to challenges presented by offender sub-populations. This includes how to manage group dynamics, referrals, and provide staff with the skills to accommodate special needs offenders.

Appendix H: Efficient Use of CCC and CRF Resources

Table H1: Days in a CRF or CCC from Release

	Number of Days in a CRF or CCC from Release							
	Mean		Median		Std Dev.		Range	
	CRF	CCC	CRF	CCC	CRF	CCC	CRF	CCC
All Offenders	110	87	80	27	101	135	0 to 1,551	0 to 974
Men	110	89	81	30	102	136	0 to 1,551	0 to 974
Women	106	0	68	0	96	0	0 to 1,038	0
Aboriginal	97	119	63	65	101	157	0 to 1,279	0 to 974
Non-Aboriginal	112	79	83	19	101	129	0 to 1,551	0 to 802

Source: OMS (2011).

Table H2: Risk/Need Profiles at Release for Offenders with Non-PBC Imposed CRF/CCC Residency Stays

Risk/Need Profiles at Release for Offenders with Non-PBC Imposed CRF/CCC Residency Stays			
Ratings (<i>n</i> = 1,510)	Low	Medium	High
Risk	5%	48%	48%
Need	2%	28%	70%

Source: OMS (2011).

Table H3: Cox Regression Analysis Results of Supervision Outcome as a Function of Voluntary Residency in a CRF

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All) (<i>n</i> = 10,631)	0.24698	0.0421	34.4072	1	<.0001	1.28
Revocation (technical violation only)	0.35941	0.04933	53.0887	1	<.0001	1.432
Revocation (with offence/outstanding charges)	-	0.08159	0.2291	1	0.6322	0.962
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED	0.08828	0.10135	0.7587	1	0.3837	1.092

Source: OMS (2011).

Table H4: Cox Regression Analysis Results of Supervision Outcome as a Function of Voluntary Residency in a CRF – Aboriginal Offenders

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)	0.29249	0.04405	44.096	1	<.0001	1.34
Revocation (technical violation only)	0.40994	0.05169	62.8939	1	<.0001	1.507
Revocation (with offence/outstanding charges)	0.01897	0.08483	0.05	1	0.823	1.019
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED	0.0661	0.10792	0.3752	1	0.5402	1.068

Source: OMS (2011).

Table H5: Cox Regression Analysis Results of Supervision Outcome as a Function of Voluntary Residency in a CCC

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All) (<i>n</i> = 9,459)	0.40742	0.14247	8.17484	1	0.0042	1.503
Revocation (technical violation only)	.0.56705	0.16152	12.3258	1	0.0004	1.763
Revocation (with offence/outstanding charges)	-0.04759	0.30294	0.0247	1	0.8752	0.954
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED	-0.03213	0.38008	0.0071	1	0.9326	0.968

Source: OMS (2011).

Table H6: Cox Regression Analysis Results of Supervision Outcome as a Function of Voluntary Residency in a CCC – Aboriginal Offenders

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)	0.61378	0.17237	12.6799	1	0.0004	1.847
Revocation (technical violation only)	0.79757	0.20534	15.0871	1	0.0001	2.22
Revocation (with offence/outstanding charges)	0.43666	0.31776	1.8883	1	0.1694	1.548
<i>Post Supervision Outcome</i>						
Return to custody with 2 years of WED	0.10275	0.44909	0.0523	1	0.819	1.108

Source: OMS (2011).

Appendix I: Efficiency of the Parole Application Process

Table I1: Reasons for Full Parole or Day Parole Decision Waivers, Postponements or Withdrawals for Offenders in the Release Cohort

Waiver Reason	All Offenders (n = 3,780)	Men Offenders (n = 3,640)	Women Offenders (n = 140)	Aboriginal Offenders (n = 743)	Non-Aboriginal Offenders (n = 3,037)
	%	%	%	%	%
Assistant not available	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%
Avoid a negative recommendation or decision	15%	15%	14%	12%	16%
Case preparation incomplete	2%	3%	0%	2%	3%
Completed program/risk unissued	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Information missing	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
No crf/community support	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%
Not interested in release	5%	5%	6%	5%	6%
Other	27%	27%	26%	26%	27%
Other plan	11%	11%	9%	13%	11%
Pending court/appeal decision	2%	2%	4%	1%	2%
Program incomplete - offender motivation	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Program incomplete - scheduling problem	0%	0%	6%	1%	0%
Programs not completed	30%	30%	30%	36%	29%
Refuses program/intervention	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%

Source: OMS (2011).

Notes: A chi-square test for independence could not be performed to look at statistically significant differences by gender and ethnicity because of the large number of cells with expected values of less than 5.

Table I2: CSC staff agreement that the following types of offender information is shared between CSC and PBC in a manner that promotes efficient use of time and resources

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree
Program Reports (<i>n</i> = 180)	7%	5%	88%
Risk assessments (including mental health assessments) (<i>n</i> = 180)	5%	4%	91%
Community assessments (<i>n</i> = 176)	3%	3%	93%
Correctional plan updates (<i>n</i> = 177)	4%	6%	90%
Community strategy (<i>n</i> = 179)	4%	4%	92%
Discretionary release requirements (<i>n</i> = 175)	6%	6%	88%
Reasons for discretionary release decisions (<i>n</i> = 169)	8%	8%	84%
Reasons for imposing residency (<i>n</i> = 179)	6%	5%	89%

Source: CSC Staff Questionnaire (2011).

Table I3: Likelihood of Supervision Outcomes by CSC Recommendation for Parole

Supervision Outcome	β	SE	Wald	df	Sig	Hazard ratio
<i>Under Supervision Outcomes</i>						
Revocation (All)	0.17618	0.34304	0.2638	1	0.6075	1.193
Revocation (technical violation only)	-0.03218	0.34526	0.0087	1	0.9257	0.968

Source: OMS (2011).