

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Patterns of Suspension Warrants

2015 N° R-368

Patterns of Suspension Warrants

Shanna Farrell MacDonald

Jamie Curno

Stephanie M. Biro

&

Renée Gobeil

Correctional Service of Canada

July 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

Thanks are extended to Marlène Pepin for answering questions concerning suspension warrants, to Jennifer Guillon for preparing comparable suspension warrants data to ensure corporate alignment of our data, and to Andrea Moser for editorial guidance and her overall support of this project.

Executive Summary

Key words: *suspensions, suspension outcomes, cancellation, revocation, conditional release, supervision period, recalls*

The successful reintegration of offenders into the community and public safety remain top priorities for correctional staff, researchers, and policy makers alike. Currently, there is a large amount of research that has focused on the identification of offender characteristics related to success or failure within the community. However, little research has examined the temporary suspension of community supervision and why some supervision periods are reinstated while others are revoked. The present study aims to contribute to an improved understanding of the reasons behind suspensions, as well as their final outcomes.

This study included all supervision suspension warrants for federal offenders that occurred between April 1, 2009 and March 31, 2014. In total, 29,388 suspension warrants were identified, representing 16,032 distinct offenders. The rate of suspension was 1.3 suspensions per offender. Most suspension warrants were issued for men while one-quarter were issued for Aboriginal offenders. All data were obtained from the Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) administrative database – the Offender Management System. Information concerning the final outcome of the suspension, the reasons for issuing the suspension warrant, the frequency of contact between the offender and the community parole officer at the time of the suspension, and the types of parole conditions in place at the time of the suspension were explored. In addition, patterns across fiscal years and regions were examined, and findings were disaggregated by gender and Aboriginal ancestry.

During the study period, the rate of suspension was 755 suspensions per 1,000 offenders under supervision (CSC, 2015). Almost half (48%) of suspension warrants resulted in a revocation of the offender's release, while 29% were cancelled by CSC and 22% were cancelled by the PBC.¹ On average, suspension warrants were resolved in 68 days, although there was variation by suspension outcome (18 days to 97 days). Overall, almost two-thirds (59%) of warrants were issued due to the breach of the terms of the offender's supervision period; about half were due to a breach of specific release conditions (26%) or failing to report (23%). Distinct patterns across fiscal year and by region, gender, and Aboriginal ancestry were evident.

The current study provides an examination of the patterns and outcomes of supervision period suspensions among federal offenders. A better understanding of the current patterns of suspension warrants may inform case management and community planning strategies as well as inform population management initiatives both in custody and in the community. Future research could examine the characteristics of offenders and behavioural indicators that lead to suspensions and the various suspension outcomes. As well, future research examining the use of alternatives to suspensions would be beneficial.

¹ One percent of suspension warrants did not have a final outcome as of February 2015, the cancellation authority was unknown, or had another outcome, such as being deported, having died, or reaching the end of their sentence.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	v
Introduction.....	1
Community Supervision	1
Suspensions and Revocations	2
The Current Study.....	3
Method	4
Study Group.....	4
Data Sources/Measures	4
Analytic Approach	4
Results.....	5
Overview of Suspensions.....	5
Patterns by Suspension Outcome.....	7
Patterns across Fiscal Years.....	8
Regional Patterns	8
Patterns by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry	9
Discussion	10
Conclusions.....	12
References	13

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Final Outcome of Suspension Warrants</i>	5
Table 2 <i>Reasons for Suspension Warrants</i>	6
Table 3 <i>Frequency of Contact and Parole Conditions</i>	7
Table A1 <i>Overview of Suspension Warrants by Warrant Issuing Region</i>	15
Table B1 <i>Overview of Suspension Warrants by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry</i>	17

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Regional Patterns of Suspensions	15
Appendix B: Patterns of Suspensions by Aboriginal Ancestry and Gender.....	17

Introduction

The successful reintegration of offenders into the community and public safety remain top priorities for correctional staff, researchers, and policy makers alike. As such, there is a large amount of research that has focused on the identification of offender characteristics related to success or failure within the community (e.g., Matheson, Doherty, & Grant, 2008; Motiuk & Porporino, 1989b; Steen & Opsal, 2007, Thompson, Forrester, & Stewart, in press). However, little research has examined the temporary suspension of community supervision and why some supervision periods are reinstated while others are revoked (i.e., offenders are returned to custody). The present study aims to contribute to an improved understanding of the reasons behind suspensions (e.g., violating conditions versus new criminal activity), as well as the outcomes of said suspensions.

Community Supervision

In Canada, the majority of federally-sentenced offenders spend a portion of their sentence supervised in the community. Most offenders serving determinate sentences (i.e., of fixed length) become eligible for discretionary release² upon finishing six months less than one-third of their sentence or seven years, whichever is less, and receive legislatively-mandated release after two-thirds of sentence completion. Similarly, offenders serving indeterminate sentences (i.e., life sentences) become eligible for conditional release at time points specified by the court. Those who are released into the community must abide by specific conditions that are then monitored and enforced by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). These conditions can range from abstaining from alcohol or drugs to avoiding specific establishments or persons, including victims.

In some cases, community supervision also applies for offenders who complete their full sentences in custody. In the instance that an offender presents a substantial risk of recidivism within the community, while a reasonable likelihood of eventual control of such risk remains, the court may choose to impose a long-term supervision order (LTSO). Long-term supervision orders commence once the offender's sentence had ended and can be in place for a maximum

² Discretionary release refers to being released on day or full parole, while conditional release encompasses both releases on parole and statutory release, which occurs at two-thirds of the sentence for all offenders serving determinate sentences.

duration of 10 years (CSC, 2014b); during this period, CSC is responsible for the offender's supervision in the community.

Since 2003-2004, over 80% of federal day paroles have been successfully completed and the successful completion rates for both day and full paroles have been continually improving over the last five years (Public Safety, 2013). In 2012-2013, the successful completion rates for federal day and full paroles, as well as statutory release, were higher for women offenders than for men offenders (Public Safety, 2013). However, though these numbers suggest an increasing success in the community supervision of offenders, it does not consider the offenders whose conditional release results in a temporary suspension, only examining those instances where the supervision is revoked.

Suspensions and Revocations

In Canada, the suspension provisions of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA, 1992) allow the Parole Board of Canada (PBC) or a person designated by the Board (e.g., a parole officer) to suspend offenders' conditional release or LTSO³ and temporarily remove them from the community until a decision is made (i.e., to revoke release or cancel suspension). More specifically, a suspension may occur (a) when a breach of conditions has occurred, (b) to prevent a breach of conditions, or (c) to protect society (i.e., risk is considered unmanageable in the community; CSC, 2014a). Additionally, when offenders convicted of an offence and issued a custodial sentence while on conditional release, it is automatically suspended (CCRA, 1992; CSC, 2014a). A decision is made to either cancel the suspension within thirty days before referral to the PBC (i.e., local cancellation) or submit the case to the PBC. If the case is referred to the PBC, Board members will decide whether to cancel the suspension (i.e., Board cancellation) or revoke conditional release (CCRA, 1992). Currently, few studies have specifically examined suspensions of conditional release (see Motiuk & Brown, 1993; Motiuk & Porporino, 1989a).

According to Public Safety Canada's (2013) annual report, in 2012-13, 72% of offenders on conditional release successfully completed their conditional release and 28% received revocations. Of those who received a revocation, only about one-in-five committed a new

³ The approach is somewhat different for offenders serving LTSOs, as they are not subject to revocation. The LTSO may be suspended for a maximum of 90 days, at which point the offender will be returned to the community or be charged with a breach of LTSO conditions or other offence. If convicted, the offender will serve this new sentence in custody before returning to the community to complete the LTSO (CSC, 2014b).

offence; the remainder were due to technical violations. As stated, however, not all suspensions result in revocation. Nationally, suspension rates have declined between FY2009-10 and FY2013-14, although there has been some year to year variation (CSC, 2015; Ritchie, Saddleback, & Gobeil, 2014). For the study period, the overall suspension rate was 755 suspensions per 1,000 offenders supervised in the community (CSC, 2015). Aboriginal offenders had suspension rates twice those of non-Aboriginal offenders, and men had higher suspension rates than women. Indeed, McConnell, Rubenfeld, Thompson, and Gobeil (2014) found that only 10% of women in a supervision snapshot had their conditional release suspended, and, in most cases, this was due to a failure to report rather than to criminal activity. Canadian patterns regarding returns to custody are similar to those in the United States, where out of the approximately 820,000 parolees in 2009, almost one quarter of those who left supervision (i.e., supervision completions and terminations combined) were due to a revocation for a technical violation (Glaze & Bonczar, 2011). American researchers have found that the fastest growing segment of the prison population consists of offenders who have violated parole or probation conditions (Petersilia, 2004). Overall, in the last 20 years, the number of parole revocations in the United States has increased six-fold (Grattet, Petersilia, Lin, & Beckman, 2009). Clearly, in both Canada and the United States, suspensions, and the revocations that may result from them, have significant effects on offender population levels and, consequently, the costs associated with incarceration.

The Current Study

Given the scarcity of information on factors associated with suspension outcomes, this study aims to report on suspension patterns in the Canadian federal offender population, as well as to examine and identify factors associated with the three suspension outcomes. The current study, which is limited to offenders who have received a suspension, contributes to the identification of factors associated with community supervision successes and failures, which may inform CSC policies and practices specific to community supervision and suspensions, and thereby contribute to their priority of the safe transition and management of eligible offenders in the community.

Method

Study Group

In order to examine the patterns of suspensions, this study included all supervision suspension warrants for federal offenders that occurred between April 1, 2009 and March 31, 2014. In total, 29,388 suspension warrants⁴ were identified, with suspension of statutory release accounting for 75% of the suspensions, followed by day parole (11%), full parole (10%) and LTSOs (4%). Over half of suspensions were issued by the National Monitoring Centre (NMC; 33%) or the Prairie Region (20%), followed by the Québec and Ontario Regions (15% each), the Pacific Region (10%), and the Atlantic Region (7%).

These 29,388 suspensions represented 16,032 distinct offenders. Almost half (49%) of the offenders had one suspension warrant in the period under study, 31% had two, 13% had three, and the remaining 7% had four to fourteen. The average was 1.3 suspensions per offender. Overall, 95% of suspension warrants were issued for men while 27% were issued for Aboriginal offenders (26% of those issued for men and 40% of those issued for women).

Data Sources/Measures

All data were obtained from the Offender Management System (OMS), the computerized administrative and operational system used by CSC that contains all offender and sentence management information collected from the start of an offender's sentence until its completion. Information concerning the final outcome of the suspension, the reasons for issuing the suspension warrant, the frequency of contact between the offender and the community parole officer at the time of the suspension, and the types of parole conditions in place at the time of the suspension were explored. In addition, patterns across fiscal years and regions were examined, and findings were disaggregated by gender and Aboriginal ancestry.

Analytic Approach

All analyses were descriptive as all suspensions issued in the study period were included; therefore inferential statistics were not appropriate and were not used in this report. Proportions, means, and standard deviations were presented.

⁴ Suspension warrants for provincial offenders issued during the study period were not included ($n = 550$).

Results

Overview of Suspensions

About half (46%) of suspension warrants issued in the time period were for a first suspension (i.e., it was the first time that the offender's supervision had ever been suspended). Offenders, on average, spent about 200 days ($SD = 493$), or about six and a half months, in the community prior to their first suspension. Due to the variability in the number of days in the community prior to the first suspension, the median was also calculated; the median number of days that offenders spent in the community prior to their first suspension was 98 days (range: 0-12,702) or about three months. Overall, 39% of suspensions during the study period resulted in an admission to provincial custody while the remaining 61% was to federal custody. Of those sent to federal custody, 44% of the suspensions were later cancelled. Examination of the final outcome of the suspension (see Table 1) shows that almost half (48%) resulted in a revocation of the offender's release, while 29% were cancelled by CSC and 22% were cancelled by the PBC. On average, suspension warrants were resolved in 68 days.

Table 1

Final Outcome of Suspension Warrants

Outcome	%	(n)
Local cancellation	29	8,433
Board cancellation	22	6,376
Revoked	48	14,129
Other ^a	1	450
Number of days from suspension to final outcome $M (SD)$	68 (83)	

Note. ^a Other includes cancellations where the authority is unknown, offenders who died, were deported, or who reached the end of their sentence before the final suspension outcome was decided, or who were still suspended at the time the data were obtained (February 2015).

Globally, there are three main reasons that staff can identify when issuing a suspension warrant: breach of a term of the release, prevention of a breach of a term of the release, or to protect society. Table 2 provides an examination of the global reasons to issue a warrant, as well as the specific reasons that were provided to explain the suspension warrant. Overall, almost two-thirds (59%) of warrants were issued due to the breach of the terms of the offender's

supervision period. Examination of the reasons in more detail indicated that both a breach of specific release conditions (26%) and failing to report (23%) were most often endorsed. A perceived increase in the risk posed by the offender or deteriorating behaviour in the community was identified for 21% of the warrants issued.

Table 2

Reasons for Suspension Warrants

Reason	%	(n)
Global warrant reason		
Breach term	59	17,333
Prevent breach	14	4,001
Protect society	27	8,054
Specific suspension reason		
Breach conditions	36	10,514
Failure to report	23	6,843
Increased risk/deteriorating behaviour	21	6,251
New charge/offence	10	3,032
Other/undetermined ^a	11	3,255

Note. ^a Undetermined reasons account for less than 1% of the other/undetermined category. Specific suspension reasons are not mutually exclusive and the percentage therefore sums to more than 100, although 98% of suspensions warrants had only one reason provided.

Over three-quarters (78%) of offenders were required to meet with their community parole officer four to eight times per month at the time of their suspension (see Table 3). Parole conditions imposed during the supervision were also examined and the distribution by condition type is also presented in Table 3. On average, there were four parole conditions imposed per supervision period, with abstaining from substance use (92%) and avoiding certain/specific persons (88%) being most common.

Table 3

Frequency of Contact and Parole Conditions

Variable	%	(<i>n</i>)
Frequency of contact ^a		
4-8 times/month	78	22,065
1-2 times/month	22	6,096
Every 2-3 months	0	49
Any parole conditions ^b	100	29,292
Abstain from substance use	92	27,132
Avoid certain/specific persons	88	25,878
Residency	34	9,936
Follow treatment/program plan	49	14,392
Other condition(s)	49	15,015
Total number of conditions <i>M (SD)</i>		4 (2)

Note. ^a Frequency of contact information was missing for 1,178 records. ^b Parole conditions are not mutually exclusive and the percentage therefore sums to more than 100. Moreover, multiple conditions are reflected in each of the condition categories presented here.

Patterns by Suspension Outcome

These analyses were restricted to warrants that had a local cancellation, a PBC cancellation, or were revoked ($n = 28,938$). The number of days from suspension to final decision varied by outcome: those that were cancelled locally were resolved in 18 days ($SD = 21$), warrants that were cancelled by the PBC took 73 days ($SD = 118$) to be resolved, and warrants that were revoked took 97 days ($SD = 71$). Also, although a similar proportion of those cancelled locally and those that were revoked were a first suspension (53% each), only 22% of those cancelled by the PBC were a first suspension.

Exploration of the global reasons for issuance of suspension warrants by outcome indicated that those locally cancelled or revoked were more likely to be issued for a breach of term than those cancelled by the PBC (60% and 61% vs. 53%) while a greater proportion of those with PBC cancellations were issued to protect society when compared to locally cancelled or revoked (35% vs. 24% and 26%). In terms of specific suspension reasons, warrants that were cancelled locally were more likely to be due to a breach of conditions when compared to PBC

cancellations or those revoked (42% vs. 34% and 33%) but were less likely for failure to report (17%, 23%, and 27%, respectively) or due to a new charge/offence (6%, 10% and 13%, respectively). Warrants that were revoked were least likely to be due to increased risk or deteriorating behaviour (19%) when compared to local (24%) or PBC (23%) cancellations.

Examination of the frequency of reporting by final suspension outcome indicated that the suspensions cancelled locally were more likely to correspond to once or twice monthly meetings with community parole officers (26%) compared to those cancelled by the PBC (17%) or revoked (21%). With respect to parole conditions, those that were cancelled by the PBC were more likely to have residency conditions imposed during the supervision period than either local cancellations or those revoked (41% vs. 33% and 30%) while those that were revoked were less likely to have a follow treatment/program condition than either local or PBC cancellations (45% vs. 53% for each).

Patterns across Fiscal Years

Suspension patterns were examined across fiscal year, from FY2009-10 to FY2013-14, although few of the factors examined showed practical differences over time. Results showed that fewer suspensions were being locally cancelled in the most recent year (from 30% to 26%) and that more were being revoked (from 47% to 51%). There was no practical change in the proportion of suspensions that were cancelled by the Board (22% to 21%). The average number of days from the issuance of the suspension to the final outcome had decreased, from 74 days ($SD = 109$) in FY2009-10 to 60 days ($SD = 52$) in FY2013-14. The frequency of reporting during supervision has also decreased over time, with 80% reporting four to eight times per month in FY2009-10 and 74% in FY2013-14. Finally, certain parole conditions increased between FY2009-10 and FY2013-14: avoid certain/specific persons went from 83% to 93%; residency increased from 29% to 36%; and other conditions increased from 41% to 56%.

Regional Patterns

Regional comparisons of suspension warrants focused on the issuing region (see Table A1, Appendix A). Pacific region stood out as the location where local cancellations were most likely (46% vs. 19% to 32%) and revocations least likely (31% vs. 43% to 59%). Suspension warrants issued there were also less likely to be for first suspensions, and, indeed, this region averaged 2.2 warrants per suspended offender, as compared to 1.7 to 1.8 in the other regions

(excluding the National Monitoring Centre). In other words, Pacific region issued more suspensions per offender, but these were less likely to lead to revocation. In addition, warrants issued in the Pacific region were resolved more quickly (52 days) compared to the other regions (64 to 90 days).

Other distinct regional patterns were evident. For instance, offenders in the Prairie Region spent the fewest number of days in the community, on average, prior to their first suspension (168 days vs. 199 to 253 days), were more likely to have a reporting frequency of one to two times per month at the time of the suspension (32% vs. 13% to 26%) and were least likely to have a residency condition (17% vs. 25% to 42%). Québec, on the other hand, was more likely to have a warrant issued to protect society (78% vs. 6% to 35%) or to have an ‘other’ or ‘undetermined’ specific suspension reason (20% vs. 7% to 16%).

Patterns by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry

Results of analyses examining suspension warrants by gender and Aboriginal ancestry are presented in Table B1, Appendix B. Suspensions issued for women were more often locally cancelled than for men (34% vs. 28%), but a similar proportion resulted in revocation (46% vs. 48%). Although similar proportions of warrants issued for men and women were for a first suspension (46% vs. 47%), warrants for women were issued earlier than for men (188 days vs. 200 days). Analyses examining global and specific reasons for suspension, frequency of contact and parole conditions were similar for warrants issued for men and women, although more men had a residency condition (35% vs. 21%) and more women were required to follow a treatment or program plan (56% vs. 49%).

Exploration of the patterns for Aboriginal offenders showed that suspensions for Aboriginal men and women were more likely to be issued by the NMC or Prairie regions than for their non-Aboriginal counterparts (see Table B1, Appendix B). Although the proportions of warrants corresponding to first suspensions for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders were similar, Aboriginal men and women spent about two months less in the community than non-Aboriginal men and women. Suspensions for Aboriginal men and women offenders were more likely to result in a revocation of the supervision (52% and 50%) and to be issued as a result of failing to report (32% and 42%) when compared to non-Aboriginal men (revocation: 47%; failure to report: 20%) and women (revocation: 43%; failure to report: 20%).

Discussion

The current study provides an examination of an under-researched area of community supervision – the patterns and outcomes of supervision period suspensions among federal offenders. Supervision suspensions can be an indicator of post-release adjustment (Motiuk & Porporino, 1989a) and suggest that the offender may be having difficulties with reintegrating into society (Dandurand, Griffiths, Murdoch, & Brown, 2008); indeed, a growing proportion of admissions in many jurisdictions are attributed to supervision suspensions and revocations, mostly due to violation of release conditions (Grattet, Petersilia, Lin, & Beckman, 2009; Hughes, Wilson, & Beck, 2001; Petersilia, 2004; Stickels, 2007). Although this pattern is not as evident in Canada, over one-third of admissions between FY2009-10 and FY2012-13 were due to revocations (Public Safety, 2013).

Findings are best contextualized in terms of the frequency with which suspensions occur. As previously mentioned, there were 755 suspensions per 1,000 offenders in the period corresponding to that of the study (CSC, 2015). Of these, our analyses revealed that about three-quarters (73%) were related to the breach of a term of the supervision or to prevent a breach. Overall, in our study, almost half (48%) of all suspension warrants resulted in a revocation of release. Even for those warrants that did not lead to a revocation, and were instead cancelled, all of the offenders were returned to custody pending the suspension's cancellation. With almost two-thirds (61%) returned to federal custody, this has potential impacts on in-custody populations, both provincially and federally, as well as on the cost of maintaining these offenders in custody during suspension. Community supervision costs are significantly less than either provincial or federal incarceration – in fact, they are between one-quarter and one-third of federal incarceration costs (Dauvergne, 2012; Easton, Furness, & Brantingham, 2014; Public Safety, 2013).

As mentioned, suspension rates have declined over the five years ending in March 2014 (CSC, 2015; Ritchie et al., 2014), which may partially reflect staff considering, in cases where an analysis of risk justifies it, alternatives to suspension. Commissioner's Directive 715-2 (CSC, 2014a) outlines the potential measures that community supervision staff can use in lieu of issuing a suspension, including modifications to the offender's correctional plan (e.g., additional treatment or programming to address dynamic risk factors), additional control measures (e.g.,

increased reporting, curfews, special instructions or direction), disciplinary interviews, amendments to special conditions, and/or suitable cultural alternatives or interventions. CSC's community population management strategy emphasizes the use of alternatives to suspensions, which are also more cost-effective than suspensions, (Community Reintegration Branch, 2010; Dandurand, Griffiths, Murdoch, & Brown, 2008), though, as MacDonald, Luong, and Oluto (2010) identified, there are many factors that impact whether a suspension is issued, such as availability of community supports and the specific characteristics and risk factors of the offender. Future research would be required to determine the impact that alternatives to suspensions have on offender reintegration into the community.

In the period corresponding to our study, rates of suspension differed by region (CSC, 2015). Quebec and Ontario regions had the lowest rates of suspension (611 and 664 suspensions per 1,000 supervised offenders, respectively), while the Prairie region had the highest (936 suspensions per 1,000 supervised offenders); suspension rates for the Atlantic and Pacific region were 738 and 880 per 1,000 supervised offenders, respectively. Our study also demonstrated regional patterns, but in this case, the greatest difference was for Pacific region, which had higher rates of suspension per offender (2.2) but was also more likely to locally cancel suspensions. In other words, while more suspensions occurred per supervised offender in the Prairie region, offenders who were suspended in Pacific region were more likely to be suspended more than once. In addition, suspension warrants, regardless of outcome, were resolved more quickly in the Pacific region than the other regions. This difference may be partially explained by the fact that interventions provided in federal custody to a portion of suspended offenders within this region are associated with higher rates of local cancellation and fewer days in custody (Gobeil, Farrell MacDonald, & Keown, in review).

During the study period, men were more likely to receive a suspension than women (CSC, 2015). We found that women's suspensions were more likely to result in a local cancellation than men's, but women tended to spend almost a month less in the community than men prior to suspension. Aboriginal offenders were more likely to be suspended than their non-Aboriginal counterparts (CSC, 2015), and in our study, Aboriginal offenders' suspension warrants were more likely to result in a revocation. For both gender and ethnicity, then, the patterns with respect to the likelihood of suspension were mirrored by patterns regarding the likelihood of revocation – in other words, men were more likely both to be suspended than

women and, if suspended, ultimately revoked. The same was true of Aboriginal offenders as compared to non-Aboriginal offenders.

This study also demonstrated that there was an increase in certain parole conditions between FY2009-10 and FY2013-14: avoid certain/specific persons; residency; and other conditions. Previous American research has indicated that an increase in conditions leads to increases in suspensions (Padfield & Maruna, 2006), but a recent study by Ritchie, Saddleback, and Gobeil (2014) found the inverse relationship for Canadian federal offenders, which is supported by the previously mentioned decline in the suspension rate during the study period. Also, Thompson et al. (in press) have found that certain supervision conditions act as protective factors with respect to returning to custody due to the commission of a new offences. For non-Aboriginal men, this included residency conditions; for Aboriginal men, conditions related to mental health treatment or correctional programming were protective. Additional research to examine the particular impact of specific types of conditions on suspension rates and suspension outcomes may provide further clarity to this area.

Future research could also build on this study by identifying the characteristics and behaviours (e.g., community urinalysis test results, community employment, the stability of family and social networks) of offenders who experience the different suspension outcomes (local cancellation, board cancellation, or revoked). Differences across regions, by gender, and by ethnicity would also need to be considered. Such research could also assist in identifying offenders who might benefit most from alternatives to suspension of their supervision. A final important focus for future research is the role of factors other than those captured in administrative data. For instance, examining the decision-making processes and the role of discussions with offenders and within the case management team with respect to issuing a suspension and to suspension outcomes could provide further rich information.

Conclusions

As successful reintegration of offenders is a key goal of community supervision, understanding the patterns of suspension warrants may inform case management and community planning strategies as well as inform population management initiatives both in custody and in the community. Future research could examine the characteristics of offenders and behavioural indicators that lead to suspensions and the various suspension outcomes. As well, future research examining the use of alternatives to suspensions would be beneficial.

References

- Community Reintegration Branch. (2010). *Community population management strategy*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2014a). *Commissioner's Directive 715-2: Post-release decision process*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2014b). *Commissioner's Directive 719: Long-term supervision orders*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2015). [Performance Direct performance indicators: Rate of supervision suspensions]. Unpublished raw data – updated February 2015.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act*. (1992). <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/>
- Dandurand, Y., Griffiths, C.T., Murdoch, D., & Brown, R.E. (2008). *Failed social re-entry: Factors behind condition release violations, suspensions and revocations*. Vancouver, BC: International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy.
- Dauvergne, M. (2012). Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2010/2011. *Juristat*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11715-eng.htm#r9>
- Easton, S., Furness, H., & Brantingham, P. (2014). *The cost of crime in Canada: 2014 Report*. Vancouver, BC: Fraser Institute.
- Glaze, L. E., & Bonczar, T. P. (2011). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2010* (NCJ 236019). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Gobeil, R., Farrell MacDonald, S., & Keown, L.A. (in review). *Comparing different approaches to management temporarily detained offenders* (RIB 14-46). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Grattet, R., Petersilia, J., Lin, J., & Beckman, M. (2009). Parole violations and revocations in California: Analysis and suggestions for action. *Federal Probation*, 73, 2-11.
- Hughes, T.A., Wilson, D.J., & Beck, A. (2001). *Trends in state parole, 1990-2000*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- MacDonald, C., Luong, D., & Olotu, M. (2010). *Evaluation of CSC's community corrections: Phase I – Report of the focus group sessions with community partners and stakeholders* (File # 394-02-84). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.

- Matheson, F. I., Doherty, S., & Grant, B.A. (2009). *Women Offender Substance Abuse Programming & Community Reintegration* (R-202). Ottawa ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- McConnell, A., Rubenfeld, S., Thompson, J., & Gobeil, R. (2014). *A profile of women under community supervision* (R-287). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Motiuk, L.L., & Brown, S.L. (1993). *Survival time until suspension for sex offenders on conditional release* (R-31). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Motiuk, L.L., & Porporino, F.J. (1989a). *Field test of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: A study of offenders on caseload* (R-06). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Motiuk, L.L., & Porporino, F.J. (1989b). *Offender risk/needs assessment: A study of conditional releases* (R-01). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Padfield, N., & Maruna, S. (2006). The revolving door at the prison gate: Exploring the dramatic increase in recalls to prison. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(3), 329-352.
- Petersilia, J. (2004). What works in prisoner re-entry: Reviewing and questioning the evidence. *Federal Probation*, 68(2). Retrieved from <http://www.uscourts.gov/uscourts/FederalCourts/PPS/Fedprob/2004-09/whatworks.html>
- Public Safety Canada. (2013). Corrections and conditional release statistical overview: Annual report 2013. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Ritchie, M. B., Saddleback, C., & Gobeil, R. (2014). *Special conditions and post-release outcomes over time* (RS 14-17). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Steen, S., & Opsal, T. (2007). "Punishment on the Installment Plan" Individual-Level Predictors of Parole Revocation in Four States. *The Prison Journal*, 87(3), 344-366.
- Stickels, J.W. (2007). A study of probation revocations for technical violations in Hays County, Texas, USA. *Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 54(1), 52-61.
- Thompson, J., Forrester, T., & Stewart, L. (in press). *Factors related to community supervision outcomes: Revocations* (R-304). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.

Appendix A: Regional Patterns of Suspensions

Table A1

Overview of Suspension Warrants by Warrant Issuing Region

Variable	Atlantic (<i>N</i> = 2,083) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Québec (<i>N</i> = 4,289) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Ontario (<i>N</i> = 4,566) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Prairie (<i>N</i> = 5,822) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Pacific (<i>N</i> = 2,965) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	NMC ^a (<i>N</i> = 9,663) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Final suspension outcome						
Local cancellation	22	19	32	25	46	29
PBC cancellation	23	36	22	14	21	20
Revoked	54	43	45	59	31	49
Other ^b	1	2	1	2	2	2
First suspension	50	47	50	46	32	46
Global warrant reason						
Breach term	74	21	60	68	51	69
Prevent breach	16	1	5	26	39	7
Protect society	10	78	35	6	10	24
Specific suspension reasons						
Breach conditions	46	36	41	34	41	30
Failure to report	11	11	12	27	11	38
Increased risk/deteriorating behaviour	25	31	23	20	37	11
New charge/offence	14	5	10	8	6	15
Other/undetermined	6	20	16	11	7	7

(Table continues)

Variable	Atlantic (<i>N</i> = 2,083) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Québec (<i>N</i> = 4,289) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Ontario (<i>N</i> = 4,566) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Prairie (<i>N</i> = 5,822) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Pacific (<i>N</i> = 2,965) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	NMC ^a (<i>N</i> = 9,663) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Frequency of contact ^c						
4-8 times/month	74	87	80	68	88	77
1-2 times/month	26	13	20	32	12	22
Every 2-3 months	0	0	0	0	0	1
Time to first suspension (days)	199 (513)	253 (656)	215 (541)	168 (364)	206 (523)	185 (429)
Time from suspension to final outcome (days)	64 (69)	90 (131)	66 (68)	69 (79)	52 (64)	65 (69)
Any parole condition	99	100	100	99	100	100
Abstain from substance use	91	89	90	93	94	94
Avoid certain/specific persons	81	89	96	80	91	89
Residency	25	40	36	17	33	42
Follow treatment/program plan	15	61	76	26	61	48
Other condition(s)	26	51	71	35	54	51
Total number of conditions	3 (2)	5 (2)	5 (2)	4 (1)	4 (2)	5 (2)
Number of suspensions/Number of suspended offenders (custodial regions only) ^d	1.68	1.74	1.65	1.78	2.24	N/A

Note. NMC = National Monitoring Centre; LTSO = Long Term Supervision Order; CSC = Correctional Service Canada; PBC = Parole Board of Canada. ^a The NMC became responsible for issuing warrants in the last quarter of FY2009-10. ^b Other contains those cases where the cancellation authority is unknown, where the offender was deported, died or reached the end of their sentence, or where a final outcome was not yet determined. ^c Frequency of contact information is missing for 1,178 suspension warrants. ^d Custodial region was determined using the regions of the holding institution, destination facility or region of release – concordance with warrant suspension issuing region (excluding those issued by the NMC) was 99%. NMC was not included in this calculation, as it is not a custodial region.

Appendix B: Patterns of Suspensions by Aboriginal Ancestry and Gender

Table B1

Overview of Suspension Warrants by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry

Variable	All Men (<i>N</i> = 27,835) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	All Women (<i>N</i> = 1,553) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Aboriginal Men (<i>N</i> = 7,305) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Non- Aboriginal Men (<i>N</i> = 20,530) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Aboriginal Women (<i>N</i> = 628) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Non- Aboriginal Women (<i>N</i> = 925) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Issuing region						
Atlantic	7	10	2	9	4	14
Quebec	15	9	5	18	2	13
Ontario	16	16	9	18	9	21
Prairies	19	25	34	14	35	18
Pacific	10	6	11	10	7	6
NMC ^a	33	34	39	31	43	28
Final suspension outcome						
Local cancellation	28	34	27	29	32	35
PBC cancellation	22	19	19	23	17	21
Revoked	48	46	52	47	50	43
Other ^b	2	1	2	1	1	1
First suspension	46	47	46	43	44	49
Global warrant reason						
Breach term	59	56	63	58	56	56
Prevent breach	13	19	17	12	21	17
Protect society	28	25	20	30	23	27
Specific suspension reasons						
Breach conditions	36	32	34	37	26	35
Failure to report	23	28	32	20	42	20
Increased risk/ deteriorating behaviour	21	22	19	22	19	24

(Table continues)

Variable	All Men (<i>N</i> = 27,835) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	All Women (<i>N</i> = 1,553) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Aboriginal Men (<i>N</i> = 7,305) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Non- Aboriginal Men (<i>N</i> = 20,530) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Aboriginal Women (<i>N</i> = 628) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Non- Aboriginal Women (<i>N</i> = 925) % or <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
New charge/offence	10	9	8	11	6	10
Other/undetermined	11	11	9	12	8	13
Frequency of contact ^c						
4-8 times/month	78	75	81	77	80	72
1-2 times/month	21	25	19	22	20	28
Every 2-3 months	1	0	0	1	0	0
Time to first suspension (days)	200 (501)	188 (301)	150 (379)	217 (535)	146 (195)	214 (349)
Time from suspension to final outcome (days)	69 (84)	61 (61)	69 (78)	69 (86)	65 (67)	59 (57)
Any parole condition	100	100	100	100	100	100
Abstain from substance use	92	92	97	90	97	89
Avoid certain/specific persons	88	84	85	89	80	86
Residency	35	21	36	34	18	23
Follow treatment/program plan	49	56	42	51	51	60
Other condition(s)	50	46	48	50	43	48
Number of suspensions/Number of suspended individuals	1.83	1.83	1.98	1.79	1.95	1.76

Note. NMC = National Monitoring Centre; LTSO = Long Term Supervision Order; CSC = Correctional Service Canada; PBC = Parole Board of Canada. ^a The NMC became responsible for issuing warrants in the last quarter of FY2009-10. ^b Other contains those cases where the cancellation authority is unknown, where the offender was deported, died or reached the end of their sentence, or where a final outcome was not yet determined. ^c Frequency of contact information is missing for 1,178 suspension warrants.