

_____ **Research Report** _____

**Residential Facilities:
Offender Profile
and Review of the Literature**

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.

**Residential Facilities:
Offender Profile and Review of the Literature**

Renée Gobeil

Leslie Anne Keown

Mary B. Ritchie

&

Stephanie M. Biro

Correctional Service of Canada

February 2015

Acknowledgements

Appreciation is extended to Jodi McDonough, Marlène Pepin, Erin Crawley, and Andrew Pettinger from CSC's Community Reintegration Branch, who generously provided relevant context and background information, and also answered many questions during this project's progress. The work of Shanna Farrell MacDonald and Colette Cousineau in extracting data is also gratefully acknowledged.

Executive Summary

Key words: *community-based residential facility, residency, day parole, profile*

Releasing offenders to the community gradually and with supervision leads to better public safety outcomes. In some cases, offenders' return to the community is facilitated through a period of residence in a community-based residential facility, which acts as a bridge between a federal institution and the community. The Correctional Service of Canada makes extensive use of these facilities, and as such, in order to allow a better understanding of this population and potentially inform operational practice, the profile of offenders residing in community-based residential facilities – including those on day parole and with residency conditions – was examined. A complementary review of literature on the effectiveness of residence in such facilities was also undertaken.

In the first examination, all offenders in the community at the end of March 2010 ($N = 7,339$) and March 2014 ($N = 7,372$) were profiled. Analyses focused on the differences between offenders on day parole, those with residency conditions, and those who were not residing in community-based residential facilities, as well as on differences over time. In keeping with expectations, those with residency conditions tended to have more limited community stability, more extensive criminal histories, and be assessed as presenting more elevated risk across a variety of markers. The proportion of offenders with residency conditions and on LTSOs was greater in 2014 than in 2010, but other differences over the five year period were modest. By contrasting findings from this study with those of one conducted a decade ago, a slightly broader lens can be applied to the question of changes over time. This contrast demonstrated that, compared to in 2003, offenders in community-based residential facilities in 2014 presented more elevated levels of static risk (i.e., risk as measured by criminal history and offence severity).

In the second stage, the international literature on residential facilities was reviewed to gather evidence regarding their effectiveness. Though the existing research is limited in quantity and cannot always be easily generalized to a Canadian context, residential facilities seems to contribute to reduced rates of re-offending, as well as a number of other positive outcomes. These effects are most pronounced when considering higher-risk offenders; indeed, some research suggests that targeting lower-risk offenders may lead to more negative outcomes. The literature also demonstrates that pairing community-based programs with residency, again, if appropriate according to the level of risk, may also be beneficial.

Overall, findings align very well with the broader risk-need-responsivity framework guiding much of CSC's case management, including recognition that interventions are most appropriately targeted at higher-risk offenders. Both policy and legislation direct that residency conditions are to be reserved for the highest-risk offenders, who, without such a condition, would present an undue risk to society and be likely to commit a violent offence. Moreover, CSC makes available community-based correctional and other programs to offenders whose risk levels support the requirement; these programs may be offered directly through the CBRF or separately.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	v
Introduction.....	1
Conditional Release	1
Residence in Community-Based Residential Facilities	2
Challenges with Residency	3
Offenders in CBRFs.....	3
The Current Study.....	4
Chapter 1: Profile of Offenders in CBRFs.....	5
Method	5
Results.....	7
Summary	13
Chapter 2: Effectiveness of Residency	14
Method	14
Findings.....	14
Summary	16
Discussion	17
Conclusion	19
References	20

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Supervision Type of Offenders in the Community</i>	5
Table 2. <i>Demographic Characteristics of Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)</i>	7
Table 3. <i>Offence and Sentence Information of Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)</i>	9
Table 4. <i>Criminal History of Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)</i>	10
Table 5. <i>Risk and Need Information for Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)</i>	11

List of Appendices

Appendix A. Need Domains for Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot).....	24
Appendix B. Comparisons of 2010 and 2014 Profiles	25

Introduction

It is well-accepted that gradual, supervised community reintegration offers many benefits, such as ensuring the protection of the public and facilitating offenders' safe return to the community through the provision of enhanced support and structure (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Motiuk & Cousineau, 2006; Zinger, 2012). Gradual community reintegration involves both supporting offenders in their reintegration efforts and monitoring risk and compliance with the conditions of release. Research has demonstrated that offenders released to community supervision have lower rates of re-offence than do offenders who serve their full sentences in custody (The Pew Center for the States, 2013). In some cases, offenders' return to the community is facilitated through a period of residence in a community-based residential facility (CBRF), which acts as a bridge between a federal institution and the community. The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) makes extensive use of such CBRFs, and as such, the profile of offenders in such facilities was examined in order to allow a better understanding of this population and potentially inform operational practice. In addition, a complementary review of literature on the effectiveness of residence in CBRFs in reducing re-offending was undertaken.

Conditional Release

In recognition of the value of gradual community reintegration, the *Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations* (CCRA, 1992), which guides corrections in Canada, indicates when offenders become eligible to apply for discretionary release. The first type of discretionary release for which offenders become eligible – excluding temporary absences – is day parole. Most offenders become eligible for consideration for day parole after serving six months less than a third of their sentence or seven years, unless otherwise specified by the Court (CCRA, 1992). Importantly, eligibility for consideration does not mean that offenders are automatically granted release. The Parole Board of Canada (PBC), an independent body with the exclusive authority to grant parole to offenders serving federal sentences, makes decisions based on the merits of each individual case. The PBC grants day parole to offenders only when the release will contribute to the protection of society by facilitating reintegration and when it is judged that the offender will not present a risk to society by re-offending prior to sentence expiry (CCRA, 1992). Moreover, offenders may be granted day parole any time from their eligibility date until they have served two-thirds of their sentence (for those with sentences of fixed length). As a

result, many offenders are granted day parole at some point after their eligibility date.

In addition to deciding whether to grant an offender day parole, the PBC determines whether special release conditions are required in conjunction with the standard conditions common to all offenders (such as to obey the law and keep the peace, and not to possess weapons). In order for PBC members to impose special conditions, the conditions must relate directly to risk, need, or inappropriate behaviour (PBC, 2014). The members must also believe that without the assistance and control provided by the special condition, the offender is likely to re-offend. Special conditions vary according to each offender's particular situation, but examples include abstaining from alcohol or refraining from having contact with certain individuals.

Residence in Community-Based Residential Facilities

Day parole, as the name implies, allows the offender to pursue employment or other opportunities during the day, but requires that he or she return to a specified location each night. In virtually all cases, offenders that are granted day parole reside in CBRFs. For offenders under CSC's jurisdiction, two types of such facilities are available: community correctional centres and community residential facilities. Community correctional centres are institutions owned and operated by CSC that provide structured living environments with 24-hour supervision, while community residential facilities are facilities owned by non-governmental agencies who provide contracted services, including special housing, counseling, and supervision (CSC, 2014b).

There are also other offenders residing in CBRFs alongside those that have been granted day parole. In addition to day parole, offenders can be released on full parole (another form of discretionary release), statutory release (a legislatively-mandated release that occurs after two-thirds of the sentence has been served¹), or, rarely, at sentence expiry to complete a long-term supervision order (LTSO)² in the community. For each of these release types, the PBC can review the case to determine whether any special conditions are required for the offender's

¹ The exceptions are those offenders who present such a high likelihood of serious re-offence that they are detained in custody until the end of their sentence (CCRA, 1992).

² An LTSO is a period of community supervision of up to ten years that can be imposed by the court to be served at the end of an offender's custodial sentence. An LTSO designation is intended for offenders – primarily sex offenders – who do not meet the criteria to be designated dangerous offenders (i.e., offenders maintained in custody indefinitely given their likelihood of re-offence and the unmanageability of the risk they present), but are determined by the court to represent a substantial risk of re-offence if not effectively supervised in the community. In contrast with those designated dangerous offenders, long term offenders must be determined by the court to present a risk that is possible to eventually control in the community.

management in the community. In some cases, a residency condition is imposed.

According to legislation, a residency condition is intended for offenders who, without such a condition, would present an undue risk to society and be likely to commit a violent offence (CCRA, 1992). Such conditions can be imposed at release or at a later point during community supervision if it becomes necessary. The latter explains why offenders on full parole – which typically does not require residence at a CBRF – occasionally receive residency conditions. Residency conditions are removed by the PBC when the offender can be safely managed without them; as such, their duration varies from offender to offender.

Challenges with Residency

Residence in a CBRF allows for enhanced ongoing supervision of the offender and can be useful as a stepping stone toward independent community residence for those offenders for whom a gradual easing of structure is considered risk-appropriate. Indeed, many offenders report perceiving benefits associated with residence in a CBRF, including help with becoming more accountable and disciplined, access to resources and support, and assistance in finding employment and saving money (Delveaux et al., 2012). That said, the greater supervision associated with intensive supervision (such as that which accompanies a residency condition) is not enough, on its own, to reduce rates of return to custody (Petersilia & Turner, 1993). Indeed, researchers have found that more intensive supervision may *increase* the rates of return to custody due to breaches of conditions, simply because there are more opportunities to become aware of breaches. Discussing special conditions as a whole (rather than solely residency), Burke (2004) has argued that greater visibility contributes to a situation where it is more difficult for offenders to succeed on community supervision. In fact, she posits that offenders are much more likely to return to custody when their behaviour is more visible, but that these returns are largely due to violations of conditions, not new offences. Overall, to date, there is a limited understanding of the possible advantages and disadvantages of residency and the circumstances in which residency can be most and least beneficial.

Offenders in CBRFs

The need for greater information in this area is underscored by the fact that the rate of imposition of residency conditions has been increasing, with over three times as many offenders in 2013-14 as in 1999-00 being imposed a residency condition at release (Gobeil & Cousineau,

submitted). Delveaux and her colleagues (2012) also found that over half of all offenders (54%) released from 2005-06 to 2010-11 spent at least a day in a CBRF during their period of community supervision. Together, these findings clearly demonstrate the high rates of CBRF utilization by both offenders on day parole and those with residency conditions

A small number of studies have examined the characteristics of offenders residing in Canadian CBRFs (Abracen, Axford, & Gileno, 2011; Bell & Trevethan, 2004; Delveaux et al., 2012; Scott & Bottos, 2012). In an early study, those in CBRFs were found, relative to offenders who were released directly to the community, to be more likely to have been convicted of homicide and other violent offences, and to display elevated needs in certain areas – with need relating to community functioning particularly pronounced (Bell & Trevethan, 2004). Another study, limited only to statutorily released offenders, resulted in similar findings, with residency conditions being associated with violent offending and elevated risk and need (Scott & Bottos, 2012). More recently, Abracen and colleagues (2011) found that the population of offenders in CBRFs is changing. In their comparison of those residing in a sample of CBRFs in 1998 and 2008, these researchers found that offenders' level of risk and need had increased. They also found increased rates of substance use, aggression, and psychological difficulties.

By and large, these studies show that the population of offenders in CBRFs present characteristics suggesting a need for increased support, which is unsurprising given the purpose of CBRFs. However, these examinations also suggest that the characteristics of offenders residing in CBRFs are changing over time. In that context, an up-to-date profile of these offenders – and especially including a contrast of those on day parole and those with a residency condition – is timely and may inform operational practice.

The Current Study

Given high rates of CBRF utilization and the time elapsed since the last comprehensive profile of offenders in CBRFs, a research project was undertaken to address two areas:

1. What are the characteristics of offenders in CBRFs? Do the characteristics differ for those on day parole and those assigned residency conditions? Further, have these population characteristics been changed over time?
2. What is the evidence related to the effectiveness of residence in CBRFs?

Chapter 1: Profile of Offenders in CBRFs

Method

Participants. The group identified for analyses was all offenders in the community at the end of March 2010 ($N = 7,339$) and the end of March 2014 ($N = 7,372$). Within each snapshot, offenders on day parole, with a residency condition, and without a residency requirement were identified.³ Overall, while the proportion of offenders on day parole remained the same (15%), the proportion with a residency condition increased slightly (from 10% to 13%) and there was a small decrease in the proportion without a residency condition (from 75% to 72%). Across groups, the number of offenders on an LTSO increased the most (by 44%, from 238 to 342), while the number on statutory release increased by 14% (from 2,429 to 2,764) and on day parole grew very modestly, by 2% (from 1,088 to 1,111). Finally, the full parole population decreased by 12% (from 3,584 to 3,155). Not surprisingly, the residency condition group was comprised primarily of offenders on statutory release, though offenders on full parole and on an LTSO were also included (see Table 1).⁴

Table 1.

Supervision Type of Offenders in the Community

Supervision Type	Percentage					
	2010			2014		
	Day Parole ($N = 1,088$)	Residency Condition ($N = 746$)	No Residency ($N = 5,505$)	Day Parole ($N = 1,111$)	Residency Condition ($N = 961$)	No Residency ($N = 5,300$)
Day Parole	100	--	--	100	--	--
Full Parole	--	13	63	--	5	59
Statutory Release	--	71	35	--	77	38
LTSO	--	16	2	--	18	3

³ A small number of offenders were omitted from each yearly snapshot – 364 in 2010 and 240 in 2014. Though identified as being in the community, these offenders were in remand or temporarily detained and therefore could not be included in residency status considerations.

Moreover, a small number of offenders reside in CBRFs without being on day parole or having a PBC-imposed residency condition. Due to the lack of such a condition, these offenders could not be identified in the existing data and were therefore grouped with those without a residency condition.

⁴ Supervision type refers to the offender's current form of supervision, which is not necessarily the same as that on which the offender was originally released.

Measures. For each offender identified in the annual snapshots, descriptive information was obtained from the Offender Management System, CSC's computerized repository of information relating to offenders. Broadly speaking, this information fell into four categories: demographic information, offence and sentence information, criminal history, and risk and need information. Demographic information included gender, ethnicity, marital status, and age. In this category, a pre-incarceration history of unstable accommodation and suspected gang involvement were also examined. Offence and sentence information included the most serious offence of which the offender was convicted (on the current sentence) and sentence length. Criminal history included history of previous adult convictions and of failures on community supervision and conditional release.

With respect to risk and need, a number of indicators were examined. The first was the security level from which the offender was released. Second was the offender's most recent assessments of static risk (based on criminal history, offence risk, and, if applicable, sex offence information), dynamic need, motivation to follow one's correctional plan, accountability (acceptance of responsibility for actions and recognizing problems) and assessed potential to successfully reintegrate the community. Each of these was assessed as *low*, *moderate*, or *high*. In addition, each offender's file was examined for the presence of responsivity and engagement flags. A responsivity flag is activated when offenders are identified as presenting characteristics that could positively or negatively influence their ability to respond to interventions (e.g., language or literacy difficulties). Engagement is endorsed when offenders are rated as moderate or high on motivation and on accountability. Finally, the seven domains of the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis – Revised (CSC, 2014a) were examined: associates, attitudes, community functioning, employment, family/marital, personal/emotional, and substance use. Unfortunately, given the time frame of the study, many offenders had been assessed using this instrument's predecessor; results from the two versions cannot be meaningfully combined.

Analytic Approach. Given that the groups represented full populations, rather than samples, inferential statistics were not appropriate and not employed. Instead, distributions on various variables were simply examined for differences by group and by time. Given that most differences seemed to be associated with groups rather than time, these were the focus of the discussion of findings, though differences associated with time were also noted. Results by time are also available in Appendix B.

Results

Demographic Characteristics. As can be seen in Table 1, proportionately, there were more Aboriginal offenders and fewer women offenders among those with a residency condition than among those on day parole or with no residency requirement.⁵ In fact, women were proportionately over-represented among those on day parole, which aligns with the fact that they tend to be released earlier in their sentences than are men (Public Safety, 2013). Those in the residency condition group were more likely to both be single and to have previous accommodation instability. Though few offenders were suspected of gang affiliation, more of those in the residency condition group were identified as such.

Table 2.

Demographic Characteristics of Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)

Demographic Characteristic	Percentage		
	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,111)	Residency Cond. (<i>N</i> = 961)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,300)
Aboriginal	15	26	15
Male	91	98	94
Marital Status ^a			
Common-law/Married	43	34	45
Divorced / Separated / Widowed	12	10	12
Single	45	56	43
Unstable Accommodation History	18	42	23
Age			
18- 25	13	8	8
26 -29	11	10	9
30 -39	25	30	21
40 -49	23	25	21
50 - 59	17	18	21
60 +	11	9	20
Suspected Gang Affiliation	10	8	13

^aExcluding offenders whose marital status was unknown.

⁵ In making comparisons to those without a residency condition, it is important to recall that data represent a single point in time. Specifically, those without a residency condition may have been on day parole or had a residency requirement when first released; not all offenders in this group were initially released directly to the community.

Differences with respect to age were also found, with offenders on day parole (median = 41.4) and with a residency condition (median = 41.7) tending to be younger than their counterparts without a residency requirement (median = 45.8). This pattern is simply attributable to the fact that indeterminately-sentenced offenders tend to accumulate, and age, over time in the community – especially among those without a residency requirement as most of those in the day parole and residency condition group will eventually no longer have a residency requirement.

Offence and Sentence Information. Offenders on day parole and with residency conditions differed in terms of their most serious offences on the current sentence. While the most common offences for those on day parole were drug or homicide-related, for those with a residency condition, sexual offences, robbery, and assault were the most common (see Table 3).⁶ In interpreting the high proportion of offenders convicted of homicide-related offences, it is important to recall that many such offences result in indeterminate sentences, and indeterminately-sentenced offenders remain under CSC's jurisdictions their entire lives, therefore accumulating in the community over time.

Mirroring patterns with respect to homicide offences, indeterminate sentences were the most common among those on day parole or without a residency requirement, and much less common among those with a residency condition. All groups also included relatively high percentages of those serving shorter sentences, and the residency condition group also included many offenders serving mid-range sentences. In addition to these custodial sentences, a small number of offenders were serving an LTSO ($n = 342$), or an additional, post-warrant sentence of community supervision. Most of these offenders (74%), regardless of group, were serving the an LTSO of the maximum possible length, 10 years.

⁶ This finding is partially because many homicide-related offences (e.g., murder 1, murder 2) result in indeterminate sentences and therefore offenders are not eligible for statutory release; residency conditions are less common for other types of conditional release.

Table 3.

Offence and Sentence Information of Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)

Offence or Sentence Characteristic	Percentage		
	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,111)	Residency Cond. (<i>N</i> = 961)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,300)
Most Serious Offence			
Homicide-related	26	9	30
Robbery	9	22	9
Assault	5	20	6
Sexual	8	30	11
Other Violent	5	6	4
Drug	29	5	24
Property	10	3	7
Other Non-Violent	8	5	9
Sentence Length			
Less than 4 Years	51	48	41
4 to 10 Years	23	40	27
More than 10 Years	4	9	5
Indeterminate	22	3	27

Criminal History. Not surprisingly, offenders imposed residency conditions were more likely to have a criminal history than their counterparts in the day parole and no residency requirement groups (see Table 4). Of particular note, they were also more likely to have a history of failure on community supervision (including bail, probation, and parole) and specifically on conditional release.

Table 4.

Criminal History of Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)

Criminal History Variable	Percentage		
	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,111)	Residency Cond. (<i>N</i> = 961)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,300)
Previous Adult Conviction	50	93	60
Community Supervision Failure	32	78	30
Conditional Release Failure	18	60	19

Risk and Need. In this area, a broad range of indicators were explored. As can be seen in Table 5, not surprisingly, compared to other offenders, those with a residency condition were more likely to be released from higher levels of security, have higher risk and need ratings, and have lower reintegration potential, motivation, and accountability ratings. They were also less likely to be seen as engaged and more likely to have identified responsivity factors.

Finally, the seven domains of the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis – Revised (CSC, 2014a) were examined. Given that results from this measure and its predecessor could not be meaningfully combined, analysis of the specific magnitude of differences within each domain is somewhat difficult but certain key differences were nonetheless evident. The data clearly demonstrated that offenders with a residency condition were much more likely than their counterparts on day parole to be assessed as presenting elevated need in the attitudes and employment domains (see Appendix A). Differences were also apparent, but were of lesser magnitude or inconsistent across measures, with respect to need in the areas of community functioning, family/marital, substance abuse, and personal/emotional. Only very modest differences – again in the same direction – were found in the attitudes domain.

Table 5.

Risk and Need Information for Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)

Variable	Percentage		
	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,111)	Residency Cond. (<i>N</i> = 961)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,300)
Security Classification at Release			
Minimum	81	13	67
Medium	19	72	31
Maximum	0	15	2
Static Risk			
Low	27	3	51
Moderate	53	26	35
High	20	71	14
Dynamic Need			
Low	24	2	48
Moderate	62	32	37
High	14	66	15
Reintegration Potential			
Low	1	46	5
Moderate	47	49	34
High	52	5	61
Motivation			
Low	1	4	16
Moderate	36	29	66
High	63	67	18
Accountability			
Low	2	20	4
Moderate	47	69	39
High	51	11	57
Engagement Flag Endorsed	97	79	94
Responsivity Flag Endorsed	13	26	10

Differences over time. As previously mentioned, overall, there were few differences over time (though comprehensive information is presented in Appendix B). That said, in keeping with the overall aging of the Canadian population (Statistics Canada, 2010), offenders in the community in March 2014 tended to be slightly older than their counterparts from 2010, regardless of residency group. In fact, the overall percentage of offenders aged 50 or more increased from 33% in 2010 to 37% in 2014. Small differences over time were also found with respect to ethnicity, with the proportion of Aboriginal offenders in the residency condition and no residency requirement groups increasing slightly (by 3 and 5 percentage points respectively) over time, but remaining unchanged for day parole.

Overall, there was a modest decrease from 2010 to 2014 in the percentage of offenders whose most serious offence was property-related (from 10% to 8% across all groups), with this difference most evident among those with a residency condition. There was also a small increase over time – though not among those with a residency condition – in drug offences. In addition, in 2014, those in the day parole group were more likely than in 2010 to be serving sentences of less than 4 years; in contrast, the proportion of those with a residency condition serving sentences of 4 to 10 years increased.

Among the most notable differences were those related to criminal history, with declines over time amongst those on day parole and with a residency condition who had histories of previous adult conviction (from 69% to 50% and 71% to 60%, respectively). Those with a residency condition were also slightly more likely to have previously failed on conditional release in 2014 relative to 2010.

Finally, a small number of differences also emerged with respect to risk and need.⁷ Compared to five years earlier, in 2014, offenders on day parole were less likely to be released from medium security and more likely to be released from minimum security. With respect to static risk, offenders with a residency condition in 2014 were somewhat more likely to be assessed as presenting a high level of static risk than were their counterparts in 2010 (71% vs. 63%). Small differences in the opposite direction were found with respect to dynamic need, with fewer offenders – across groups – being rated as high in 2014 than 2010. It is unclear whether

⁷ Changes over time were not examined for accountability, engagement, or responsivity given their assessment was implemented in 2009 and few offenders with assessments in these areas were available in the 2010 snapshot. In addition, the issue previously mentioned with respect to the examination of the seven domains of the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis – Revised prevented its inclusion in temporal analyses.

these differences may be influenced by the change of measure that occurred in this time period.

Summary

Overall, results from this examination were consistent with expectations based on both previous findings and simply on the principles underlying PBC decision-making. Consistent with previous findings (Bell & Trevethan, 2004; Scott & Bottos, 2012), those with residency requirements tended to have more limited community stability, more extensive criminal histories, be more likely to be suspected of gang affiliation, and be assessed as presenting more elevated risk across a variety of markers. However, in contrast with Abracen et al.'s (2011) findings, although offenders with residency conditions tended to be assessed as higher risk in 2014 rather than 2010, limited other changes over time were noted. This may be due to the time frame examined in this study (half of that examined by Abracen and colleagues), the difference in sampling strategy (Abracen and colleagues' study focused on a subsample of CBRFs while the current study was national in scope), or simply the fact that some of the differences Abracen and colleagues found were in areas that could not be measured using the data readily at our disposal in 2014 (e.g., psychological functioning).

These findings must be considered within the broader context of the accumulating evidence-base regarding the effectiveness of community-based residential facilities in reducing re-offending and in contributing to other positive outcomes. As such, the second research question focused on the international literature on these facilities' effectiveness and the factors associated with more positive outcomes.

Chapter 2: Effectiveness of Residency

Method

The second objective of this study was to review evidence relating to the effectiveness of residency requirements. To address this goal, both academic and other publications were reviewed and synthesized thematically. As limited pertinent research has been conducted in Canada, the focus was broadened to other jurisdictions. As a result, the literature review also included a variety of residency options that may differ from those available at CSC, including different kinds of halfway houses and residential therapeutic communities which, in some cases, offered intensive residential programs. Moreover, in most studies, there was no distinction in the sample akin to that between day parole and residency conditions, or such a distinction was not explicitly examined.

Information was grouped according to the following broad themes:

1. Is residency effective in managing risk?
2. For whom is residency effective?
3. What are the characteristics of CBRFs or similar facilities that are most effective?

Findings

Effectiveness. While many studies have reported on re-offending among offenders with residency condition, most were descriptive or, at best, quasi-experimental. In many cases, the groups with residency requirements and those without either explicitly differed or were not compared for equivalence. As such, it is quite likely that the findings of these studies were heavily influenced by the pre-study differences in the populations involved. While this is completely understandable, given that CBRFs and similar facilities typically aim to support offenders who present more elevated levels of risk, it does present challenges in trying to draw evidence-based conclusions. Overall, while the body of research in the area does suggest that residency in these facilities can support community success in at least some cases, the quality of the research is not compelling.

That said, there appears to be more research supporting these facilities' effectiveness than not. For instance, offenders who resided in CBRFs or similar facilities have been found to re-offend both less frequently and less seriously (Dowell, Klein, & Krichmar, 1985; Sacks, Sacks, McKendrick, Banks, & Stommel, 2004; Seiter & Kadela, 2003), as well as to be less likely to be

revoked for breaching parole conditions (Thompson, Forrester, & Stewart, submitted), to have more success in abstaining from drugs and alcohol (Jason & Ferrari, 2010), to be more likely to find employment (Gibbons & Rosecrance, 2005) and stable housing (Bayens & Smykla, 2012), and to be more likely to complete voluntary community-based aftercare treatment programs (Olson, et al., 2009). In contrast, two studies did not find residence to be associated with better outcomes than traditional community supervision (Braude, 2005; Scott & Bottos, 2012), though in one of these (Scott & Bottos, 2012), those with a residency requirement already presented more elevated levels of risk of re-offence at release (comparable risk estimates were not provided in Braude, 2005).

Individual-Level Factors Associated with Residency Effectiveness. There is substantial evidence that, in keeping with the risk principle (Andrews & Bonta, 2010), high-risk offenders benefit the most from the structure and support associated with residency requirements (Abracen et al., 2011; Bayens & Smykla, 2012; Bonta & Motiuk, 1990; Jason & Ferrari, 2010; McDonald & Arlinghaus, 2014; Motiuk, Bonta, & Andrews, 1986). Indeed, for some lower-risk offenders, residency may lead to an increased risk of re-offence (e.g., McDonald & Arlinghaus, 2014). An obvious best practice, then, is to limit residency requirements to higher-risk offenders.

Other studies have identified demographic and offence characteristics of offenders who have the best outcomes after residing in a CBRF or similar facility. While these are informative, it is worth noting that they are the same or similar characteristics associated with positive correctional outcomes in general; in other words, it is possible or even plausible that the offenders identified in these studies would also have had the best outcomes had traditional community supervision been employed. By and large, these findings are based on very basic descriptive analyses, which, along with other methodological limitations, do not statistically isolate the effects of residency requirements. As such, findings regarding risk should be preferred over these somewhat inconsistent findings. Regardless, factors associated with post-residency success in these descriptive studies include being older, being married, having less extensive criminal history, and having more educational and employment history (Donnelly & Forschner, 1984; English & Mande, 1991; Gutierrez, 2000). On the other hand, neither personality, psychopathology (Motiuk et al., 1986), nor psychiatric difficulties (Jason & Ferrari, 2010) seemed to be associated with residency effectiveness.

Facility-Level Factors Associated with Residency Effectiveness. There are also a

number of broader factors that have been found to be associated with residency effectiveness. Not surprisingly, one of the factors consistently found to be associated with positive outcomes was the provision of correctional or other programs in tandem with a residency requirement (e.g., Liao et al., 2004; Olson & Lurigio, 2014; Olson et al., 2009). The exception was deterrence-focused programs, which, as would be expected given the broader literature in the area, were associated with poorer outcomes (Lowenkamp, Flores, Holsinger, Makarios, & Latessa, 2010). On the other hand, human service oriented programs (Lowenkamp et al., 2010), psychoeducational programs (Liao et al., 2004), and 12-step programs (Polcin & Henderson, 2008) all have been found to lead to improved outcomes when provided to those with residency requirements. Programs delivered with good integrity (Gibbons & Rosecrance, 2005; Lowenkamp, Latessa, & Smith, 2006) are also strongly supported in this context.

Another facility-level factor associated with more positive outcomes in terms of both re-offending and substance use was involvement of children in the rehabilitation process – either through co-habitation or other means (D’Arlach, Olson, Jason & Ferrari, 2006; Kim, Davis, Jason, & Ferrari, 2006; Ortiz, Alvarez, Jason, Ferrari & Groh, 2009). Though this is an area often examined only among women, one study found positive outcomes for men residing with their children as well (Ortiz et al., 2009). Also notably, positive outcomes were not limited to parents – one study found that children residing in residential facilities increased responsibility among all women residing there, including both mothers and non-mothers (D’Arlach et al., 2006).

Summary

Overall, the quantity and quality of literature assessing the effectiveness of residency requirements is somewhat limited, and much of what does exist reflects other jurisdictions’ populations and approaches. Nonetheless, it does seem evident that residence in CBRFs or similar facilities can contribute to reduced rates of re-offending, as well as a number of other positive outcomes, when targeted at higher-risk offenders. Pairing community-based programs with residency requirements, again, if appropriate according to the level of risk, may also contribute to positive outcomes.

Discussion

The importance of research focused on offenders residing in CBRFs is underscored by the fact that over half of CSCs offenders spend at least a portion of their period of community supervision in CBRFs (Delveaux et al., 2012), and that the population of offenders in these facilities seems to be changing over time (Abracen et al., 2011). As such, the current study was undertaken with to both update the profile of these offenders and review the effectiveness of CBRFs in terms of both reductions of re-offending and other positive post-release outcomes.

Overall, profile findings aligned with both previous results (Bell & Trevethan, 2004; Scott & Bottos, 2012) and legislative direction (*CCRA*, 2012) on who is to be granted day parole and for whom residency conditions may be required. By and large, offenders on day parole tended to demonstrate greater stability, less extensive criminal involvement, and less elevated risk than did those with residency conditions or others in the community without a residency requirement. Those with residency conditions had more limited community stability, more extensive criminal histories, more serious offences, and higher levels of risk across a range of indicators.

In contrast with previous findings that the characteristics of the population of offenders in CBRFs had changed over time (Abracen et al., 2011), only modest differences were found in comparing profiles from 2010 to 2014 in the current study. With that being said, a wider lens can be applied to the question of changes over time by contrasting the results of the present examination with those reported by Bell and Trevethan (2004), whose research focused on offenders under community supervision in 2003. Though not all results were directly comparable across studies (and in some cases, the earlier study's results had to be manually aggregated to allow comparisons), several conclusions could be drawn. In keeping with Abracen and colleagues' (2011) previous findings and results specific to offenders with residency conditions in the current study, offenders with residency requirements (e.g., day parole or residency conditions) were more frequently assessed as presenting higher levels of static risk in 2014 than in 2003, with an increase of just over ten percentage points over this time. They were also more likely to be convicted of drug offences and less likely to be convicted of robbery than were those in 2003; this is consistent with what has been found in broader population examinations and may reflect changes in charging and sentencing patterns (Keown & Cousineau,

submitted; CSC Research Branch, 2013). Perhaps more interestingly, the greatest differences across these two time points were actually with respect to offenders without residency requirements, who, in 2014, presented less elevated levels of risk and need and higher levels of motivation to follow their correctional plan and to reintegrate in the community. This may suggest that relative to 2003, CSC has continued to increase its ability to successfully prepare offenders for community release.

In order to make comparisons with Bell and Trevethan's (2004) findings, it was necessary to consider all offenders with a residency requirement together – that is, to group those on day parole and with residency conditions. These analyses were ultimately somewhat misleading, as while differences certainly exist between those with and without residency requirements, these differences are generally much less than those found within this group. While offenders in CBRFs, as a whole, had more elevated static risk than did those without residency requirements, those on day parole had the lowest levels of static risk. Again, this finding is consistent with expectations and serves to underscore the importance of considering the heterogeneity among offenders in CBRFs.

Another important source of difference is the type of CBRF at which an offender resides. Though data limitations made it impossible to distinguish between offenders in community correctional centres and community residential facilities in the current study, logic and previous research (e.g., Abracen et al., 2011) clearly indicate that these populations differ. Community residential facilities, run by independent non-governmental agencies, tend to accommodate lower risk offenders. In turn, certain offenders at community correctional centres present more challenging profiles, with, for example, greater numbers of sexual offenders and of offenders presenting with problems relating to psychological functioning (Abracen et al., 2011).

Indeed, differences among offenders and among residential facilities were also found, in the broader literature, to be associated with differential effectiveness of these facilities. Overall, what limited evidence exists suggests that residency requirements can positively affect rates of re-offending (Dowell et al., 1985; Sacks et al., 2004; Seiter & Kadela, 2003) and revocation (Thompson et al, submitted), as well as substance use (Jason & Ferrari, 2010), employment (Gibbons & Rosecrance, 2005), housing (Bayens & Smykla, 2012), and correctional program adherence (Olson et al., 2009). It seems, however, that the effectiveness of residency requirements is maximized by targeting higher-risk offenders, by offering concurrent access to

community-based correctional programs, and, possibly, by facilitating access to one's children.

Conclusion

Overall, findings align very well with the broader risk-need-responsivity framework (Andrews & Bonta, 2010) guiding much of CSC's case management, including a recognition that while interventions targeted at higher-risk offenders contribute importantly to public safety, targeting lower-risk offenders in the same manner may actually be counter-productive. Both policy (PBC, 2014) and legislation (*CCRA*, 1992) direct that residency conditions are to be reserved for the highest-risk offenders, those who, without such a condition, would present an undue risk to society and be likely to commit a violent offence. Moreover, CSC makes available community-based correctional and other programs to offenders whose risk levels support the requirement; these programs may be offered directly through the CBRF or separately.

Moreover, the differences between offenders on day parole and with residency conditions underscore the importance of considering these populations separately in case management, particularly so as to avoid over-scrutiny of lower-risk offenders (Burke, 2004). Indeed, CSC uses risk assessments to guide the extent of parole officers' contact with offenders, ensuring that all offenders are supervised in a manner commensurate with their risk to public safety. As such, offenders on day parole are able to benefit from support and structure in facilitating their gradual community reintegration, without having the same level of direct supervision as do those presenting a sufficiently elevated level of risk to merit the imposition of a residency condition.

Finally, although the growth in the rate of imposition of residency requirements has been increasing (Gobeil & Cousineau, submitted), consideration of the current study's results together with one conducted earlier (Bell & Trevethan, 2004) indicates that so too has the level of risk presented by offenders in CBRFs. That said, other changes in the population of offenders in CBRFs have been more modest in scope and it is therefore important to ensure that residency conditions continue to be applied judiciously, reflecting offenders' risk and the criteria outlined in legislation.

References

- Abracen, J., Axford, M., & Gileno, J. (2011). *Changes in the profile of offender populations residing in community facilities: 1998 and 2008* (R-256). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Andrews, D., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexis.
- Bayens, G., & Smykla, J. O. (2012). Residential, day reporting and drug courts: Offenders living among us. In G. Bayens & J. O. Smykla (Eds), *Probation, Parole, and community-based corrections: Supervision, treatment and evidence-based practices* (pp. 280-306). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Bell, A., & Trevethan, S. (2004). *Community residential facilities in Canada: A descriptive profile of residents and facilities* (R-157). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Bonta, J., & Motiuk, L. L. (1990). Classification to halfway houses: A quasi-experimental evaluation. *Criminology*, 28, 497-506.
- Braude, L. F. (2005). *Back home from prison: An examination of the halfway house as a transitional alternative* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The George Washington University, Washington, DC.
- Burke, P. (2004). *Parole violations revisited: A handbook on strengthening parole practices for public safety and successful transition to the community* (NIC Accession Number: 019833). Silver Spring, MD: Centre for Effective Public Policy.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2014a). *Commissioner's Directive 705-6: Correctional planning and criminal profile*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2014b). *Community-based residential facilities (CBRFs)*. Retrieved January 20, 2015 from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/facilities-and-security/001-0001-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada Research Branch. (2013). *Federal offender population: 2013 warrant of committal admissions – All offenders*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act*. (1992). Retrieved from <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/>

- D'Arlach, L., Olson, B. D., Jason, L. A., & Ferrari, J. R. (2006). Children, women, and substance abuse: A look at recovery in a communal setting. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 31, 121–132.
- Delveaux, K., Heath, S., Flight, J., McKay, M., Rastin, C. J., Allegri, N., et al. (2012). *Evaluation report: Community correctional operations, chapter 2: Community supervision strategies and staff safety* (2012-01). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Donnelly, P. G., & Forschner, B. (1984). Client success or failure in a halfway house. *Federal Probation*, 48, 38-44.
- Dowell, D. A., Klein, C., & Krichmar, C. (1985). Evaluation of a halfway house for women. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 13, 217-226.
- English, K. K., & Mande, M. J. (1991). Empirical support for intervention strategies in community corrections. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 7, 95-106.
- Gibbons, S. G., & Rosecrance, J. D. (2005). Pretrial release, diversion, special programs and halfway houses. In G. Bayens & J. O. Smykla (Eds), *Probation, parole, and community-based corrections* (pp. 384-389). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gobeil, R., & Cousineau, C. (submitted). *The imposition of residency conditions over fifteen years* (RS 14-27). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Gutierrez, A. M. (2000). Community-based corrections: Offenders characteristics and success in a halfway house program (Unpublished Thesis). University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Jason, L. A., & Ferrari, J. R. (2010). Oxford house recovery homes: Characteristics and effectiveness. *Psychological Services*, 7, 92-102.
- Keown, L. A., & Cousineau, C. (submitted). *Profile of all incarcerated offenders serving federal sentences, 2014* (PR 14-1). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Kim, K. L., Davis, M. I., Jason, L. A., Ferrari, J. R. (2006). Structural social support: Impact on adult substance use and recovery attempts. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 3, 85–94.
- Liau, A. K., Shively, R., Horn, M., Landau, J., Barriga, A., & Gibbs, J. C. (2004). Effects of psychoeducation for offenders in a community correctional facility. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32, 543-558.

- Lowenkamp, C. T., Flores, A. W., Holsinger, A. M., Makarios, M. D., & Latessa, E. J. (2010). Intensive supervision programs: Does program philosophy and the principles of effective intervention matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 368-375.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E., & Smith, P. (2006). Does correctional program quality really matter? The impact of adhering to the principles of effective intervention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5, 201-220.
- McDonald, D., & Arlinghaus, S. L. (2014). The role of intensive case management services in re-entry: The northern Kentucky female offender re-entry project. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 24, 229-251.
- Motiuk, L. L., Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (1986). Classification in correctional halfway houses: The relative and incremental predictive criterion validities of the Megargee-MMPI and LSI Systems. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 13, 33-46.
- Motiuk, L. L., & Cousineau, C. (2006). *The safe return of offenders to the community: Statistical overview 2006*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Services of Canada.
- Olson, D. E., & Lurigio, A. J. (2014). The long-term effects of prison-based drug treatment and aftercare services on recidivism. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 53, 600-619.
- Olson, D. E., Rozhon, J., & Powers, M. (2009). Enhancing prisoner re-entry through access to prison-based and post-incarceration aftercare treatment: Experiences from Illinois Sheridan Correctional Centre therapeutic community. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 5, 299-321.
- Ortiz, E., Alvarez, J., Jason, L. A., Ferrari, J. R., & Groh, D. (2009). Abstinence social support: The impact of children in Oxford House. *Journal of Groups in Addiction & Recovery*, 4, 71-81.
- Parole Board of Canada. (2014). *Decision-making policy manual for board members* (2nd ed.) Ottawa, ON: Author. Retrieved from http://www.pbc-clcc.gc.ca/infocntr/policym/polman-eng.shtml#p5_1
- Petersilia, J. & Turner, S. (1993). Intensive probation and parole. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice, a review of the research, volume 17*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Polcin, D. L., & Henderson, D. M. (2008). A clean and sober place to live: Philosophy, structure, and purported therapeutic factors in sober living houses. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 40, 153-159.
- Public Safety Canada. (2013). *Corrections and conditional release statistical overview 2013*.

Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

Sacks, S., Sacks, J. Y., McKendrick, K., Banks, S., & Stommel, J. (2004). Modified TC for MICA offenders: Crime outcomes. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 22, 477-501.

Scott, T.-L., & Bottos, S. (2012). *At risk for residency: A profile of statutory release offenders with a residency condition* (R-261). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

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

Statistics Canada. (2010). *Annual estimates of population, by age group and sex, Canada, provinces and territories* (CANSIM Table 051-0001). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.

The Pew Center for the States. (2008). *Putting public safety first: 13 strategies for successful supervision and re-entry* (Public Safety Policy Brief No. 7). Retrieved from www.pewpublicsafety.org.

Thompson, J., Forrester, T. K., & Stewart, L. A. (submitted). *Factors related to community supervision outcomes: Revocations* (R-304). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Zinger, I. (2012). Conditional release and human rights in Canada: A commentary. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 54, 117-137.

Appendix A. Need Domains for Offenders in the Community (2014 Snapshot)

Domain	Percentage		
	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,103)	Residency Cond. (<i>N</i> = 941)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,203)
Associates			
DFIA (some / considerable)	51	62	25
DFIA-R (moderate / considerable)	58	63	57
Attitudes			
DFIA (some / considerable)	42	69	24
DFIA-R (moderate / considerable)	55	81	58
Community Functioning			
DFIA (some / considerable)	41	41	15
DFIA-R (moderate / considerable)	11	35	13
Employment and Education			
DFIA (some / considerable)	40	64	21
DFIA-R (moderate / considerable)	41	63	42
Family / Marital			
DFIA (some / considerable)	49	53	22
DFIA-R (moderate / considerable)	21	50	23
Personal / Emotional			
DFIA (some / considerable)	87	93	48
DFIA-R (moderate / considerable)	55	92	59
Substance Abuse			
DFIA (some / considerable)	61	68	24
DFIA-R (moderate / considerable)	45	68	45

Note. Offenders were more likely to have a DFIA-R assessment than a DFIA assessment. DFIA: $N_{\text{Day Parole}} = 270$; $N_{\text{Residency}} = 316$; $N_{\text{No Residency}} = 2,068$. DFIA-R: $N_{\text{Day Parole}} = 833$; $N_{\text{Residency}} = 625$; $N_{\text{No Residency}} = 3,135$. DFIA = Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis. DFIA-R = Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis – Revised (implemented in 2009 as part of the intake process).

Appendix B. Comparisons of 2010 and 2014 Profiles

Table B.1

Demographic Characteristics of Offenders in the Community (2010 and 2014 Snapshots)

Demographic Characteristic	2010 (%)			2014 (%)		
	Day Parole (N = 1,088)	Residency Condition (N = 746)	No Residency (N = 5,505)	Day Parole (N = 1,111)	Residency Condition (N = 961)	No Residency (N = 5,300)
Aboriginal	15	21	12	15	26	15
Male	91	97	93	91	98	94
Marital Status ^a						
Common-law/Married	43	36	44	43	34	45
Divorced / Separated / Widowed	12	12	13	12	10	12
Single	45	52	43	45	56	43
Unstable Accommodation History	23	45	25	18	42	23
Age						
18- 25	13	11	9	13	8	8
26 -29	12	11	9	11	10	9
30 -39	25	28	22	25	30	21
40 -49	25	31	24	23	25	21
50 - 59	16	13	20	17	18	21
60 +	9	6	16	11	9	20
Suspected Gang Affiliation	11	14	13	10	8	13

^aExcluding offenders whose marital status was unknown.

Table B.2

Offence and Sentence Information of Offenders in the Community (2010 and 2014 Snapshots)

Offence or Sentence Characteristic	2010 (%)			2014 (%)		
	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,088)	Residency Condition (<i>N</i> = 746)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,505)	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,111)	Residency Condition (<i>N</i> = 961)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,300)
Most Serious Offence						
Homicide-related	28	9	30	26	10	30
Robbery	11	21	11	9	22	9
Assault	5	17	5	5	20	5
Sexual	6	27	9	8	30	11
Other Violent	3	4	3	5	5	4
Drug	26	7	21	29	5	24
Property	9	9	9	10	3	8
Other Non-Violent	12	6	12	8	5	9
Sentence Length						
Less than 4 Years	45	56	42	51	48	41
4 to 10 Years	27	32	25	23	40	27
More than 10 Years	4	10	7	4	9	5
Indeterminate	24	2	26	22	3	27

Table B.3
Criminal History of Offenders in the Community (2010 and 2014 Snapshots)

Criminal History Variable	2010 (%)			2014 (%)		
	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,088)	Residency Condition (<i>N</i> = 746)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,505)	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,111)	Residency Condition (<i>N</i> = 961)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,300)
Previous Adult Conviction	69	92	71	50	93	60
Community Supervision Failure	36	75	42	32	78	30
Conditional Release Failure	23	53	27	18	60	19

Table B.4

Risk and Need Information for Offenders in the Community (2010 and 2014 Snapshots)

Variable	2010 (%)			2014 (%)		
	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,088)	Residency Condition (<i>N</i> = 746)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,505)	Day Parole (<i>N</i> = 1,111)	Residency Condition (<i>N</i> = 961)	No Residency (<i>N</i> = 5,300)
Security Classification at Release						
Minimum	76	17	65	81	13	67
Medium	24	69	33	19	72	31
Maximum	0	14	2	0	15	2
Static Risk						
Low	31	5	52	27	3	51
Moderate	52	32	34	53	26	35
High	17	63	14	20	71	14
Dynamic Need						
Low	23	2	47	24	2	48
Moderate	60	28	35	62	32	37
High	17	70	18	14	66	15
Reintegration Potential						
Low	2	42	5	1	46	5
Moderate	39	49	29	47	49	34
High	59	9	66	52	5	61
Motivation						
Low	1	18	3	1	4	16
Moderate	39	67	34	36	29	66
High	60	15	63	63	67	18