

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Minimum Security Women: A Profile

2018 N° R-394

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.



Correctional Service
Canada

Service correctionnel
Canada

Canada

Minimum Security Women: A Profile

Kaitlyn Wardrop

Jennie Thompson

&

Dena Derkzen

Correctional Service of Canada

October 2018

Acknowledgements

Thanks are extended to Chealsea De Moor for her assistance in identifying relevant literature and Shanna Farrell-MacDonald for her input regarding data capture methods. The authors are also appreciative of the consultations and feedback provided by the Women Offender Sector and Aboriginal Initiatives Directorate. Finally, editorial suggestions from Lynn Stewart and Andrea Moser are gratefully acknowledged.

Executive Summary

Key words: *minimum security, women offenders, profile.*

The *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (CCRA, 1992) requires all incarcerated offenders to be assigned a classification of minimum, medium, or maximum security. Classifying offenders according to their risk of being involved in institutional misconducts, incidents of violence, and escapes assists the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) in ensuring safe and secure institutions. Previous studies have been conducted on higher risk women but very little research has focused on incarcerated women classified as minimum security. Given that the majority of women offenders spend at least some portion of their incarceration in minimum security, it is important to understand their profiles to better inform case management strategies.

The primary purpose of the study was to describe women who have been placed in minimum security and contrast them with women who have not been placed in minimum security. The descriptions and comparisons focus on four areas of the correctional process: intake information, institutional adjustment, intervention involvement, and release-related information for three groups of women released between April 1, 2014 and March 31, 2016: (1) women who were initially placed at minimum security and stayed there until release ($n = 296$; 15% Indigenous); (2) women who had never cascaded to minimum security prior to release ($n = 249$; 46% Indigenous); and (3) women who had cascaded to minimum security prior to release ($n = 132$; 35% Indigenous).

Results indicated that there were distinct differences in profile and in correctional outcomes by group. Relative to other groups, women who spent their entire incarceration in minimum security were the least likely to be violent offenders, had the lowest risk and need ratings, were least likely to have mental health concerns, and were least likely to violate institutional rules and receive sanctions. As well, they were most likely to be granted parole and had the best community outcomes on release.

Some differences emerged between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women within each of the groups examined. Compared to their non-Indigenous counterparts, Indigenous women tended to be assessed as higher risk and need, particularly in the domains of Employment/Education, Marital/Family, Associates, Substance Abuse, and Personal/Emotional Orientation. On release, they had higher rates of revocations than non-Indigenous women. Encouragingly, Indigenous women often had higher rates of enrollment and completion in programs, and in educational and Indigenous-specific services. These results are consistent with the risk principle; as higher risk women are receiving more intensive programming.

This descriptive profile sheds light on the profile and correctional experiences of women who have been classified as minimum security during their incarceration. Overall, the results suggest that the security classification decisions by CSC are classifying women appropriately and provide insight in where correctional planning could be improved; namely increased focus on the needs of minimum-security Indigenous women.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	vii
Introduction.....	8
Minimum Security Women.....	9
Method	12
Cohort.....	12
Data	12
Analytic Approach	13
Results.....	14
Demographic, Risk Assessment, and Sentence Profiles	14
Institutional Adjustment.....	15
Programming, Education, and Employment Opportunities	16
Release-Related Information.....	17
Differences by Indigenous Ancestry	18
Discussion	19
Conclusion	21
References.....	22

List of Tables

Table B1 <i>Demographic Information and Sentence Measures</i>	32
Table B2 <i>Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) Information</i>	33
Table B3 <i>Women’s Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA) Information</i>	35
Table B4 <i>Computerized Mental Health Intake Screening System (CoMHISS) Information</i>	36
Table B5 <i>Rate of Incidents, Charges, and Sanctions</i>	37
Table B6 <i>Average Involvement in Correctional Programs, Mental Health Interventions, and Social/Other Programs</i>	39
Table B7 <i>Healing Lodge Information</i>	40
Table B8 <i>Involvement in Any Education and Employment Activities</i>	40
Table B9 <i>Release-Related Information</i>	41
Table B10 <i>Revocation Information</i>	42

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Measures	25
Appendix B: Tabular Results.....	32

Introduction

Security classification in federal penitentiaries is legislated by the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (CCRA, 1992). The Act requires all incarcerated offenders to be assigned a security classification of minimum, medium, or maximum. Classifying offenders according to their risk of being involved in institutional misconducts, incidents of violence, and escapes, assists the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) in managing institutions.¹ Within each security level, there are established security requirements and behavioural norms and differences between the programming and privileges afforded to offenders. Women classified as minimum or medium security are housed in living units – houses with shared living space where women are expected to share the responsibility for daily tasks (e.g., preparing meals, cleaning, etc.). These living units can be located either inside or outside the perimeter fence of the institution.² Under minimal monitoring, both minimum and medium security women are expected to interact effectively and responsibly and demonstrate a high level of motivation towards self-improvement by actively participating in their correctional plan. It is noted that medium security women can only be accommodated in units located inside the perimeter fence, whereas minimum security women may be in units both inside and outside the perimeter fence.³ Women classified as maximum security are housed in secure units that have added static security measures (e.g., closed pods, command post, a secure yard, etc.) and their movement is regulated. While women in maximum security are still expected to interact effectively and responsibly, they are also subject to regular direct and indirect monitoring and must demonstrate at least a minimum interest in participating in their correctional plan (Commissioner's Directive (CD) 706). Women inmates classified as maximum security also have access through off unit movement, in accordance with CD 578, to programs, activities and services in other areas of the institution.

At intake, the Custody Rating Scale (CRS), a gender-neutral security classification tool used for both men and women, is completed to determine an offender's initial security

¹ It is important to note that all women's institutions, with the exception of the healing lodge, are multi-level, where minimum-, medium-, and maximum-security women are accommodated. Healing lodges are only for women classified as minimum or medium security.

² When housed outside of the perimeter fence, the perimeter of this unit will be defined but not normally directly controlled.

³ The one exception is Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge where women classified as both minimum and medium security are in housing units and there is no security perimeter fence at the facility.

classification. The CRS considers a number of different areas including, but not limited to, the seriousness of the current offence, the criminal history, and the offender's potential for violent behaviour. Structured professional judgement is used to rate an individual's risk for poor institutional adjustment, escape risk, and public safety risk. Previous research has shown that the CRS is valid and reliable for use among women and Indigenous offenders in so far as ratings were consistent with other measures of offender risk and predicted offender outcomes (Barnum & Gobeil, 2012; Blanchette & Motiuk, 2004; Blanchette, Verbrugge, & Wichmann, 2002; Grant & Luciani, 1998; Luciani, Motiuk, & Nafekh, 1996).

The CCRA requires that the security classification of an offender be periodically reviewed.⁴ Security classification for women is reviewed during their sentence using the Security Reclassification Scale for Women (SRSW; Blanchette & Taylor, 2005), a gender-informed actuarial tool, which is used to inform professional judgement. The SRSW was developed in an effort to adopt gender-informed assessment tools, in response to criticism of the use of gender-neutral assessment tools on women (see Belknap, 2015; Brennan, 2007; Farr, 2000; Hannah-Moffat, & Shaw, 2001; Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004). Security classifications are reviewed through the scaling of nine dynamic items: (1) placement in involuntary segregation, (2) progress or motivation regarding correctional plans, (3) presence of serious disciplinary offences, (4) number of recorded incidents, (5) number of successful escorted temporary absences, (6) CRS history rating, (7) most recent level of pay, (8) ever unlawfully at large from temporary absence, work release, or supervision, and (9) prosocial family contact. These variables are optimally weighted through statistical procedures (see Blanchette & Taylor, 2005 for more information). Previous research has found that the SRSW reliably predicts offender outcomes for follow-up periods of at least six months (Blanchette & Taylor, 2005; Gobeil, 2008; Gobeil & Blanchette, 2007; McConnell, 2012), as well as shorter follow-up periods of less than six months (Thompson, McConnell, & Paquin-Marseille, 2013).

Minimum Security Women

Very little recent research has examined minimum-security women. An early study by

⁴ Women in medium or maximum security must be reassessed at least once every two years. Across all security groups a security classification review occurs prior to making a recommendation for any decision (e.g., transfer, temporary absence, work release, or parole). As well, for medium security offenders segregated under paragraph 31(a) of the CCRA if a security classification review is required, it must be completed prior to the 30th day Institutional Segregation Review Board (CD 710-6).

Blanchette (1997) compared federally sentenced Canadian women at each security level on information collected at admission. She found that there were clear differences by security designation with offenders with higher needs and more difficulties being placed at higher security levels. In general, minimum-security women were older, had lower static and dynamic risk ratings, had less extensive criminal histories, and were less likely to be incarcerated for a violent assault or robbery than women classified as medium or maximum security. As well, minimum-security women had more favourable histories of institutional adjustment, with the lowest rates of escaping custody and segregation placement across all security groups. Finally, an examination of women's suicide risk potential revealed that, generally, minimum-security women demonstrated less suicide risk potential than those in medium or maximum security.

More recent research by Harris and colleagues (2014) has shown that women initially classified as minimum security engaged in institutional offences less frequently than their medium- and maximum-security counterparts, although the difference with maximum-security women weakened when time spent within the institution was considered. Nevertheless, these results provide further evidence to support the presence of distinct differences between security groups.

Given that the limited research focusing on women in minimum security is dated and predominately focused on information collected at the point of admission, a current examination of minimum-security women throughout the correctional process was undertaken. The study will examine the women's institutional adjustment, programming involvement, and release information, in addition to the profiling information collected based on intake assessments to gain a better understanding of the women under CSC's care.

Study Purpose

The primary purpose of the study was to describe and contrast women who have been placed in minimum security with those who have not been classified as minimum security. Given that the majority of women offenders spend at least some time in minimum security, examining their profiles and their correctional outcomes during the course of incarceration can provide useful information for correctional planning purposes.

Analyses focused on four areas of the correctional process: intake information, institutional adjustment, intervention involvement, and outcomes on release. The following research questions were examined:

1. What are the demographic characteristics, sentence and offence information, and Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) profile of minimum-security women relative to those who did and did not cascade to minimum security?
2. What type of institutional events (e.g., charges, incidents, etc.) do minimum-security women experience at CSC, relative to those who did and did not cascade to minimum security?
3. Which interventions have women classified as minimum security received, relative to those who did and did not cascade to minimum security?
4. What type of release events do women classified as minimum security experience, relative to those who did and did not cascade to minimum security?

Method

Cohort

This study includes 717 women who were released between April 1, 2014 and March 31, 2016. The following groups of security placement were examined: women who were initially placed at minimum security and stayed there until release ($n = 296$; 45 Indigenous and 251 non-Indigenous women); women who never cascaded to minimum security by release ($n = 249$; 114 Indigenous and 134 non-Indigenous women); women who did cascade to minimum security by release ($n = 132$; 46 Indigenous and 86 non-Indigenous women). In addition to these groups there were small numbers of women who were initially placed at minimum security, however, their security level increased overtime and they were released from either maximum or medium security ($n = 20$); women who cascaded from higher security levels to minimum security, however, their security level increased over time and they were released from either maximum or medium security ($n = 11$); and, finally, women whose first and last security placements were at minimum security but experienced security level increases between these two time points ($n = 9$). Given the limited sample sizes in the latter three groups, only the first three groups of women could be compared. Women in the excluded groups were slightly younger, had higher rates of low educational attainment, and were serving a determinate sentence of more than three years compared to women in the three groups that will be examined in the complete analyses.

Data

Information obtained from the Offender Management System (OMS⁵) was used to profile the women and examine their experiences in the correctional process. Two periods of time were examined – the in-custody period and the period spent under supervision in the community. Data extracted from OMS included: demographic characteristics, sentence and offence information, results of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA; e.g., static and dynamic risk, motivation level, level of engagement, CRS recommendations, initial security placement, etc. See Commissioner's Directive 705 for more information), and information regarding mental health and substance use. In addition, we examined factors related to institutional adjustment (e.g., involvement in institutional incidents and offences, and disciplinary sanctions), offender involvement in

⁵ An electronic database containing all federally sentenced offenders' correctional files.

correctional interventions, correctional programs, mental health services, employment assignments and educational upgrading, participation in Indigenous-specific services (such as residing in Pathways Units or at a Healing Lodge) and participation in temporary absences. For women who were released we compared first parole decisions, whether parole hearings were waived, proportion of sentence served at release and types of release and revocations within the study period. For details on how these measures were defined see Appendix A.

Analytic Approach

Descriptive statistics were used to profile the groups. In some analyses, time incarcerated was accounted for between the groups of women due to substantial differences in sentence length. The results section highlights differences of practical importance between the women in different security-based groupings. Where possible, results were disaggregated by Indigenous ancestry within groups.

Results

The results are presented in four parts. The first section examines the demographic characteristics, risk assessment, and sentence profiles of the three groups: (1) women who do not cascade to minimum security; (2) women who do cascade to minimum security; and (3) women who spend their entire incarceration in minimum security. The second section assesses institutional adjustment of offenders within each group. The third section examines offenders' involvement in programming, education, other interventions and employment opportunities. Lastly, the fourth section assesses parole applications, release decisions and outcomes on release. Detailed tabular information can be found in Appendix B.

Demographic, Risk Assessment, and Sentence Profiles

There was substantial variability in women's demographic, education, and sentence profiles across groups (see Table B1). Women who spent their entire incarceration in minimum security were older, more likely to have a significant other, and less likely to have educational needs in comparison to the other two groups. The vast majority of women always in minimum security were on their first federal sentence with that sentence being three years or less for a non-violent offence.

Women who were only in minimum security throughout their incarceration were rated as having significantly lower static and dynamic risk ratings, higher reintegration levels, higher accountability levels, lower responsivity concerns, and higher levels of engagement compared to other groups. Women who did not cascade to minimum security consistently had the highest risk and need ratings. Similar patterns were seen in each dynamic need domain, with women who spent their entire incarceration in minimum security having the lowest rates of need in the Employment/Education, Marital/Family, Associates, Substance Abuse, Community Functioning, Personal/Emotional Orientation, and Attitude domains (Table B2).

As expected, the majority (96%) of women who spent their entire incarceration in minimum security were rated by the CRS as minimum security. In contrast, those who cascaded to minimum security and those who were never classified as minimum security most frequently had an initial CRS rating of medium (91% and 84%, respectively). The majority of these women were subsequently placed at medium security (96% and 87%, respectively). The high level of agreement between initial CRS rating and first security placement suggests that there are very

few overrides for security classification. Of those who cascaded to minimum security, 38% of their incarceration was spent in minimum security.

Women who did not cascade to minimum security had the most severe substance abuse needs and greatest need for institutional treatment to address this concern in comparison to the other two groups based on the Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA; see Table B3). The majority of women who spent their entire incarceration in minimum security had no or low substance abuse severity.

Women varied in their mental health needs across groups, as measured by the Computerized Mental Health Intake Screening System (CoMHIS; see Table B4). Women who did not cascade to minimum security were most likely to have mental health needs and women who were always in minimum security had the lowest rates of mental health needs. For example, 60% of women who did not cascade to minimum security reported having been diagnosed with a mental disorder in the past, compared to 29% of women who were always in minimum security.

Institutional Adjustment

The following indices of institutional adjustment were assessed: rates of incidents, charges, and sanctions. These analyses controlled for time incarcerated (see Table B5). As hypothesized, women who did not cascade to minimum security had been involved in the most institutional incidents both as victims and as instigators, followed by women who did cascade to minimum security, and then women who were always in minimum security. Those who did not cascade to minimum security consistently had the highest rates of involvement in all types of incidents. The most frequent incident types for this group were behavioral, assault, and self-injury. Women who cascaded to minimum security and women who were always in minimum security had significantly lower rates of incidents across most incident types. However, the most frequent types of incidents differed across groups with women who cascaded to minimum and who were always in minimum being involved in less serious infractions (e.g., miscellaneous,⁶ behavioural, and contraband incidents). Similarly, women who did not cascade to minimum security had the highest rates of receiving minor and serious charges.

⁶ While the types of incidents within the miscellaneous category were not explicitly examined, they can include intervention for medical purposes, medical emergency, minor disruptions, etc.

Programming, Education, and Employment Opportunities

Women varied in their involvement in correctional programs and other interventions across groups (see tables B6 and B7 for detailed findings). When examining involvement in correctional programs, women who cascaded to minimum security prior to release, on average, were enrolled in the most correctional programs compared to the other two groups. Higher rates of involvement in correctional programming would be expected for women who met the risk criteria for participation in correctional programming. Women who were always minimum security completed, on average, the greatest proportion of enrolled programs compared to those that did and did not cascade to minimum security prior to release (92% vs. 89% and 74%, respectively). Markedly, women who did not cascade to minimum security prior to release had the highest rates of program non-completion due to offender reasons.

As many interventions that were categorized under mental health interventions and social/other programs did not have established start and end dates we did not report on rates of completion for services in these categories, instead we provide only the average number of enrollments. Generally, women who did and did not cascade to minimum security prior to release were enrolled in a greater number of these types of interventions than women always in minimum security.

Women who cascaded to minimum security had the highest rates (27%) of involvement in Indigenous-specific services such as residing in Pathways Units or at a Healing Lodge compared to those who did not cascade to minimum (9%) or women who were always in minimum security (8%; see Table B7). When restricting numbers to only Indigenous women, those who cascaded to minimum security by release had the highest involvement in Indigenous-specific services (61%), compared to those who spent their entire period of incarceration in minimum-security (31%) and those who did not cascade to minimum security by release (18%).

Given that women who were always categorized as minimum security had the lowest need for educational intervention, it is expected that they also had the lowest rates of involvement in these opportunities. Women who cascaded to minimum security were the most likely (61%) to achieve an Adult Basic Education (ABE) level followed by those who did not cascade to minimum security (54%) and women always in minimum security (29%). Women who did not cascade to minimum security also had the highest rates of completing their GED or CEGEP compared to the other groups.

Involvement in employment interventions differed by group, with women who cascaded to minimum security having the highest rates of at least one CORCAN assignment and CSC employment assignment of 90 days or more (20% and 61%, respectively), followed by women who did not cascade to minimum security (13% and 48%, respectively) and women who spent their entire incarceration period in minimum security (10% and 36%, respectively).

Release-Related Information

Several aspects of offender release were examined (see tables B9 and B10). The majority (92%) of women who cascaded to minimum security, and women who were always in minimum security (76%), were granted at least one temporary absence, while only 31% of those who did not cascade to minimum security had at least one temporary absence. Across all groups, the most common temporary release was escorted temporary absences. With respect to other temporary absences, women who cascaded to minimum security were most likely to have at least one work release, while women who were always in minimum security were most likely to experience at least one unescorted temporary absence.

Women who did not cascade to minimum security were most likely to waive a release hearing or withdraw their release application compared to the other groups, while women who cascaded to minimum security were the most likely to postpone a hearing. Women who were in minimum security throughout their incarceration were the least likely to waive, postpone, or withdraw a release application. Parole board decisions on offenders' first release application differed by group, with women who cascaded to minimum security and women who were always in minimum security (58% for each) being more likely to be granted parole than women who did not cascade to minimum security (32%).

We examined the proportion of offenders who experienced a Section 84 release. This type of release varied across groups. Those who cascaded to minimum security were more likely to experience a Section 84 release (13%), followed by those always in minimum security (9%) and those who never cascaded to minimum security (2%).

Almost all women who were always in minimum security were granted discretionary release (90%). Those who cascaded to minimum also received a high rate of discretionary release (73%). The lowest rate of discretionary release was for women who did not cascade to minimum security at 21%.

We followed the women after their release to determine whether there were differences in

success rates based on their security classification (see Table B10). Numbers only allowed the examination of a return to custody for any reason. Women who spent their entire incarceration in minimum security returned at the lowest rate (15%), followed by those who cascaded to minimum security (30%); those who did not cascade to minimum security had the highest rates of return (42%). It is important to note that this result did not control for time at risk in the community and women who were always in minimum security had longer potential follow-up time, and therefore a greater time at risk, than those who did not cascade to minimum security prior to release. Nevertheless, they had the lowest rates of returns to custody.

Differences by Indigenous Ancestry

Differences emerged between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women within each of the groups examined. Notably, Indigenous women less frequently cascaded down to minimum security. This is not necessarily surprising given that, across all groups, Indigenous women were more likely to be serving a sentence for a violent crime and tended to be assessed as higher risk and need, particularly in the domains of Employment/Education, Marital/Family, Associates, Substance Abuse, and Personal/Emotional Orientation in comparison to their non-Indigenous counterparts. On release, they had higher rates of revocations than non-Indigenous women. Positively, Indigenous women often had higher rates of enrollment and completion in programs, and in educational and Indigenous-specific services (e.g., Healing Lodge, Section 84 release).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to compare the profiles and correctional experiences of women who have been placed in minimum security and those who had not from admission to warrant expiry. Distinct differences by group, as well as Indigenous ancestry, were observed.

Overall, these findings suggest that the security classification tools employed by CSC are classifying women offenders appropriately. Relative to other groups, women who were always in minimum security were less likely to have been convicted for violent offences, more likely to be rated as lower risk and need, less likely to have mental health concerns, and less likely to violate institutional rules and receive sanctions during their incarceration. Unsurprisingly, women who spent their entire incarceration in minimum security generally had the most positive outcomes compared to those who cascaded to minimum security or women who never cascaded to minimum security. As well, they were more likely to be granted discretionary release and, on release, they had more positive community outcomes.

Results related to group differences in charges, and incidents provide further evidence of the utility of the initial security classification ratings. Women with a classification of medium or maximum security on the CRS had the higher rates of institutional misconduct. These results suggest that our security assessment tools for women, specifically the CRS and SRSW, are useful in identifying the appropriate security placement for women, supporting results in previous research that has shown that both the CRS and SRSW are valid and reliable for use among women and Indigenous offenders (Barnum & Gobeil, 2012; Blanchette & Motiuk, 2004; Blanchette & Taylor, 2005; Blanchette, Verbrugge, & Wichmann, 2002; Gobeil & Blanchette, 2007; Gobeil, 2008; Grant & Luciani, 1998; Luciani, Motiuk, & Nafekh, 1996; McConnell, 2012; Thompson, McConnell, & Paquin-Marseille, 2013).

Differences in involvement in programs and interventions across group indicate that CSC is providing services that are congruent with the risk principle; that is, correctional programming and services are provided to offenders commensurate with their risk and need level. Women who did and did not cascade to minimum security had the highest rates of enrollment in correctional programming, education, and mental health interventions relative to those who spend their entire incarceration in minimum security.

There was a high rate of parole waivers for women who cascaded to minimum or never

cascaded to minimum security. Again, this result would be expected given previous research that has shown that individuals who waive release hearings tend to have higher risk and need and be incarcerated for a violent offence (Cabana, Beauchamp, Emeno, & Bottos, 2009). Work by Cabana and colleagues (2009) examined the reasons for parole waivers, postponements, and withdrawals through qualitative interviews with offenders. Their results indicated that common explanations for postponing parole review or withdrawing parole applications were related to programming (e.g., currently completing a program, waitlisted, etc.) and factors that reflect problematic behaviour (e.g., recent institutional misconduct or security increase). In our sample, women who cascaded to minimum and women who did not cascade to minimum had higher rates of institutional misconduct than those originally classified as minimum security and were also more likely to be referred to correctional programs. As a possible consequence of this, women who cascaded to minimum and those always in minimum security were granted day or full parole at higher rates than those who did not cascade.

Within each of our study groups, relative to non-Indigenous women, Indigenous women were more likely to be assessed as higher risk and need, with particularly higher need in the domains of Employment/Education, Marital/Family, Associates, Substance Abuse, and Personal/Emotional Orientation. As well, they had higher rates of revocations once released. Given the large volume of literature demonstrating the complex social histories of Indigenous women (Beaudette, Cheverie, & Gobeil, 2014; Mann, 2009; McConnell, Rubenfeld, Thompson, & Gobeil, 2014; Thompson & Gobeil, 2015) these findings are expected. On a positive note, results show that Indigenous women are involved in various institutional programs and activities. Indeed, compared to their non-Indigenous counterparts, Indigenous women often had higher rates of enrollment and completion in correctional programs, mental health interventions, social/other programs, and educational programs. As well, a large proportion of Indigenous women, particularly those who cascaded to minimum security, were involved in one of CSC's initiatives to address Indigenous-specific needs – spending time in a Healing Lodge. Indigenous women, however, did not appear to frequently utilize a Section 84 release into the Indigenous community. It may be of interest to examine this issue further to determine the reasons why involvement in this opportunity is not being utilized more frequently. Nevertheless, given that Indigenous women consistently had less favourable outcomes in the community, it may be that these individuals need are different or they require additional programming to address their

complex needs.

CSC policy specifies that the case management team should consider the social history of Indigenous offenders when making security classification decisions (CD 705-7). Given that Indigenous women within the minimum-security classification had higher of risk and need levels than non-Indigenous women, it appears as though these considerations are being taken into account.

This research was largely beneficial as it provides CSC with an empirical understanding of the profiles and experiences of women under our supervision and further informs correctional planning. These results support the current case-management strategies used for women in minimum security, although increased efforts should center on refining the management of the complex needs of Indigenous women in minimum security. As well, these results support the continued focus on addressing medium- and maximum-security women's criminogenic needs, mental health concerns, and substance misuse through correctional programming and interventions. It is hoped that these efforts will support the rehabilitation of women offenders and may, ultimately, lead to better institutional and community outcomes.

Conclusion

Overall, results showed that the outcomes of minimum security women are markedly different for women of other groups. The results indicate that the security classification decisions by CSC are classifying women appropriately, with women designated minimum security at intake having better institutional and community outcomes than those who eventually cascade to minimum or those who are never classified as minimum. This information will assist CSC in refining their case management strategies for minimum-security women, as well as refining our strategies for women in medium or maximum security to ensure timely security classification reviews at the earliest and safe time in consideration of their eventual return to the community.

References

- Archambault, K., Stewart, L., Wilton, G., & Cousineau, C. (2010). *Initial results of the Computerized Mental Health Intake Screening System (CoMHISS) for Federally Sentenced Women*. Research Report R-230. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Barnum, G. & Gobeil, R. (2012). *Revalidation of the custody rating scale for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women offenders*. Research Report R-273. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Belknap, J. (2015). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime, and justice* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Beaudette, J., Cheverie, M., & Gobeil, R. (2014). *Aboriginal women: Profile and changing population*. Research Report R-341. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Blanchette, K. (1997). *Risk and need among federally-sentenced female offenders: A comparison of minimum, medium, and maximum-security inmates*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Blanchette, K. & Motiuk, L.L. (2004). Taking down the straw man: A reply to Webster and Doob. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 46, 621-630.
- Blanchette, K., & Taylor, K. (2005). *Development and field test of a gender-informed security reclassification scale for women offenders*. Research Report R-167. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Blanchette, K., Verbrugge, P., & Wichmann, C.G. (2002). *The Custody Rating Scale, initial security level placement, and women offenders*. Research Report R-127. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Brennan, T. (2007). Institutional Assessment and classification of Women Offenders: From Robust Beauty to Person-Centered Assessment. In Zaplin R. (Editor) *Female Offenders: Critical Perspectives and Effective Interventions* (2nd Edition). Massachusetts: Jones and Barthlett.
- Brown, S., & Motiuk, L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process: A meta-analytic, psychometric and consultative review*. Research Report R-164. Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Cabana, R., Beauchamp, T., Emeno, K., & Bottos, S. (2009). *Waivers, postponements and withdrawals: Offenders, parole officers and national parole board perspectives*. Research Report R-193. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2003). *Reintegration potential: A guide for determining and*

- entering an offender's reintegration potential into the offender management system.*
Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Derogatis, L.R. (1993). *BSI Brief Symptom Inventory. Administration, Scoring, and Procedures Manual* (4th Ed.). Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Farr, K. (2000). Classification for female inmates: Moving forward. *Crime and Delinquency*, 46, 3-17.
- Gobeil, R. (2008). *Revalidation of the Security Reclassification Scale for Women (SRSW)*. Research Report R-191. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Gobeil, R., & Blanchette, K. (2007). Revalidation of a Gender-Informed Security Reclassification Scale for Women Inmates. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 23 (4), 296-309.
- Grant, B.A. & Luciani, F.P. (1998). *Security classification using the Custody Rating Scale*. Research Report R-67. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Hannah-Moffat, K., & Shaw, M. (2001). *Taking risks: Incorporating gender and culture into the classification and assessment of federally sentenced women in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Policy Research, Status of Women Canada.
- Hardyman, P.L. & Van Voorhis, P.V. (2004). *Developing gender-specific classification systems for women offenders*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- Harris, A., Blanchette, K., & Brown, S. L. (2014). *Examining gender differences in institutional offences*. Research Report R-312. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Luciani, F., Motiuk, L., & Nafekh, M. (1996). *An operational review of the Custody Rating Scale: Validity, reliability, and practical utility*. Research Report R-47. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Mann, M. (2009). *Good intentions, disappointing results: A progress report on Federal Aboriginal corrections*. Ottawa, ON: Office of the Correctional Investigator.
- McConnell, A. (2012). *A re-validation of the security reclassification scale (SRSW) among federal women offenders for a period of at least six months*. RS-12-05. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- McConnell, A., Rubenfeld, S., Thompson, J. & Gobeil, R. (2014). *A profile of women under community supervision*. Research Report R-287. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Mills, J. F. & Kroner, D. G. (2003). *Depression Hopelessness and Suicide Screen form: User guide*. Kingston, ON.

- Mills, J.F., & Kroner, D.G. (2010). *Concurrent validity and normative data of the Depression, Hopelessness, and Suicide Screening form with women offenders*. B-47. Ottawa ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Skinner, H. A. (1982). The Drug Abuse Screening Test. *Addictive Behaviors*, 7, 363-371.
- Skinner, H. A., & Horn, J. L. (1984). *Alcohol Dependence Scale (ADS): Users Guide*. Toronto, ON: Addiction Research Foundation.
- Thompson, J. & R. Gobeil. (2015). *Aboriginal women: An overview of the correctional process from admission to warrant expiry*. Research Report R-342. Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Thompson, J., McConnell, A., & Paquin-Marseille, L. (2013). *The Security Reclassification Scale (SRSW) for Shorter Review Periods among Federal Women Offenders*. Research Report R-286. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Appendix A: Measures

Demographic & Incarceration Characteristics

Has a significant other. This variable divided women into two groups: (1) married and common-law and (2) single, which includes divorced, separated, widowed, and unknown.

Education. These two variables indicate whether or not an individual completed grade 10 education or attained a high school diploma prior to their current incarceration. This information is collected in the intake process; however, between 32% and 34% of women are missing this information.

Age at release. This variable indicates the age of offenders at the time of their release and is measured in whole years.

First federal sentence. This variable divided women into two groups: (1) those on their first federal sentence and (2) those who have more than one federal sentence.

Length of sentence. This variable indicates the total length of an offender's sentence in years. Offenders are divided into three groups: aggregate sentence length of three years or less, aggregate sentence length greater than three years, and indeterminate sentence.

Offence type. Participants' most serious offence types on their sentences were classified using seven binary variables that include: homicide-related (e.g., murder or attempted murder), robbery, drugs (e.g., possessing drugs or trafficking/importing drugs), sexual assault, major assault, property (e.g., break and enter, fraud, theft, possession of stolen property or property damage/mischief), other violent (e.g., sexual abuse and moral-sexual offences, kidnapping, abduction, weapons and explosives, common assault or arson), and other non-violent offences (e.g., morals-gaming and betting, public order offence, criminal code traffic offence, offences of administration of justice, impaired driving, other criminal federal statutes, provincial offences for traffic, provincial offences or municipal by-law offences).

Had a violent offence. This variable classifies participants' most serious offence types on their sentence as violent (homicide-related, sexual, robbery, assault, and other violent offences) or non-violent (drug, property, and other non-violent offences).

Offender Intake Assessment

The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) is used to assess levels of static (i.e., criminal history) and dynamic risk (i.e., criminogenic need) as well as motivation to participate in their

correctional plan and reintegration potential. In addition, the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis-Revised (DFIA-R) tool, which is a component of the OIA process, assesses seven dynamic factor domains that represent various criminogenic needs (i.e., dynamic risk). Use of the DFIA-R is to identify and prioritize factors linked to an offender's criminal behaviour that will inform her correctional plan (Brown & Motiuk, 2005). This information was taken at the time closest to admission to a Federal Penitentiary.

Static Risk

Static risk. Offenders are assessed as being of low, medium, or high risk based on an assessment of factors associated with their criminal history, offence severity and sex offence history. These static factors are fixed because they are historical and cannot be changed by attending programs and interventions (CD 705-6).

Dynamic Risk and Need Domains

Dynamic risk. Dynamic risk refers to an offender's needs, which have been traditionally correlated with correctional outcomes, and are used to determine the level of intervention an offender requires. These needs are considered modifiable through program participation. Offenders are assessed as low, medium, or high risk based on an assessment of these criminogenic needs (CD 705-6).

DFIA-R domains. These variables are comprised of seven dynamic factors that are assessed and monitored by CSC. Each domain is individually assessed and an offender is provided a rating of one of five response options: (1) Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment, (2) No immediate need for improvement, (3) Low need for improvement, (4) Moderate need for improvement, and (5) High need for improvement in the revised version. There are seven criminogenic need domains which include: *Employment/Education* (values concerning education and work), *Marital/Family* (support derived from family and community), *Associates* (value of interacting with non-criminal peers), *Substance Abuse* (value of abstaining from substances), *Community Functioning* (the use of skills necessary for daily living), *Personal and Emotional Orientation* (control exerted over one's life), and *Attitudes* (living in a pro-social manner). It is important to note that the Substance Abuse and Personal/Emotional domains are rated on a four-point scale as an individual cannot be seen to have an asset to community adjustment in these areas.

Accountability, Motivation, Responsivity, and Engagement

Reintegration potential. This variable is assessed as low, medium, or high and gauges the probability of an offender successfully reintegrating back to the community. Women offenders' reintegration potential is determined by their rating on the Custody Rating Scale (CRS), the static factor assessment rating, and the dynamic factor assessment rating from the OIA (CD 705-6).

Motivation level. This variable is assessed as low, medium, or high, based on an offender's drive and willingness to complete the requirements of her correctional plan.

Accountability level. This variable is assessed as low, medium, or high, based on an offender's ability to accept responsibility for their actions.

Responsivity flag. This variable is assessed as present or not present, based on the presence of a characteristic(s) that influences the offender's capacity to benefit from targeted intervention(s).

Custody Rating Scale (CRS)

The CRS, a gender-neutral security classification tool, is designed to provide an objective, empirically based instrument to assist in the security classification of offenders. The instrument consists of items that comprise two dimensions: (1) an Institutional Adjustment subscale designed to assess risks associated with the offender committing institutional incidents and (2) a Security Risk sub-scale measuring the danger an offender would pose to the public should they escape. This measure, completed based on review of offender files, provides a recommended security classification of minimum, medium, or maximum.

Security Reclassification Scale for Women (SRSW)

The SRSW reclassifies offenders as either minimum, medium, or maximum security based on the scaling of nine dynamic factors: (1) placement in involuntary segregation, (2) progress or motivation regarding correctional plan, (3) presence of serious disciplinary offences, (4) number of recorded incidents, (5) number of successful escorted temporary absences, (6) CRS history rating scale, (7) most recent level of pay, (8) ever unlawfully at large from temporary absence, work release, or supervision, and (9) family contact. Each item is optimally weighted through statistical procedures.

Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA)

Implemented in 2011, the W-CASA is a 261-item computerized assessment that assesses the scope and nature of women's substance abuse patterns, both over their lifetime and 12

months prior to arrest. The W-CASA includes a number of standardized measures, including the Alcohol Dependence Scale (ADS; Skinner & Horn, 1984) and the Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST; Skinner, 1982). In the current study, overall substance use severity was determined by using the higher of two ratings. For example, if a woman had a severe score on the ADS, but a low score on the DAST, her overall severity was severe.

Computerized Mental Health Intake Screening System (CoMHISS)

To help identify offenders with mental health symptoms who require further mental health assessment and follow-up, as well as generating data for future mental health planning, offenders are assessed using the CoMHISS. A number of variables were considered.

Mental health indicators. A number of indicators were examined regarding mental health history.

Adult Self-Report Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder Screener. The Adult Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) self report symptom checklist was developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) in conjunction with the revision of the WHO Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI). The Symptom Checklist consists of the 18 DSM-V criteria. Six of the 18 questions were found to be the most predictive of symptoms consistent with ADHD and are the basis for the ADHD screener. This is a screening tool and is not a diagnostic test. This variable is assessed as none (0 items endorsed), low (1 item endorsed), moderate (2-3 items endorsed), and high (4-6 items endorsed).

Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). The BSI is a validated 53-item self-report symptom inventory intended to reflect the psychological symptom patterns of psychiatric and medical patients as well as community non-patient respondents (Derogatis, 1993). Each item of the BSI is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (extremely). Of interest to the current project, the Global Severity Index (GSI) was used as an index of current level of symptomology. The GSI is scored by summing the values for the items in each symptom dimension (including four additional items pertinent for the GSI) and then dividing by the number of endorsed items in that dimension. An individual must answer at least 40 items of the BSI and must not provide the same response for every item on the measure for the responses to be considered a valid administration of the test. T-scores are calculated by comparing a given raw score to the normative tables that are calculated with data from a population generally provided with the measure. T-scores for a given instrument and for a certain population have a

mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. This means that the vast majority (97.7%) of individuals from that same population would have a T-score less than 70. Any individual scoring higher than 70 would be considered to have an unusually high score compared to the population for which the T-scores were calculated. An unusually low T-score would be 30 or less. Frequently, a cut-off T-score of 65 is used in identifying very high scores. Only about 7% of the referent population would score higher than a T-score of 65. In the current study, the norms the T-scores are based on are Adult Non-patient Female norms. This is consistent with previous CSC research that has used the BSI with women offenders (Archambault, Stewart, Wilton, & Cousineau, 2010).

Depression, Hopelessness and Suicide Screening Form (DHS). The DHS (Mills & Kroner, 2003) is a validated 39-item self-report psychometric instrument developed to screen for depressive symptoms, hopelessness, and suicide risk indicators. Subscale scores are provided for depression, hopelessness, current suicide ideation, historical suicide and cognitive suicide. Scores for the Depression and Hopelessness subscales have established specific normative interpretative ranges for women (Mills & Kroner, 2010), with t-scores of 65 and above. This is consistent with previous CSC research that has used the DHS with women offenders (Archambault, Stewart, Wilton, & Cousineau, 2010). The DHS also includes items associated to suicidal related behaviour. The authors of the tool recommend that the endorsement of any one of the three items related to current suicidal ideation warrants a further assessment for potential risk for suicide. Two of these items relate to the cognitive permissiveness of suicide, where the endorsement of at least of these items may flag concern in this area. As well, three items relate to an offender's current suicidal ideation. Again, endorsement of at least of these items may flag concern in this area.

General Ability Measure for Adults (GAMA). The GAMA is designed to evaluate intellectual ability using abstract designs. This approach offers the advantage of providing an instrument that is accessible to a wide variety of people with different communication skills and diverse linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds. The test provides a GAMA IQ score with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. The current study examined the presence of borderline intellectual deficits, defined as GAMA scores of 85 and below.

Events occurring during period of incarceration

Several types of events occurring during the period of incarceration were examined to assess whether the different groups experienced these events at higher or lower rates than others. The types of events included institutional incidents, institutional charges, sanctions, program participation, and education/employment involvement.

Average number of institutional incidents. The role women played in incidents was considered (instigator and victim). Incidents that were accidents or medical emergencies not attributable to assaultive behaviours were excluded as there were no clear instigator or victim roles. As well, several categorizations of incidents women were involved in were considered: (1) Assault, (2) Behavioural, (3) Contraband, (4) Property, (5) Self-injury, and (6) Miscellaneous. Due to low numbers, death-related and escape-related incidents were not examined. Means were adjusted for time at risk.

Average number of institutional charges. Institutional charges are classified as being major and minor, at the time that the charge is laid, and can be mutually exclusive of institutional misconducts. Only charges for which a conviction occurred are included. Means were adjusted for time at risk.

Average number of sanctions. Institutional sanctions are classified as warnings, suspensions, fines, and other. Means were adjusted for time at risk.

Program involvement and completion. Women offenders can participate in several types of program/activities within institutions during their sentence. In the current study, involvement in programming was examined by program enrollments, program completions, program non-completions due administrative reasons (e.g. release into community, program cancelled, offender transferred, etc.), and non-completions due to offender reasons (e.g., suspension, withdrawn, program incomplete). Three categories of programs were examined: (1) correctional programs, (2) mental health interventions, and (3) social/other program. Correctional programs consists of nationally recognized programs that include, but are not limited to, Women Offender Correctional Programs (excluding Engagement programs), Violent Offender programming, Sex Offender programming, and Substance Abuse programming. Mental health interventions consist of, but are not limited to, Women Offender Surviving Abuse and Trauma, Dialectical Behavioural Therapy (DBT), Psychosocial programming, and Psychological Counselling. Social/Other programs consist of, but are not limited to, Family Violence programs, Living Skills

programs, the Mother-Child program, and Peer Support programs. As some of the programs categorized under mental health interventions and social/other programs did not have established start or end dates, only enrollments were examined.

Completion of an education program was defined as completing at least one Adult Basic Education (ABE) level. The possible certificate/diploma types include: Adult Basic Education I completion (equivalent to grade 6), Adult Basic Education II completion (equivalent to grade 8), Adult Basic Education III completion (equivalent to grade 10), or Adult Basic Education IV completion (equivalent to high school). Completion of the General Education Diploma (GED) or College of General and Vocational Education (CEGEP) was also examined. Additionally, assignments of at least 90 days to institutional employment (including CORCAN) were examined. Involvement in Indigenous-specific activities were assessed through involvement in a Section 81 Healing Lodge.

Release Outcomes

Temporary absences. Women were assessed as to whether they experienced at least one temporary absence. Of those who did, it was further explored as to whether they experienced at least one work release, escorted temporary absence, or unescorted temporary absence. Medical and administrative temporary absences were excluded from analysis.

Parole applications. Events related to parole applications were assessed, including whether women waived a release hearing⁷, postponed a release hearing, or withdrew a release application. As well, the result of their first parole hearing was examined.

Section 84 release. Women were assessed as to whether they experienced a Section 84 release into an Indigenous community.

Release type. The type of release was categorized as day parole, full parole, statutory release, and other (e.g., Warrant expiry, long term supervision order, etc.).

Any return to custody. An examination of those who had any revocation to custody occurred.

⁷ Parole waivers were excluded when they occurred on the same day as another release decision where a decision was recorded.

Appendix B: Tabular Results

Table B1
Demographic Information and Sentence Measures

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	% or <i>M</i>	% or <i>M</i>	% or <i>M</i>	% or <i>M</i>	% or <i>M</i>	% or <i>M</i>	% or <i>M</i>	% or <i>M</i>	% or <i>M</i>
Has significant other Education ^a	26.1	22.8	24.9	40.7	23.9	34.9	34.3	46.7	36.2
Has less than grade 10 or equivalent	46.0	75.0	60.1	49.3	52.9	50.5	23.6	69.6	31.8
Has less than high school diploma or equivalent	64.9	88.6	76.4	59.7	73.5	64.4	42.3	81.8	49.2
Offender age at release	33.8	32.8	33.3	36.9	33.2	35.6	40.0	35.7	39.3
First federal sentence	78.4	74.6	76.7	83.7	87.0	84.9	95.2	95.6	95.3
Sentence Length									
Three years or less	65.7	73.7	69.1	54.7	58.7	56.1	75.3	77.8	75.7
More than three years	30.6	23.7	27.7	41.9	32.6	38.6	24.7	22.2	24.3
Life sentence	3.7	†	3.2	†	†	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Offence Type									
Assault	18.9	29.5	23.7	5.8	17.4	9.9	†	†	†
Drug	16.7	9.8	13.5	43.0	17.4	34.1	55.8	46.7	54.4
Homicide-related	6.1	10.7	8.2	14.0	26.1	18.2	2.4	†	2.4
Property	9.1	8.0	8.6	12.8	10.9	12.1	28.3	13.3	26.0
Robbery	24.2	25.9	25.3	11.6	23.9	15.9	†	†	2.4
Sexual	5.3	†	4.5	†	†	†	†	0.0	†
Other violent	9.9	7.1	8.6	†	†	†	†	†	1.7
Other non-violent	9.9	5.4	7.8	7.0	0.0	4.6	8.0	24.4	10.5
Had a violent offence	64.4	76.8	70.2	37.2	71.7	49.2	8.0	15.6	9.1

Note. Ns vary within each group due to missing data.

^a Between 32% and 34% of women were missing information on the education-related DFIA-R indicators, even after restricting analysis to women admitted subsequent to the DFIA-R being implemented. Women who were missing information on these indicators had lower static and dynamic risk ratings.

†Information suppressed due to frequencies fewer than 5 in one category.

Table B2

Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) Information

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Static risk									
Low	17.2	4.4	11.2	24.4	†	18.9	66.9	46.7	63.9
Medium	49.3	43.9	47.0	58.1	41.3	52.3	28.3	42.2	30.4
High	33.6	51.8	41.8	17.4	50.0	28.8	4.8	11.1	5.7
Dynamic risk									
Low	†	0.0	†	0.0	†	†	25.1	13.3	23.3
Medium	24.6	12.3	18.9	50.0	15.2	37.9	55.4	37.8	52.7
High	73.9	87.7	80.3	50.0	82.6	61.4	19.5	48.9	24.0
Reintegration Potential									
Low	36.6	37.7	37.0	14.0	26.1	18.2	†	†	2.0
Medium	59.7	61.4	60.6	77.9	73.9	76.5	43.8	73.3	48.3
High	3.7	†	2.4	8.1	0.0	5.3	54.6	22.2	49.7
Motivation level									
Low	9.7	5.3	7.6	†	0.0	†	†	0.0	†
Medium	64.2	65.8	64.7	44.2	65.2	51.5	29.1	37.8	30.4
High	26.1	29.0	27.7	51.2	34.8	45.5	70.1	62.2	68.9
Accountability level									
Low	19.4	10.5	15.3	8.1	†	7.6	3.6	†	3.4
Medium	65.7	75.4	69.9	52.3	65.2	56.8	45.0	48.9	45.6
High	14.9	14.0	14.9	39.5	28.3	35.6	51.4	48.9	51.0
Responsivity flag	46.3	44.7	45.4	25.6	45.7	32.6	17.9	20.0	18.2
Engagement flag	82.1	88.6	85.1	91.9	97.8	93.9	97.2	97.8	97.3

Table B2 *Continued*

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
DFIA-R domains ^a									
Employment /Education need	67.2	86.8	76.4	61.5	74.4	65.9	27.1	53.3	31.1
Marital/Family need	66.4	84.2	74.8	50.6	88.4	63.5	35.9	57.8	39.2
Associates need	82.4	91.2	86.6	69.9	88.4	76.2	41.8	64.4	45.3
Substance Abuse need	84.7	94.7	89.4	69.9	100.0	80.2	37.5	68.9	42.2
Community Functioning need	57.3	56.1	56.9	41.0	51.2	44.4	13.2	22.2	14.5
Personal/Emotional need	90.8	98.3	94.3	89.2	97.7	92.1	65.3	80.0	67.6
Attitude need	74.8	69.3	72.2	44.6	60.5	50.0	31.1	20.0	29.4

Note. Ns vary within each group due to missing data. Information presented in this table is based on the first available assessment, usually done at intake. Need was determined as having a rating of “High Need for Improvement” or “Moderate Need for Improvement”.

†Information suppressed due to frequencies fewer than 5 in one category.

^a 9 women were missing information on DFIA-R domain ratings.

Table B3

Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA) Information

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
W-CASA									
Substance use severity									
None	6.8	†	4.4	21.2	†	14.6	39.4	15.9	35.9
Low	17.1	19.3	18.1	22.4	†	17.7	27.6	27.3	27.6
Moderate	18.0	16.5	17.6	12.9	22.2	16.2	12.6	13.6	12.8
Substantial	32.5	33.9	33.0	28.2	37.8	31.5	12.6	27.3	14.8
Severe	25.6	28.4	26.9	15.3	28.9	20.0	7.7	15.9	9.0
Substance abuse treatment required	76.1	83.5	79.7	56.5	88.9	67.7	32.9	59.1	36.9

Note. 30 women were missing information on the W-CASA. Information presented in this table is based on the first available assessment, usually done at intake.

†Information suppressed due to frequencies fewer than 5 in one category.

Table B4
Computerized Mental Health Intake Screening System (CoMHISS) Information

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Mental Health Indicators									
Has been diagnosed in the past with a mental disorder	60.4	59.3	60.0	49.0	80.0	56.1	29.0	27.3	28.8
Has received treatment for a mental illness or disorder	62.5	53.7	59.3	51.0	66.7	54.6	33.5	36.4	33.8
Has been hospitalized for a mental illness or disorder	27.1	46.3	34.0	23.5	†	22.7	12.4	†	12.0
ADHD Screener									
None	16.5	14.8	15.9	31.4	†	27.3	54.3	54.6	54.3
Low	14.4	13.0	13.9	15.7	†	13.6	14.2	†	14.6
Moderate	26.8	33.3	29.1	19.6	†	21.2	18.8	†	18.3
High	42.3	38.9	41.1	33.3	53.3	37.9	12.7	†	12.8
BSI-GSI ^a									
t-score ≥ 65	48.3	46.0	47.5	35.8	42.9	37.5	15.4	22.7	16.1
DHS: Depression									
t-score ≥ 65	13.8	15.6	14.4	13.4	23.8	15.9	3.3	†	3.8
DHS: Hopelessness									
t-score ≥ 65	25.0	20.3	23.3	9.0	†	10.2	2.4	†	3.0
DHS: Current Suicidal Ideation	11.2	14.1	12.2	†	0.0	†	†	†	2.1
DHS: Cognitive Suicide Indicators	16.4	14.1	15.6	9.0	0.0	6.8	6.6	†	6.8
Borderline intellectual deficit ^b	49.5	51.9	50.3	21.6	40.0	25.8	18.8	22.7	19.2

Note. Ns vary due to missing data. Information presented in this table is based on the first available assessment, usually done at intake. Approximately 25% of women were missing mental health assessment information, even after restricting analysis to women admitted subsequent to version 1 and version 2 of the CoMHISS when necessary. Women missing information on the CoMHISS tended to have higher static and dynamic risk ratings.

†Information suppressed due to frequencies fewer than 5 in one category.

BSI-GSI = Brief Symptom Inventory Global Severity Index. DHS = Depression Hopelessness and Suicide Screening Form.

^at-scores are based on adult non-patient female norms. ^bBorderline intellectual deficit was defined as having an IQ score of 85 and below.

Table B5

Rate of Incidents, Charges, and Sanctions

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
Incidents									
Average number incidents as a victim	0.28	0.34	0.31	0.20	0.10	0.16	0.07	0.03	0.06
Average number of incidents as an instigator	3.70	2.83	3.30	0.82	0.91	0.86	0.31	0.43	0.32
Average number of involvements in:									
Assault incidents	0.85	1.02	0.92	0.26	0.23	0.24	0.10	0.05	0.09
Behavioural incidents	1.39	1.46	1.42	0.42	0.46	0.44	0.08	0.30	0.11
Contraband incidents	0.57	0.45	0.52	0.28	0.38	0.32	0.12	0.23	0.13
Property incidents	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01
Self-injury incidents	1.18	0.44	0.84	0.06	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.05
Misc. incidents	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.43	0.47	0.29	0.10	0.26
Charges									
Average number of minor charges	2.76	3.40	3.05	0.81	1.39	1.04	0.25	0.28	0.25
Median days until first minor charge	107.0	133.0	124.0	114.0	101.5	114.0	114.5	184.0	120.0
Average number of serious charges	1.08	1.00	1.04	0.18	0.33	0.24	0.06	0.13	0.07
Median days until first serious charge	144.0	126.0	134.0	120.0	156.0	120.0	171.0	65.0	170.0

Table B5 *Continued*

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
Sanctions									
Average number of warnings	0.48	0.76	0.61	0.31	0.34	0.32	0.12	0.15	0.12
Average number of suspensions	0.75	0.55	0.66	0.11	0.15	0.13	0.04	0.08	0.04
Average number of fines	2.11	2.01	2.06	0.44	0.88	0.61	0.13	0.15	0.13
Average number of other sanctions	0.39	0.66	0.51	0.08	0.27	0.15	0.02	0.00	0.02

Note. Means are adjusted for time incarcerated and it is estimated on a per year basis.

Table B6

Average Involvement in Correctional Programs, Mental Health Interventions, and Social/Other Programs

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non- Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
Correctional programming									
Mean number of enrollments	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8	2.1	1.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
Of those who enrolled:									
Mean percentage of completed programs	76.8%	71.1%	74.2%	90.0%	88.2%	89.3%	90.8%	95.7%	91.6%
Mean percentage of programs not completed due to offender reasons	18.6%	18.9%	18.7%	6.8%	3.8%	5.7%	3.8%	0.0%	3.2%
Mean percentage of programs not completed due to administrative reasons	4.7%	9.9%	7.1%	3.2%	8.0%	5.0%	5.4%	4.3%	5.2%
Mental health interventions^a									
Mean number of enrollments	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.8	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.1
Social/other programming^{a b}									
Mean number of enrollments	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.7	1.4	1.0	0.3	0.4	0.3

Note. Additional analyses examining the rate of involvement in programming, controlling for time incarcerated, found similar results; however, differences emerged regarding correctional programming. Women always in minimum security had the highest rates of enrollment and completion in comparison to the least likely to enroll or complete at least one correctional program as seen above.

^aAs many programs that were categorized under mental health interventions and social/other programs did not have established start and end dates, only the average number of enrollments were considered.

^b Due to operational changes by institution and over time, results should be interpreted with caution.

Table B7
Healing Lodge Information

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Transferred to a Section 81 Healing Lodge	†	17.5	8.8	9.3	60.9	27.3	3.6	31.1	7.8

†Information suppressed due to frequencies fewer than 5 in one category.

Table B8
Involvement in Any Education and Employment Activities

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 132)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 296)		
	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Education									
Any ABE level	43.3	65.8	53.8	59.3	65.2	61.4	27.5	37.8	29.1
Any GED or CEGEP	13.4	†	8.8	†	0.0	†	6.0	†	6.4
Employment									
At least one CORCAN assignment of 90 days or more	17.2	7.9	12.9	20.9	17.4	19.7	10.0	11.1	10.1
At least one CSC employment assignment of 90 days or more	46.3	49.1	47.8	59.3	65.2	61.4	35.9	33.3	35.5

†Information suppressed due to frequencies fewer than 5 in one category.

Table B9

Release-Related Information

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (N = 249)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (N = 132)			Always minimum security (N = 296)		
	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Temporary absences									
Had any TA	29.1	32.5	30.9	89.5	97.8	92.4	75.3	80.0	76.0
Had any work release	†	†	†	15.6	31.1	21.3	10.6	13.9	11.1
Had any ETA	94.9	97.3	96.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.9	100.0	98.2
Had any UTA	†	†	7.8	31.2	20.0	27.1	32.8	36.1	33.3
Parole Waivers									
Waived a release hearing	73.9	80.7	76.7	61.6	69.6	64.4	22.3	20.0	22.0
Had a postponed release hearing	32.1	28.1	30.1	44.2	41.3	43.2	24.3	24.4	24.3
Withdrew a release application	19.4	22.8	20.9	11.6	17.4	13.6	4.4	†	4.4
First parole decision									
Denied	29.8	38.3	33.3	16.9	23.8	19.5	24.7	20.5	24.0
Granted	33.3	29.8	32.4	57.8	57.1	57.5	57.0	61.4	57.7
Other	36.8	31.9	34.3	25.4	19.1	23.0	18.3	18.2	18.3
Section 84 release	0.0	4.4	2.0	†	30.4	12.9	4.4	33.3	8.8
Average proportion of sentence served before release	60.3	61.8	60.8	50.9	49.2	50.3	33.6	33.9	33.6
Discretionary Release	23.9	15.8	20.5	72.1	73.9	72.7	90.8	86.7	90.2

†Information suppressed due to frequencies fewer than 5 in one category.

Table B10

Revocation Information

	Did not cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 241)			Did cascade to minimum security by release (<i>N</i> = 129)			Always minimum security (<i>N</i> = 292)		
	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	All Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Any return to custody	34.6	55.5	44.0	23.8	44.4	31.0	13.8	26.7	15.8

Note. 15 cases were removed because the reasons for their return to custody were not relevant to the current analysis (e.g., return on previous outstanding charge).