_____ Brief Report _____

Temporary Absences Reduce Unemployment and Returns to Custody for Women Offenders

2015 Nº R-354

Temporary Absences Reduce Unemployment and Returns to Custody for Women Offenders

Leslie Helmus

&

Marguerite Ternes

Correctional Service of Canada

June 2015

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sara Johnson for her helpful comments throughout this project and Chris Hill for feedback on developing our research questions. We also thank Trina Forrester and Shanna Farrell MacDonald for their assistance on the data pull.

Executive Summary

Key words: *temporary absences, women offenders, community reintegration, dosage effects, returns to custody*

Temporary absences (TAs) allow offenders to leave the institution for short periods of time to attend to administrative matters, perform community service, strengthen family contacts, receive medical attention, attend to parental responsibilities, engage in personal development, and/or attend rehabilitative programming in the community. TAs are intended to assist in community reintegration by allowing gradual and conditional access to the community while supporting offender rehabilitation efforts. This report focused only on the rehabilitative types of TAs, excluding those granted for medical or administrative purposes (as there is less discretion in granting these absences).

The purpose of the current study was to examine who received TAs and to explore the impact of participating in TAs on community outcomes for women offenders. The final sample included 1,683 women offenders released to the community between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2011. Outcomes included unemployment, any return to custody, return to custody with a new offence, and return to custody without a new offence.

Overall, 44% of women offenders received a TA during their sentence. Women who received a TA were generally more likely to be higher risk, higher need, have lower Reintegration Potential, and were serving a longer sentence.

Participation in TAs was also related to community outcomes. A significant dosage effect was found for returns to custody for any reason and returns to custody for a new offence: the more TAs an offender received, the lower the chances of returning to custody. For unemployment and returns without an offence, merely participating in a TA (yes/no) demonstrated a significant reduction in negative outcomes.

These findings indicate that higher risk women are more likely to participate in TAs, and according to the risk principle of effective correctional practice, they stand to benefit the most from them. Additionally, participation in TAs reduces unemployment and returns to custody. Consequently, TAs play a valuable role in gradual reintegration to the community, and generally, the more the offenders participate, the greater the benefits.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Introduction

To assist their successful reintegration into the community, offenders may, on occasion, be authorized to leave the institution for short periods of time on a temporary absence (TA). TAs allow offenders to demonstrate appropriate community behaviour and subsequently demonstrate suitability for additional forms of conditional release (i.e., day parole or full parole).

The objectives of TAs are to encourage offenders to maintain family and community ties and to take advantage of rehabilitative activities, with the goal of safely reintegrating them into the community as law-abiding citizens through a gradual and controlled release strategy (Johnson & Grant, 2001). The *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (CCRA, 1992) sets the guidelines for the eligibility requirements, the permitting circumstances, and the maximum duration of the TA. Additional descriptions of the process and how it is being administered are described elsewhere (Ternes, Helmus, & Forrester, 2014). Generally, TAs permit offenders to attend to administrative matters, perform community service, strengthen family contacts, receive medical attention, attend to parental responsibilities, engage in personal development, and/or attend rehabilitative programming in the community (CSC, 2012). They can also be granted on compassionate grounds (CSC, 2012).

The CCRA identifies two types of TAs: escorted and unescorted. Offenders granted an escorted temporary absence (ETA) are supervised by a correctional officer, other CSC employee, or community volunteer. It is also possible to receive a group TA, where several offenders are supervised by one person. Recent research found that roughly 70% of ETAs are for group absences (Ternes et al., 2014). The majority of ETAs (group or individual) are granted to offenders residing in minimum security institutions, with those in medium and maximum security institutions having historically comprised less than 20% of all ETAs (Grant & Millson, 1998).

A recent study found that the strongest predictor of who received TAs was sentence length: offenders with longer sentences (including lifers) were more likely to eventually participate in a TA (Helmus & Ternes, 2014b). Additionally, offenders participating in TAs generally had higher motivation ratings and lower scores on the Institutional Adjustment subscale of the Custody Rating Scale. Most of the remaining variables examined were also significant predictors, but the effects were quite small. Generally, offenders participating in TAs

were moderate risk, were more likely to have had a previous federal sentence and a current violent offence, and they generally had fewer problems in institutions and on previous periods of community supervision. This study also found that women were more likely than men to receive TAs (Helmus & Ternes, 2014b).

Examining the impact of TAs in Canada, offenders granted TAs were more likely to receive day parole and were less likely to be unemployed or returned to custody during a two-year follow-up period (Helmus & Ternes, 2014a). International studies on temporary absences, also known as furloughs, have found similar benefits. In Ireland, prison absences were associated with significantly fewer returns to custody (Baumer, O'Donnell, & Hughes, 2009). Systematic reviews on the effectiveness of temporary releases also found that TAs can help to reduce recidivism and increase employment rates (Cheliotis, 2008; Seiter & Kadela, 2003).

Purpose of the Current Study

Recent CSC research has examined who receives TAs and explored the impact of participating in TAs on release and community outcomes (Helmus & Ternes, 2014a, 2014b). These studies combined men and women in their analyses. Given that women comprised only 6% of the population, additional research is needed to determine whether the overall findings are applicable to women offenders. The current study examined data from the women offenders in the previous reports (Helmus & Ternes, 2014a, 2014b) to determine the extent to which findings are different for women. Given substantial reductions in statistical power, this report examined all TAs (rather than separating ETAs and UTAs). The following research questions were addressed:

1) Which offenders receive temporary absences?
2) Does participation in temporary absences impact outcomes in the community? Specifically, do offenders who participated in TAs show lower rates of unemployment and returns to custody compared to those who did not participate and after controlling for relevant differences between the two groups identified in Research Question 1?
    a. If TAs have a positive impact on community outcomes, is there evidence of a dosage effect? Specifically, does effectiveness increase with a greater number of temporary absences?

Method

Population

This study used data on women offenders from a previous project (Helmus & Ternes, 2014a, 2014b). Specifically, this population included 1,683 women under CSC jurisdiction who were granted their first release to the community between April 1, 2005 and March 31, 2011. Offenders whose 'release type' was for death, deportation, or due to court order were deleted, as were women who were deported or died during the two-year follow-up period. If offenders served more than one sentence during the study period, only the first sentence was retained in the final dataset. Of the full sample, 26.7% self-reported Aboriginal ancestry (n = 450).

Procedure and Outcomes

All data were obtained from the Offender Management System (OMS), which is the computerized offender file management system maintained by CSC. Additional details about the measures and data from this sample can be obtained from the full report (Helmus & Ternes, 2014b). To maintain consistency with recent CSC publications, all TAs with completion codes of "cancelled" and "did not participate" were excluded. Additionally, all medical and administrative TAs were excluded, as there is substantially less discretion in granting these TAs. Although work releases were examined in the full report, these analyses were not conducted separately for women due to small sample sizes in the work release group.

A variety of composite ratings were examined, including the Static Factors Assessment (SFA; assesses risk level), the Dynamic Factors Intake Assessment (DFIA; assesses level of need), the Institutional Adjustment and Security Risk subscales of the Custody Rating Scale (CRS; informs initial security classification decisions), the Reintegration Potential rating (for women, this is derived from their rating on the SFA, DFIA, and CRS), and the Motivation Level rating. For the DFIA, the overall rating (low/moderate/high) was examined, regardless of whether the original DFIA or the DFIA-R was used. Given changes to the domain rating scales (Brown & Motiuk, 2005), however, only the original DFIA domain ratings were used (as that was what was available for approximately 95% of the sample). For all ratings, the intake assessment was used.

Four community outcomes were examined: employment, any return to custody, return without a new offence, and return with a new offence. All outcomes except for returns without

an offence were coded for two years post-release for all offenders. Offenders were considered 'unemployed' if there was no record of any full-time or part-time employment during the follow-up period. Any return to custody included any revocation (with or without an offence) as well as any readmission to CSC custody with a new sentence during the follow-up. Returns with outstanding charges (i.e., pseudo-recidivism) were excluded. Return with a new offence considered any revocation with an offence or a new federal sentence during the follow-up period. Returns without an offence used a one-year follow-up period and included any revocation without a new offence. Analyses of returns without an offence were restricted to offenders who had at least one year of community supervision (i.e., one year between their release date and their Warrant Expiry Date) to ensure there was opportunity for revocation (n = 1,378).

Overview of Analyses

This report primarily used the Area Under the Curve (AUC) and logistic regression. AUCs were used to identify predictors of receiving a TA. The AUC is an effect size statistic with values that can vary between 0 and 1, with .500 indicating no predictive value (Swets, Dawes, & Monahan, 2000). AUCs below .500 indicate that offenders with higher scores were less likely to have a TA. AUC values above .500 indicate that offenders with higher scores were more likely to have a TA. As a rough heuristic, an AUC of .560 corresponds to a small effect size, while .640 reflects a moderate effect, and .710 reflects a large effect size, as these values roughly correspond to Cohen's *d*s of .20, .50, and .80 (see Rice & Harris, 2005). Conversely, AUC values of .440, .360, and .290 reflect small, moderate, and large effect sizes in the opposite direction (i.e., offenders with higher scores on that factor were less likely to receive a TA).

Logistic regression (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000) was used to examine the impact of participating in TAs on community outcomes. The effect size is expressed as an odds ratio, which is defined as the odds of the outcome for those who participated in a TA divided by the odds of the outcome for those who did not participate. In these analyses, to control for as many important covariates as possible, we calculated a propensity score for receiving a TA. The propensity score included all variables that significantly distinguished the two groups (identified in analyses addressing Research Question 1), excluding AUC values between .490 and .510 (as these effects were considered too small to be meaningful). This was calculated for each offender to determine their predicted probability of obtaining a temporary absence (this is their propensity score). Then, in analysing the effect of TAs on a community outcome (e.g., being returned to

custody), we controlled for the propensity score. This isolates the effect of the TA, controlling for differences between groups with respect to who gets TAs. To determine whether there was a dosage effect for temporary absences, logistic regression was used to estimate the effect of the *number* of TAs an offender participated in, after controlling for the dichotomous variable of whether they participated in a TA at all, and controlling for the propensity score.

Results

Who Gets Temporary Absences?

Appendix A presents analyses of the differences between offenders who participated in at least one TA and those who did not participate in a TA, first for categorical ordinal predictors (Table A1), followed by continuous predictors (Table A2). Overall, 44% of women offenders received a TA during their sentence. From Table A1, women receiving temporary absences were significantly more likely to have had a past federal sentence, a current violence offence, a current sex offence, self-report Aboriginal ancestry, and to be serving an indeterminate sentence. Effect sizes, however, were generally small (the largest was for having a current violent offence; AUC = .63). As an example of interpreting the data in Table A1, 61% of women with a violent offence were granted a TA, compared to 33% of women without a violence offence. Examining the composite assessments, women receiving TAs were significantly more likely to be high risk on the SFA, high need on the DFIA, and to be assessed as having Low Reintegration Potential (these effects, however, were small). Participation in TAs was unrelated to motivation level. On the SFA, DFIA, and Reintegration Potential Rating, the effects were consistently linear (e.g., on the DFIA, 30% of women with a low overall level of need received a TA, compared to 45% of those with moderate overall need, and 50% of those with a high overall level of need).

Examining selected offence history items on the SFA (mostly examining prior behaviour in institutions and on community supervision), offenders who received TAs were significantly more likely to have previous violent offences or to have had three or more prior victims. For the DFIA need domains, women offenders receiving TAs were assessed as having significantly higher levels of need in the domains of family/marital, substance abuse, and personal/emotional. However, participation in TAs was unrelated to whether the offenders had previous youth convictions, 15 or more previous adult convictions, prior failures during community supervision, prior segregation placements for disciplinary infractions, prior escapes or attempted escapes, prior reclassifications to a higher security level, prior failures on conditional release, less than six months since their last incarceration, not having a crime free period of 1 or more years, previous sex offences, and to assessed level of need for employment, associates/social interaction, community functioning, and attitude.

From Table A2, age at admission and total score on the Criminal History Record subscale of the SFA were unrelated to receiving a TA. Offenders receiving a TA did, however, have

higher scores on the Offence Severity Record subscale of the SFA and on both subscales of the Custody Rating Scale (Institutional Adjustment and Security Risk). Additionally, they had more previous federal sentences. Women receiving TAs also had a significantly longer sentence length, on average. Offenders with indeterminate sentences, however, are not included in calculations of sentence length, although analyses in Table A1 demonstrated that offenders with indeterminate sentences were more likely to receive a TA. To combine these two variables assessing the sentence, a new sentence length variable was created whereby indeterminate offenders were artificially scored as having a sentence length of 26 years (this value was chosen because the longest determinate sentence in the dataset was 25 years). The combined sentence length variable (including indeterminate sentences) had a larger AUC in predicting TAs than the previous variables and was considered a more comprehensive variable. Consequently, it replaced the other two variables in developing the propensity score for outcome analyses.

Effect of TAs on Community Outcomes

This set of analyses explored whether women offenders participating in TAs had better community outcomes (specifically, lower levels of unemployment and returns to custody) than those who did not participate. Direct comparisons of their outcomes would be misleading, however, given that the previous section found that women who participated in TAs are generally higher risk than those who did not participate. To account for these group differences, a propensity score was developed for each offender to estimate their probability of receiving a TA based on the following 16 variables: past federal sentence, current violent offence, Aboriginal ancestry, SFA rating, DFIA rating, Reintegration Potential rating, previous violent offence, three or more previous victims, DFIA family/marital domain rating, DFIA substance abuse domain rating, DFIA personal/emotional domain rating, number of previous federal sentences, CRS Institutional Adjustment rating, CRS Security Risk rating, SFA Offence Severity total score, sentence length (including lifers). There was sufficient data to calculate the propensity score for 1,353 offenders. The propensity score predicted TA group membership with a large effect size (AUC = .71), demonstrating high accuracy in indexing differences between the groups.

Controlling for the propensity score, participating in a temporary absence significantly reduced unemployment, returns to custody for any reason, and returns to custody without a new offence (see Table 1). Specifically, after controlling for risk-relevant differences between the two

groups, the odds of being unemployed were approximately one-third lower for offenders who participated in a TA compared to those who did not (OR = .680). In other words, there was a 32% reduction in the odds of being unemployed. There was a 29% reduction in the odds of returning to custody for any reason (OR = .712) and a 35% reduction in the odds of returning to custody without a new offence (OR = .649). Participation in a TA (yes/no) was not significantly related to returns to custody for a new offence.

Table 1

Logistic Regressions for Effectiveness of TAs, Controlling for Propensity Scores

Outcome	*N*	OR	95% CI		Wald	*p*
Unemployed	1,353	.680	.538	.858	10.51	.001
2-year any return	1,353	.712	.561	.903	7.85	.005
Return without offence – 1 year follow-up before WED	1,086	.649	.475	.888	7.33	.007
2-year return with new offence	1,353	1.067	.729	1.561	0.11	.738

Note. OR = odds ratio. CI = confidence interval.

Dosage Effects

Analyses regarding dosage effects examined whether the *number* of TAs an offender participated in was related to the outcomes, controlling for propensity scores (to account for group differences), and the dichotomous effect of participating in a TA (see Table 2). Note that odds ratios should be smaller for tests of the number of TAs: because it is a continuous variable, the odds ratio examines differences between two adjacent values (e.g., 10 TAs versus 11 TAs). The number of TAs an offender received was significantly related to any returns to custody and returns to custody with a new offence. Specifically, the more TAs the offender participated in, the better their outcomes. Dosage effects were not significant for unemployment and returns without an offence. Interestingly, the previous section found that simply participating in a TA (yes/no) did not significantly reduce returns to custody with a new offence, but considering the number of TAs, the more TAs an offender received, the lower their risk of returning with a new offence. Specifically, after controlling for the likelihood of receiving a TA and whether the offender participated in any TAs, each additional TA the offender participated in reduced the

odds of returning to custody with a new offence by 3% (OR = .971). Though small, this effect continues to accumulate for each successive TA.

Table 2

Logistic Regressions for Effect of the Number of TAs (Controlling for Dichotomous Participation and Propensity Scores)

Outcome		*N*	OR	95% C.I.		Wald	*p*
Unemployed	Absence	1,353	.710	.558	.904	7.70	.006
	Number		.995	.987	1.002	1.90	.167
2-year any return	Absence	1,353	.790	.614	1.016	3.36	.067
	Number		.987	.977	.997	5.92	.015
Return without offence – 1 year follow-up before WED	Absence	1,086	.673	.448	.929	5.82	.016
	Number		.996	.986	1.005	0.82	.366
2-year return with new offence	Absence	1,353	1.324	.875	2.006	1.76	.184
	Number		.971	.946	.998	6.17	.013

Note. OR = odds ratio. CI = confidence interval.

Discussion

Similar to the full report combining men and women for analyses (Helmus & Ternes, 2014b), this study found that several factors predict which women receive TAs, and that TAs are related to community outcomes. Importantly, the more TAs an offender received, the lower the chances of returning to custody overall and for a new offence. For unemployment and returns without an offence, merely participating in a TA (yes/no) demonstrated a significant benefit.

Although these findings support the value of TAs in the gradual reintegration of women offenders, there were some interesting departures from the results of the full sample (reported in Helmus & Ternes, 2014b). Overall, 44% of women offenders received a TA during their sentence, which was twice as high as the rate for CSC offenders overall (22%; Helmus & Ternes, 2014b). Additionally, there were important differences in *who* received TAs. For the overall sample, there was an inverse-U relationship between offender risk/need and participation in TAs: specifically, moderate risk/need offenders were most likely to receive a TA, whereas low and high risk/need offenders did not differ in their participation rates (Helmus & Ternes, 2014b). For women offenders, however, there was a clear linear relationship; higher risk and need offenders were more likely to participate.

Similarly, for the overall sample, offenders with higher reintegration potential ratings and higher motivation were more likely to participate, with motivation being one of the larger predictors in that study (Helmus & Ternes, 2014b). For women, there was an inverse relationship with reintegration potential: offenders with the lowest reintegration potential were most likely to participate, and surprisingly, motivation was unrelated to TA participation. Almost all criminal history items (mostly reflecting behaviour in institutions and on community supervision) were unrelated to TA participation for women, whereas in the overall sample most of these items were significantly related, with offenders who received TAs showing fewer problems in these areas (Helmus & Ternes, 2014b). Lastly, in the full sample, offenders with higher scores on the Custody Rating subscale for Institutional Adjustment (reflecting more problems in this area) were less likely to receive TAs (Helmus & Ternes, 2014b), whereas for women, they were more likely to receive TAs.

Cumulatively, these differences point to a clear pattern that was unique among women: higher risk offenders were more likely to participate in TAs. This makes sense according to the

risk principle of effective correctional practice (Andrews & Bonta, 2010): higher risk offenders stand to benefit the most from additional support for community reintegration. What is unclear, however, is why this pattern was particularly salient for women. It is possible that women are viewed as 'safer' risks for TAs. This perception is supported by findings that women are rated lower risk on the Static Factors Assessment compared to men (Helmus & Forrester, 2014a) and their readmission rates for any new offence and any new violent offence are substantially lower than men, even within the same static risk category (Helmus & Forrester, 2014b). This means that prioritizing higher risk women for TAs is unlikely to place undue risk to public safety. This is further supported by the extremely low failure rates for TAs (Forrester & Grant, 2013). These low failure rates were consistent for men and women (Helmus & Ternes, 2014a; analyses not reported). Consequently, the higher risk profile of women receiving TAs (compared to men) does not appear to be increasing the risk to public safety.

We also found that TAs significantly reduced unemployment and returns to custody for women, after controlling for important risk-relevant differences between those who participated and those who did not. The general conclusion that TAs are an effective component of gradual reintegration for women was similar to the overall report (Helmus & Ternes, 2014a), though some of the nuances in the findings were different. For the overall sample, a significant dosage effect for TAs was found for all four outcomes, whereas the analyses of women found a dosage effect only for returns to custody for any reason and returns to custody with a new offence (the other outcomes did, however, have a significant dichotomous effect of TA participation). The dosage effect means that above and beyond the value of participating in at least one TA, the more TAs the offender received, the better their outcomes.

A primary limitation of the current study is that the sample size for women is much smaller than sample size for men, which limits statistical power. Consequently, it was not possible to conduct meaningful analyses for different types of TAs (e.g., ETA versus UTA, group ETA versus individual ETA). The low sample size also meant we were unable to examine work releases. The conclusions are also limited by the quality of the data. For example, to the extent that new offences are undetected, or that staff are not diligent in recording community employment, this would introduce additional error in the analyses. Another limitation is that this study was restricted to intake assessments of most of the variables. Particularly for offenders serving long sentences before their release, their intake assessment may not be the most accurate

reflection of their characteristics at release. Intake assessments were used, however, because they are more consistently available for offenders. Additionally, research supporting the added value of assessments of change over initial assessments is currently limited (e.g., Serin, Lloyd, Helmus, Derkzen, & Luong, 2013).

A major strength of this study was that the tests of the effectiveness of TAs controlled for important differences between groups. This is important because lack of group equivalency is one of the primary threats to the validity of outcome studies (Collaborative Outcome Data Committee, 2007). In this study, controlling for propensity scores allowed for consideration of a large and diverse number of relevant differences between the groups, helping to better isolate the effects of TAs. Additionally, rather than hypothesize which key factors would be important to control for, the first research question allowed for an empirical examination of the key differences between the two groups, better informing the selection of control variables for the propensity score.

Conclusions

These findings support the important role of temporary absences in the successful community reintegration of women offenders. TAs allow for offenders to engage in appropriate community behaviour and subsequently demonstrate that their risk can be successfully mitigated in the community. This study illustrates that TAs are adequately meeting their objectives and contributing to the mission of CSC. Participating in TAs significantly reduced both unemployment and returns to custody, and participating in more TAs was generally more beneficial than participating in fewer TAs.

References

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexus/Anderson.

Baumer, E. P., O'Donnell, I., & Hughes, N. (2009). The porous prison: A note on the rehabilitative potential of visits home. *The Prison Journal, 89*, 119-126. doi:10.1177/0032885508330430

Brown, S. L., & Motiuk, L. L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process: A meta-analytic, psychometric and consultative review* (Research Report No. R-164). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Cheliotis, L. K. (2008). Reconsidering the effectiveness of temporary release: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13,* 153-168. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2008.02.004

Collaborative Outcome Data Committee. (2007). *The Collaborative Outcome Data Committee's guidelines for the evaluation of sexual offender treatment outcome research Part 2: CODC guidelines* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2007-03). Ottawa, Ontario: Public Safety Canada.

Correctional Service of Canada. (2012). *Temporary absences. Commissioner's Directive 710-3.* Ottawa, ON: Author.

Corrections and Conditional Release Act (1992). C-20. Retrieved from http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/page-1.html

Forrester, T., & Grant, B. A. (2013). Descriptive analysis of unsuccessful unescorted temporary absences (Research Snippet No. 13-8). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Grant, B. A. & Millson, W. A. (1998). *Temporary absence program: A descriptive analysis.* (Research Report No. R-64). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.

Helmus, L., & Forrester, T. (2014a). *Construct validity of the Static Factors Assessment in the offender intake assessment process* (Research Report No. R-309). Report under approval. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Helmus, L., & Forrester, T. (2014b). *The Static Factors Assessment (SFA) of the offender intake assessment process: Relationship to release and community outcomes* (Research Report No. R-339). Report under approval. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Helmus, L., & Ternes, M. (2014a). *The impact of temporary absences and work releases on community outcomes.* Report submitted. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Helmus, L., & Ternes, M. (2014b). *Who gets temporary absences and work releases?: A profile.* Report submitted. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Hosmer, D. W., & Lemeshow, S. (2000). *Applied logistic regression* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Johnson, S. L., & Grant, B. A. (2001). Using temporary absence in the gradual reintegration process. *Forum on Corrections, 13*(1), 36-38.

Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (2005). Comparing effect sizes in follow-up studies: ROC area, Cohen's *d*, and *r*, *Law and Human Behavior, 29*, 615-620. doi:10.1007/s10979-005-6832-7

Seiter, R. P., & Kadela, K. R. (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency, 49,* 360-388. doi:10.1177/0011128703049003002

Serin, R. C., Lloyd, C. D., Helmus, L., Derkzen, D. M., & Luong, D. (2013). Does intra-individual change predict offender recidivism? Searching for the Holy Grail in a review of offender programming. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18,*32-53. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.09.002

Swets, J. A., Dawes, R. M., & Monahan, J. (2000). Psychological science can improve diagnostic decisions. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 1,* 1-26. doi:10.1111/1529-1006.001

Ternes, M., Helmus, L., & Forrester, T. (2014). *Temporary absences and work releases: Characteristics and patterns of use.* Report submitted. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Appendix A: Predictors of Receiving Temporary Absences

Table A1

Relationship Between Categorical Predictors and Receiving a TA

Predictor Variable	*N*	% Received	AUC
Overall	1,683	44.1	
Past federal sentence			.528*
No	1,463	42.5	
Yes	220	54.5	
Current violent offence			.633*
No	1,020	33.1	
Yes	648	60.6	
Current sex offence			.506*
No	1,643	43.5	
Yes	25	64.0	
Aboriginal			.586*
No	1,212	38.3	
Yes	450	59.8	
Indeterminate Sentence			.518*
No	1,657	43.2	
Yes	26	100.0	
Static Factors Assessment			.584*
Low Risk	582	36.4	
Moderate Risk	602	51.0	
High Risk	300	55.3	
DFIA Rating			.573*
Low Need	328	30.2	
Moderate Need	680	44.7	
High Need	675	50.2	
Reintegration Potential			.443*
Low	254	54.3	
Moderate	535	46.9	
High	894	39.5	
Motivation Level			.502
Low	74	37.8	
Moderate	664	44.9	
High	945	44.0	
Previous youth convictions			.516
No	1,047	45.0	
Yes	435	48.7	

Table continues on next page

Table A1 continued

Predictor Variable	*N*	% Received	AUC
15+ previous adult convictions			.508
No	1,087	45.5	
Yes	392	47.7	
Prior failure during community supervision			.502
No	760	45.9	
Yes	712	46.4	
Prior segregation placement for disciplinary infractions			.502
No	1,242	46.4	
Yes	212	47.2	
Prior attempted escape, UAL, or escape			.503
No	1,304	46.0	
Yes	175	47.4	
Prior reclassification to higher level of security			.500
No	1,384	46.2	
Yes	84	46.4	
Prior failures on conditional release			.506
No	1,042	45.7	
Yes	435	47.1	
Less than 6 months since last incarceration			.493
No	1,330	46.5	
Yes	150	42.7	
No crime free period of 1 or more years			.503
No	1,341	45.9	
Yes	139	47.5	
Previous violent offences			.532*
No	936	43.6	
Yes	547	50.5	
Previous sex offences			.500
No	1,475	44.8	
Yes	8	50.0	
Three or more previous victims			.524*
No	1,224	44.8	
Yes	250	53.2	

Table continues on next page

Table A1 continued

Predictor Variable	*N*	% Received	AUC
DFIA – Employment			.497
Factor seen as asset	48	62.5	
No current difficulty	367	43.3	
Some difficulty	842	45.6	
Considerable difficulty	229	45.4	
DFIA – Family/Marital			.560*
Factor seen as asset	66	21.2	
No current difficulty	664	42.9	
Some difficulty	454	48.2	
Considerable difficulty	302	52.6	
DFIA – Associates/social interaction			.489
Factor seen as asset	46	50.0	
No current difficulty	424	46.7	
Some difficulty	562	45.2	
Considerable difficulty	452	44.7	
DFIA – Substance Abuse			.574*
No current difficulty	450	35.1	
Some difficulty	172	43.6	
Considerable difficulty	864	51.4	
DFIA – Community Functioning			.493
Factor seen as asset	64	56.2	
No current difficulty	968	44.8	
Some difficulty	375	46.7	
Considerable difficulty	78	41.0	
DFIA – Personal/Emotional			.562*
No current difficulty	340	37.1	
Some difficulty	540	43.9	
Considerable difficulty	609	51.6	
DFIA – Attitude			.510
Factor seen as asset	169	42.0	
No current difficulty	786	46.4	
Some difficulty	346	42.8	
Considerable difficulty	183	50.8	

Note. Due to missing information on cell variables, not all sample sizes add up to 1,683. DFIA = Dynamic Factors Intake Assessment.
*$p < .05$

Table A2

Relationship Between Continuous Predictors and Receiving a TA

		No TA	Any TA	
Item	*N*	*M* (*SD*)	*M* (*SD*)	AUC
Age at admission	1,683	35.0 (10.3)	34,3 (9.6)	.484
Number of previous federal sentences	1,683	0.1 (0.5)	0.2 (0.6)	.528*
CRS Institutional Adjustment	1,674	35.2 (27.0)	37.5 (26.3)	.539*
CRS Security Risk	1,674	56.1 (22.4)	64.0 (25.8)	.579*
Sentence length (years)	1,657	2.8 (1.4)	3.3 (2.0)	.595*
Sentence length (incl. lifers)	1,683	2.8 (1.4)	4.1 (4.6)	.609*
CHR total	1,484	10.8 (7.2)	11.0 (6.8)	.518
OSR total	1,484	9.5 (7.7)	12.6 (7.6)	.631*

*Note.*CRS = Custody Rating Scale; CHR = Criminal History Record; OSR = Offence Severity Record.