

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Adjustment of the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS): Elimination of the Administrative Segregation Item

2019 N° R-432

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.

Adjustment of the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS): Elimination of the Administrative Segregation Item

Shanna Farrell MacDonald

Angela Smeth

Rebecca Sullivan

&

Dena Derkzen

Correctional Service of Canada

September 2019

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to extend their appreciation to Kaitlyn Wardrop for her methodological consultation and overall support throughout this project. Thanks as well to Bruno Jean and Leslie-Anne Keown for their support of the current methodology. The methodology feedback from Marty Maltby, Aboriginal Initiatives Directorate, and Lyne Cholette and Dania Khanafer, Correctional Operations and Programs, was greatly appreciated. Finally, thanks to Cindy Cooper-Johnson and Paul Squires from the Offender Management System group for flexibility on the timelines for this project.

Executive Summary

Key words: *security reclassification, Indigenous offenders, revalidation, reliability, validity*

The Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) is a research-based tool designed by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) to help caseworkers determine the most appropriate level of security for an offender. More specifically, it includes factors related to institutional adjustment, escape risk, and public safety concerns. As administrative segregation policy has changed over the last few years, and with the elimination of administrative segregation with the impending passage of Bill C-83, this study examined the impact of dropping the segregation item on the validity of the SRS.

This study used the dataset from the recent revalidation of the SRS (Farrell MacDonald, Beauchamp, Conley, Cociu, & Scott, 2018). Overall, 6,281 SRS assessments were examined for the study period from April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2016. These assessments represented 5,433 federal men offenders. For the purpose of this study, the dataset were randomly divided into construction ($N = 3,141$) and validation ($N = 3,140$) samples. Indigenous offenders accounted for 28% of each of the two samples. Revalidation analyses examined the modified scale's reliability, convergent validity, and the prediction of relevant outcomes (e.g., offender security level, disciplinary charges and post-release outcomes).

The results demonstrated that the adjusted SRS is a reliable and valid tool for the security reclassification process, for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. The adjusted SRS scores and cut-offs ensured that a comparable proportion of men offenders were identified as minimum, medium, and maximum security compared to the original SRS. The overall concordance for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders between the original and adjusted SRS was 88.6% and 88.9%, respectively, indicating the revised scores and cut-offs are suitable for both groups.

Convergent validity analyses indicated that the adjusted SRS continues to have moderate associations with other offender risk and need measures, which were comparable for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. In terms of predictive validity, the results demonstrated that the adjusted SRS assessed level was predictive of offender security level, disciplinary charges, the rates of discretionary release, and returns to custody, with and without an offence. Finally, all of the findings in this research were replicated with the validation sample, thereby reinforcing the consistency of the findings.

It is recommended that the adjusted SRS cut-offs identified in this study be integrated into the OMS algorithm for security reclassification. Additional factors such as Aboriginal Social History, institutional adjustment, escape risk, and risk to public safety will still be taken into consideration by CSC staff prior to the final security placement decision being made. Overall, on-going use of this tool is supported by the findings of this study.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
List of Appendices.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Method.....	2
Study Cohort.....	2
Security Reclassification Scale.....	2
Data Sources.....	3
Analysis.....	3
Results.....	5
Adjusted SRS Score and Revision of Cut-off Scores.....	5
Adjusted SRS and Concordance with the Original SRS and Caseworker Recommendation.....	7
Reliability of the Adjusted SRS.....	9
Validity of the Adjusted SRS.....	10
Overview of Findings.....	14
Conclusions.....	16
References.....	17

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Segregation period across the original SRS assessed security level for the construction sample</i>	5
Table 2 <i>Comparison of original and adjusted SRS score security level cut-offs</i>	6
Table 3 <i>Mean scores and assessed security levels for the original and adjusted SRS scores for the construction sample</i>	7
Table 4 <i>Association between the adjusted SRS level compared to the original SRS assessed level and caseworker recommendation for the construction sample</i>	8
Table 5 <i>Standardized SRS item-to-total correlations and descriptive statistics for the adjusted SRS, based on the construction sample</i>	9
Table 6 <i>Cramer's V association between the adjusted SRS assessed level, offender security level placement, and measure of risk and need for men offenders in the construction sample</i>	10
Table 7 <i>Association between the adjusted SRS level compared to the offender security level placement for the construction sample</i>	12
Table 8 <i>Rates of disciplinary charges, discretionary release, and returns to custody between the adjusted SRS assessed level and the offender security level for men offenders in the construction sample</i>	13

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic, Sentence, Offence and Criminogenic Characteristics of the Construction and Validation Samples.....	18
Appendix B: Adjusted Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) Items and Weighting.....	23
Appendix C: Calculation of Adjusted SRS score cut-offs.....	25
Appendix D: Analysis for the Validation Sample	27
Appendix E: Supplementary Analysis for the Construction Sample.....	35

Introduction

Classification and reclassification systems play an integral role in the correctional environments both at the institutional and offender level. The Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) is a research-based tool designed by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) to help caseworkers determine the most appropriate level of security for an offender (Commissioner's Directive (CD) 710-6) and to assess behavioural progress and outcomes following 12 months of incarceration (CSC, 2014; 2018a). More specifically, it includes factors related to institutional adjustment, escape risk, and public safety concerns.

As administrative segregation policy has changed over the last few years, and with the elimination of administrative segregation with the expected passage of Bill C-83, it is important to examine the impact of dropping the segregation indicator on the validity of the SRS. This study will examine the modified scale's reliability, convergent validity, and the prediction of relevant outcomes (e.g., offender security level, institutional charges and post-release outcomes). This research will also examine whether the adjusted SRS is appropriate and effective in conducting security reviews for various sub-populations. Analyses will be conducted separately for Indigenous men and non-Indigenous men.

This research continues an ongoing commitment to re-examine the validity of key case management assessment tools used within CSC. The following research questions will be examined:

- 1) What is the impact of dropping the administrative segregation item in the SRS?
- 2) What is the reliability and consistency of the adjusted SRS across decision-making points (SRS assessed levels vs. caseworker recommendations) for incarcerated, male Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders?
- 3) Is the adjusted SRS a valid measure of security reclassification for incarcerated, male Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders?
 - a. Does the adjusted SRS demonstrate convergent validity with risk, need, reintegration potential, and the criminal risk index?
 - b. Does the adjusted SRS predict offender security level, disciplinary offences, discretionary releases or revocations?

Method

Study Cohort

This study used the dataset from the recent revalidation of the SRS (Farrell MacDonald, Beauchamp, Conley, Cociu, & Scott, 2018). The data were extracted from CSC's Offender Management System (OMS), an automated data management system that contains information on offenders from admission through to warrant expiry. Overall, 6,281 SRS assessments were completed for the period from April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2016, representing 5,433 federal men offenders. Overall, 74% of offenders had one assessment while 21% had two, 4% had three, and 1% had four assessments. SRS assessments for Indigenous offenders accounted for 28%¹ ($n = 1,755$) of all assessments and 27% ($n = 1,493$) of all offenders. Indigenous offenders were slightly more likely to have multiple assessments during the study period than non-Indigenous offenders (28% versus 25%, respectively).

For the purpose of this study, the dataset were randomly divided into construction ($N = 3,141$) and validation ($N = 3,140$) samples. Indigenous offenders accounted for 28% of each of the two samples. Demographic, sentence, offence and criminogenic information for the samples are presented in Appendix A.

Security Reclassification Scale

The current SRS is a 15-item actuarial security reclassification tool implemented in 1998 for men offenders (CSC, 2001; Luciani et al., 1998). With the removal of the *segregation period* item from the assessment, to align with Bill C-83, the overall SRS score was adjusted and revising of the cut-off scores for the security reclassification level of *minimum*, *medium* or *maximum* was necessary. The weighting for the remaining fourteen items in the SRS are shown in Table B1, Appendix B.

During the study period, the SRS was completed as part of the SRS review process at least once every two years for offenders classified as medium or maximum security as well as prior to events that demonstrate a potential change in security classification such as transfers, temporary absences/work releases, or parole (CSC, 2014). Minimum security offenders underwent security reclassification reviews prior to events indicating a potential change in

¹ Nineteen percent of assessments were for First Nations offenders while 7% were for Métis and 1% for Inuit men offenders.

security (same events mentioned for medium/maximum security). As part of the SRS review process, the *Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations (CCRR, 1992)* requires CSC staff to take into account factors such as Aboriginal Social History, the seriousness of the offence, and the offender's physical or mental health issues (Section 17) and assess the offender's overall institutional adjustment, escape risk, and risk to public safety (Section 18) in addition to the assessed level computed by the SRS tool. All of these indicators inform the final security classification level or actual placement decision (CSC, 2014; 2018a).

Data Sources

Data were extracted at both the event level (i.e., all SRS assessments) and the offender level (i.e., unique offenders) to take into account multiple assessments per offender. Event level data obtained from OMS included all SRS assessments that occurred according to CSC policy², SRS scores, security level classification assessed by the SRS, staff recommended security level (caseworker recommendation), final offender security level (actual placement), and an adjusted SRS score, accounting for the removal of the segregation period item.

Offender level data extracted from OMS included information on demographics (age at the assessment, ethnicity, marital status), offence type and sentence related information (e.g., sentence term, sentence length), as well as static factor rating (risk), dynamic factor rating (need), and reintegration potential from the Offender Intake Assessment (CSC, 2018b) updated prior to SRS administration, and the Criminal Risk Index (CRI; Motiuk & Vuong, 2018). Initial security level obtained from the CRS and initial offender security placement were also included, as was information related to disciplinary charges (minor and serious), release (day/full parole versus statutory release/long-term supervision orders), and returns to custody.

Analysis

As all SRS assessments during the study period were used, inferential statistics were not suitable. The majority of the analyses conducted were descriptive in nature (e.g., frequency distributions as well as means and standard deviation). Bivariate analyses were used to examine concordance between SRS assessed levels, adjusted SRS levels, caseworker recommendations for security classification, and offender security level (actual security placement). Cramer's *V*

² Out of policy assessments include SRS assessments completed mistakenly in place of the CRS at time of intake or return to custody. These assessments were not included in the study.

was used to determine the level of association between the variables examined. Analyses were conducted for all men offenders, as well as separately for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders.

An adjusted SRS score was calculated by removing the value of the segregation period item from the current SRS score. The segregation item had a possible score of 0.5 for no placements and 3.0 for placements. Adjusted scores ranged from 9.5 to 32 for the both the construction and validation samples. Cut-off scores for the three security levels were determined by maximizing the degree of concordance with the original and adjusted security level classifications based on the original and adjusted scores, which ensured balanced discordance levels between those that increased and decreased the assessed security level.

Revalidation analyses examined the reliability, convergent validity, and predictive validity of the SRS assessment. To assess reliability, Cronbach's alpha and item-to-total correlations were examined. Convergent validity was analysed by comparing the SRS assessed level with other measures of offender risk: the static factor rating, the dynamic factor rating, reintegration potential, and the CRI. Predictive validity was assessed by comparing the bivariate relationship between the adjusted SRS assessed level with the offender security level and whether the offender committed a disciplinary offence, had a discretionary release, or had their conditional release revoked. In order to account for time at risk for both disciplinary charges and returns to custody, survival analysis was used to determine the association with the outcomes of interest. Area under the curve was used to determine the predictive validity for disciplinary offences, discretionary releases, and revocations of release. To adjust for multiple assessments completed³, one assessment per offender was randomly selected for the convergent and predictive validity analyses.

³ Lack of independence of the SRS events was identified due to some offenders having multiple SRS assessments during the study period. The Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was calculated, which assessed the correlation between events clustered per individual as well as the correlation between individuals in the study (Yadav & Agarwal, 2013). Overall, for the construction sample, the ICC was 0.68 (0.73 for Indigenous and 0.67 for non-Indigenous offenders), indicating a moderate level of homogeneity for offenders with multiple assessments. Therefore, to minimize the potential bias on standard error estimates, one assessment per offender was selected for reliability and validity analyses.

Results

Adjusted SRS Score and Revision of Cut-off Scores

To adjust the SRS score, the weighted value of segregation was removed from the assessed SRS score (0.5 for those that did not have a segregation period and 3.0 for those that had one or more). Table 1 indicates the proportion across the original SRS assessed levels who had one or more periods of segregation during the review period. Very few offenders assessed as minimum had segregation periods during the review period compared to those assessed as medium or maximum (2% versus 50% and 98%, respectively). Therefore, the adjusted SRS score for minimum were closer to the original SRS score than those for the medium or maximum scores.

Table 1
Segregation period across the original SRS assessed security level for the construction sample

SRS Assessed Level	No Segregation Period	One or More Segregation Periods
	% (n)	% (n)
Minimum	98 (706)	2 (17)
Medium	50 (991)	50 (991)
Maximum	2 (8)	98 (428)

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale.

Table 2 presents the original SRS and adjusted SRS security level cut-offs. The calculations of ranges and percentages across assessed security level, as well as additional cut-offs options explored, are in Appendix C. The original SRS has a total range of score of 25 (10 to 35) based on scoring weights. Removal of the segregation period item reduced the overall scoring range to 22.5.

Table 2

Comparison of original and adjusted SRS score security level cut-offs

SRS Assessed Level	Original SRS Cut-offs	Adjusted SRS Cut-offs
Minimum	10 to 16.5	9.5 to 15.5
Medium	17 to 26.5	16.0 to 24.0
Maximum	27 to 35	24.5 to 32

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale.

Table 3 compares the original SRS and adjusted SRS mean scores across assessed security level for the construction sample. All analyses for the validation sample are in Appendix D and provide similar results. Overall, changes in the average score for minimum offenders was reduced by 0.8 while the mean scores for medium was 1.7 lower and 2.6 lower for maximum. Analyses by Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders are included in Table 3 and demonstrate comparable findings. The proportion of offenders assessed as medium security changes slightly between the original and adjusted SRS (63% versus 67%, respectively – see Table 3), but shows equitable impact on minimum and maximum assessed security levels.

Table 3

Mean scores and assessed security levels for the original and adjusted SRS scores for the construction sample

Mean SRS scores across Security Level <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)						
Assessed Security Level	Original SRS			Adjusted SRS		
	All Men	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men	All Men	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men
Minimum	15.3 (1.0)	15.2 (1.0)	15.3 (1.0)	14.5 (0.9)	14.4 (0.9)	14.5 (0.9)
Medium	21.8 (3.0)	21.9 (3.1)	21.8 (2.9)	20.1 (2.5)	20.1 (2.6)	20.1 (2.5)
Maximum	28.4 (1.4)	28.6 (1.6)	28.3 (1.3)	25.8 (1.3)	26.0 (1.5)	25.8 (1.2)
Total	21.2 (4.6)	21.1 (4.8)	21.3 (4.6)	19.6 (3.8)	19.5 (4.1)	19.6 (3.7)

SRS Assessed Levels % (<i>n</i>)						
Assessed Security Level	Original SRS			Adjusted SRS		
	All Men	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men	All Men	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men
Minimum	23 (723)	25 (225)	22 (498)	21 (652)	24 (208)	20 (444)
Medium	63 (1,982)	61 (533)	64 (1,449)	67 (2,119)	63 (556)	69 (1,563)
Maximum	14 (436)	14 (120)	14 (316)	12 (370)	13 (114)	11 (256)

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard Deviation.

Adjusted SRS and Concordance with the Original SRS and Caseworker Recommendation

Examination of concordance between the original and adjusted SRS cut-offs indicate 88.8% agreement with 5.7% assessed on the adjusted SRS to a higher security level and 5.5% assessed to a lower security level. This method provides a sufficient balance between overall concordance as well as the proportion of assessed security level to a higher or lower designation. Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders analyses demonstrate comparable results (Indigenous: concordance 88.5%, 6.4% up and 5.1% down; non-Indigenous: concordance 88.9%, 5.4% up and 5.7% down). Table 4 compares the adjusted SRS assessed level with the original SRS assessed level and the caseworker recommendation There is a strong association between the adjusted SRS and the two decision points examined.

Table 4

Association between the adjusted SRS level compared to the original SRS assessed level and caseworker recommendation for the construction sample

	Indigenous Offenders				Non-Indigenous Offenders				All Men Offenders			
	Adjusted SRS Level % (n)			Cramer's V	Adjusted SRS Level % (n)			Cramer's V	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level % (n)			Cramer's V
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum	
Original SRS Assessed Level				0.80				0.79				0.79
<i>Minimum</i>	90 (188)	7 (37)	0 (0)		91 (403)	6 (95)	0 (0)		91 (591)	6 (132)	0 (0)	
<i>Medium</i>	10 (20)	89 (494)	17 (19)		9 (41)	88 (1,380)	11 (28)		9 (61)	88 (1,874)	13 (47)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	4 (25)	83 (95)		0 (0)	6 (88)	89 (228)		0 (0)	5 (113)	87 (323)	
Caseworker Recommended Security Level				0.65				0.63				0.64
<i>Minimum</i>	90 (188)	11 (61)	0 (0)		89 (394)	9 (141)	0 (0)		89 (582)	10 (202)	0 (0)	
<i>Medium</i>	10 (20)	71 (394)	20 (23)		11 (50)	73 (1,143)	20 (52)		11 (70)	73 (1,534)	20 (75)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	18 (101)	80 (91)		0 (0)	18 (279)	80 (204)		0 (0)	18 (380)	80 (295)	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. Overall, 3,141 SRS assessments were examined for all men offenders in the construction sample; 878 were for Indigenous offenders and 2,263 were for non-Indigenous offenders. For every SRS assessment, CSC staff (caseworker) make a recommendation concerning the final security placement, which may not agree with the SRS assessed level. The institutional head then uses both the SRS assessed level and the caseworker recommendation, which includes a clinical appraisal of various offender-specific factors including Aboriginal Social History, to come to a final placement decision. The final decision may or may not align with either the SRS assessed level or the caseworker recommendation. It is important to note that the caseworker recommendation included consideration of segregation placements, which the adjusted SRS level excludes.

Reliability of the Adjusted SRS

To assess the reliability of the adjusted SRS assessment score, Cronbach's alpha and standardized item-to-total correlations (see Table 5) were used. The internal consistency of the adjusted SRS for all men offenders is $\alpha = 0.64$, while it is $\alpha = 0.68$ for Indigenous offenders and $\alpha = 0.63$ for non-Indigenous offenders. This indicates sufficient homogeneity of the assessment. The correlations indicate a weak to moderate association with the total score, indicating sufficient reliability for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders.

Table 5

Standardized SRS item-to-total correlations and descriptive statistics for the adjusted SRS, based on the construction sample

SRS Items	Indigenous Offenders		Non-Indigenous Offenders		All Men Offenders	
	<i>r</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Serious Disciplinary Offences	0.43	0.7 (0.4)	0.38	0.7 (0.4)	0.40	0.7 (0.4)
Minor Disciplinary Offences	0.24	0.5 (0.1)	0.32	0.6 (0.2)	0.30	0.6 (0.2)
Recorded Incidents	0.50	1.5 (1.0)	0.40	1.5 (1.0)	0.43	1.5 (1.0)
Pay Grade	0.33	0.8 (0.2)	0.39	0.8 (0.2)	0.37	0.8 (0.2)
Detention Referral	0.17	0.9 (0.7)	0.05	0.8 (0.6)	0.09	0.8 (0.6)
Correctional Plan Progress	0.48	3.7 (0.9)	0.44	3.8 (1.0)	0.45	3.8 (1.0)
Correctional Plan Motivation	0.57	3.6 (1.4)	0.49	3.9 (1.5)	0.51	3.8 (1.5)
Drug and Alcohol Rating	0.21	1.0 (0.3)	0.22	0.9 (0.4)	0.21	0.9 (0.4)
Successful ETA Releases	0.26	2.3 (0.6)	0.16	2.4 (0.3)	0.19	2.4 (0.4)
Successful UTA/Work Releases	0.08	1.0 (0.04)	0.11	1.0 (0.04)	0.10	1.0 (0.04)
Age at Review	0.11	0.7 (0.2)	0.10	0.7 (0.2)	0.11	0.7 (0.2)
Psychological Concerns	0.19	0.7 (0.4)	0.12	0.7 (0.4)	0.15	0.7 (0.4)
CRS Escape History	0.09	0.5 (0.1)	0.07	0.5 (0.1)	0.08	0.5 (0.1)
CRS Incident History	0.29	1.4 (0.8)	0.34	1.3 (0.8)	0.33	1.3 (0.8)

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. ETA = Escorted Temporary Absences. UTA = Unescorted Temporary Absences. CRS = Custody Rating Scale.

Validity of the Adjusted SRS

Convergent Validity

To account for the potential impact of multiple SRS assessments per offender, one assessment was randomly chosen for each offender to examine the convergent and predictive validity of the adjusted SRS score. Appendix E (Tables E1 and E2) contains the cross-tabulation analysis for the construction sample regarding the adjusted SRS and offender security level placements.

Table 6 indicates that both the adjusted SRS and the offender security level placements have a strong association with measures of risk, specifically the static factor rating, dynamic factor rating, reintegration potential, and the CRI. In fact, the dynamic measures (dynamic factor rating and reintegration potential) have stronger associations than the static ratings. This pattern is evident for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders (see Table 6).

Table 6

Cramer's V association between the adjusted SRS assessed level, offender security level placement, and measure of risk and need for men offenders in the construction sample

Measure	Cramer's V Strength of Association					
	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level ^{a,b}			Offende Security Level Placement ^{a,b}		
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	All Men	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	All Men
Static Risk ^a	0.24	0.16	0.18	0.26	0.19	0.20
Dynamic Need ^{a,b}	0.29	0.31	0.30	0.32	0.33	0.32
Reintegration Potential ^b	0.40	0.37	0.37	0.43	0.38	0.39
CRI ^a	0.22	0.16	0.16	0.23	0.19	0.19

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. ^a Cramer's V between 0.1 and 0.3 indicates a weak association. ^b Cramer's V between 0.3 and 0.5 indicates a moderate association.

Predictive Validity

To assess the predictive validity of the SRS for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous men, offender security level placement, disciplinary charges (serious and minor), discretionary release, and any return to custody (with or without offence) on conditional release (i.e., day parole, full parole, statutory release, or long-term supervision order) were examined. As with the analysis for convergent validity, one assessment per offender was randomly selected for these analyses.

Table 7 examines the concordance between the adjusted SRS level and the offender security level placement. Overall, there is a high concordance level with 77% of the adjusted

SRS assessed levels aligning with the offender security level placement. A smaller proportion of adjusted SRS levels would identify the a higher security placement compared to a lower security placement (9% versus 14%, respectively). These findings were comparable for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders, with a concordance rate of 77% between the adjusted SRS level and the offender security level placement for each group.

As shown in Table 8, both the adjusted SRS assessed level and the offender security level placement were predictive of disciplinary charges, the rates of discretionary release, and returns to custody, with and without an offence. As security level increased, the rate of disciplinary charges increased, even after accounting for time at risk. With respect to discretionary release, offenders at lower security levels were more likely to be granted this type of release. Offenders with higher security level on the adjusted SRS assessment or the offender security level placement were also more likely to return to custody, including when a return with a new offence was examined. The pattern was comparable for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders for all indicators examined (see Appendix E, Tables E3 and E4).

Table 7

Association between the adjusted SRS level compared to the offender security level placement for the construction sample

	Indigenous Offenders				Non-Indigenous Offenders				All Men Offenders			
	Adjusted SRS Level % (n)			Cramer's V	Adjusted SRS Level % (n)			Cramer's V	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level % (n)			Cramer's V
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum	
Offender Security Level Placement	0.64				0.62				0.64			
<i>Minimum</i>	88 (184)	11 (62)	0 (0)		87 (385)	9 (139)	0 (0)		87 (569)	9 (201)	0 (0)	
<i>Medium</i>	12 (24)	71 (394)	21 (24)		13 (58)	74 (1,154)	22 (57)		13 (82)	73 (1,548)	22 (81)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	18 (100)	79 (90)		0.04 (1)	17 (270)	78 (199)		0.2 (1)	18 (370)	78 (289)	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. It is important to note that the offender security level placement included consideration of segregation placements, which the adjusted SRS level excludes. Also, the one offender who had an offender security level placement of maximum but would be identified as minimum based on the adjusted SRS level had a medium score at the lower end of the original SRS medium range but was placed in maximum due to institutional security concerns related to a violent incident.

Table 8

Rates of disciplinary charges, discretionary release, and returns to custody between the adjusted SRS assessed level and the offender security level for men offenders in the construction sample

Predictive Validity Indicator	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level			Offender Security Level Placement		
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Minimum	Medium	Maximum
Disciplinary Charges						
% (<i>n</i>)***	26 (152)	40 (727)	63 (197)	26 (178)	40 (585)	58 (313)
HR	(ref)	1.46***	2.91***	(ref)	1.52***	2.89***
AUC		0.60			0.62	
Discretionary Release						
% (<i>n</i>)***	61 (304)	39 (195)	0.4 (2)	73 (367)	27 (134)	0 (0)
AUC		0.75			0.81	
Return to Custody						
% (<i>n</i>)***	29 (151)	44 (530)	68 (111)	28 (178)	43 (400)	61 (214)
HR	(ref)	2.20***	5.01***	(ref)	2.19***	4.17***
AUC		0.60			0.62	
Return with New Offence						
% (<i>n</i>)	5 (24)**	6 (77)**	12 (19)**	5 (31) ^{n.s.}	6 (59) ^{n.s.}	9 (30) ^{n.s.}
HR	(ref)	2.04**	5.54***	(ref)	1.87**	3.41***
AUC		0.57			0.55	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. AUC = Area under the curve. n.s.= not significant. *** < .0001

Overview of Findings

This study demonstrates that the adjusted SRS is a reliable and valid tool for the security reclassification process, for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. Legislative, judicial, and operational changes to the use of administrative segregation has required the modification of the SRS by dropping the administrative segregation item. Optimizing the balance between overall concordance and equal proportions of upper and lower inconsistencies between the adjusted and original SRS had provided adjusted score cut-offs that align in 88.8% of cases. The adjusted SRS scores and cut-offs ensure that a comparable proportion of men offenders are identified as minimum, medium, and maximum security compared to the original SRS. In addition, the overall concordance for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders between the original and adjusted SRS was 88.6% and 88.9%, respectively, indicating the adjusted scores and cut-offs are suitable for both groups. Overall, about two-thirds of offenders, regardless of Indigenous ancestry, were identified as medium security based on the adjusted SRS.

Comparison of the adjusted SRS with the caseworker recommendation and offender security level placement showed sufficient agreement (about 77%) between the decision points after dropping the segregation item. Although having inconsistent security ratings over 20% is not recommended in the literature (Austin & Hardyman, 2004), it is important to identify that the caseworker recommendation and offender security level placements would have taken segregation periods into consideration when identifying the security classification, therefore for the purposes of adjusting the SRS score and cut-offs, this level of agreement is sufficient.

Analyses examining the reliability of the adjusted SRS indicate that the tool continues to be reliable for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders based on the Cronbach's alpha and the item-to-total correlation analyses. For instance, the item-to-total correlations for the adjusted SRS were very similar to those for the original SRS (see Table 7 in Farrell MacDonald, et al., 2018). Also, although the Cronbach's alpha lowered slightly (from 0.68 for the original SRS to 0.64 for the adjusted SRS), this is likely due to the dropping of the segregation period item than to heterogeneity within the assessment, as internal consistency values can decrease after the reduction of assessment items (Cortina, 1993).

Finally, convergent validity analyses indicated that the adjusted SRS continues to have moderate associations with other offender risk and need measures, particularly with the dynamic

factor rating and reintegration potential. As with the other results of the study, these findings were comparable for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. In terms of predictive validity, the adjusted SRS aligns with the offender security level placement in 77% of cases. As well, the adjusted SRS levels continue to support the relationship between higher security classification and poorer institutional behaviour. Offenders in maximum security were most likely to have disciplinary charges and to return to custody during release, with or without an offence. These findings were maintained even after accounting for time at risk. As well, they were less likely to be granted discretionary release than their minimum and medium counterparts. Finally, all of the findings in this research was replicated with the validation sample, thereby reinforcing the consistency of the findings.

Although the adjusted SRS continues to function well as a security reclassification tool, future research will be needed in this area. For instance, over the last few years, the use of administrative segregation within CSC has decreased and other population management strategies have been employed, such as involuntary transfers and unscheduled security reclassifications, in order to manage offenders who pose security threats to themselves or others within the institution. Replicating this study in a few years once administrative segregation is completely removed from CSC institutions will be necessary to revalidate the adjusted SRS, thereby allowing for sufficient time to examine other population management strategies on offender security reclassification.

In addition, future examination of the adjusted SRS should consider other possible indicators to replace the segregation period item in the long term. Exploring the inclusion of potential options, such as involuntary transfers, involvement in violent and drug related incidents, or security threat group association, may provide additional information to adequately identify security reclassification levels. It would be of benefit to examine whether involvement in cultural interventions for Indigenous offenders, such as Pathways or Aboriginal Intervention Centres, would be protective factors for determining the appropriate security classification level. With the passing of Bill C-83 by the Government of Canada, and the creation of Structured Intervention Units, the examination of whether offender involvement in these units plays a role in security reclassification for the Service should be undertaken. Finally, based on all of the operational and policy changes, it will be necessary to determine if the current weighting of items in the adjusted SRS are maintained or also need to be modified.

Conclusions

It is recommended that the adjusted SRS cut-offs identified in this study be integrated into the OMS algorithm for security reclassification. The adjusted SRS continues to be a reliable and valid tool for men offender security reclassification, for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. Additional factors such as Aboriginal Social History, institutional adjustment, escape risk, and risk to public safety will still be taken into consideration by CSC staff prior to the final offender security level placement decision being made. Overall, on-going use of this tool is supported by the findings of this study.

References

- Austin, J. & Hardyman, P.L. (2004). Objective prison classification: A guide for correctional agencies. *National Institute of Corrections*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (1992). *Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations [CCRR]*. (SOR/92-620). Retrieved from <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-92-620/page-2.html#h-11>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2001). *Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) functional specification version 4.0.3*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2014). *Commissioner's Directive 710-6: Review of inmate security classification*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2018a). *Commissioner's Directive 710-6: Review of inmate security classification*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2018b). *Commissioner's Directive 705-6: Correctional planning and criminal profile*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98-104.
- Farrell MacDonald, S., Beauchamp, T., Conley, C., Cociu, L., & Scott, T. (2018). *Revalidation of the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS; R-414)*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Luciani, F., Taylor, G., & Motiuk, L.L. (1998). *National field test results of the security reclassification protocol: Final report* (unpublished Manuscript). Ottawa: ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Motiuk, L., & Vuong, B. (2018). *Development and validation of a Criminal Risk Index (CRI) for federally sentenced offenders in Canada (R-403)*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Yadav, M. K., & Agarwal, G. G. (2013). On estimation of standard error of intra-class correlation coefficient in unbalanced nested designs. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 42(1), 88-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610926.2011.575513>.

Appendix A: Demographic, Sentence, Offence and Criminogenic Characteristics of the Construction and Validation Samples

Table A1

Demographic characteristics of the study samples

Characteristic	Construction Sample % (<i>n</i>)			Validation Sample % (<i>n</i>)		
	Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 814)	Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 2,085)	Total (<i>N</i> = 2,899)	Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 809)	Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 2,104)	Total (<i>N</i> = 2,913)
Indigenous Ancestry						
Non-Indigenous		100 (2,085)	72 (2,085)		100 (2,104)	72 (2,104)
Indigenous	100 (814)		28 (814)	100 (809)		28 (809)
First Nations	68 (555)		19 (555)	72 (578)		20 (578)
Métis	28 (227)		8 (227)	24 (198)		7 (198)
Inuit	4 (32)		1 (32)	4 (33)		1 (33)
Marital Status						
Single/Widowed/Divorced	57 (461)	54 (1,130)	55 (1,591)	54 (439)	55 (1,159)	55 (1,598)
Married/Common-law	37 (305)	42 (882)	41 (1,187)	38 (307)	42 (876)	41 (1,183)
Unknown	6 (48)	4 (73)	4 (121)	8 (63)	3 (69)	5 (132)
Average Age at SRS (<i>SD</i>)	35 (10.7)	38 (11.9)	37 (11.7)	34 (10.7)	37 (11.6)	37 (11.4)

Note. SRS = Security Classification Scale; *SD* = Standard Deviation.

Table A2

Offence and sentence characteristics of the study samples

Characteristic	Construction Sample % (n)			Validation Sample % (n)		
	Indigenous (N = 814)	Non-Indigenous (N = 2,085)	Total (N = 2,899)	Indigenous (N = 809)	Non-Indigenous (N = 2,104)	Total (N = 2, 913)
Violent offences	82 (654)	72 (1,492)	75 (2,146)	79 (648)	71 (1,471)	74 (2,119)
Homicide related	26 (210)	20 (423)	22 (633)	23 (189)	20 (415)	21 (604)
Assault	18 (143)	14 (281)	15 (424)	22 (181)	13 (271)	16 (452)
Robbery	16 (129)	19 (400)	18 (529)	17 (138)	18 (382)	18 (520)
Sexual offences	16 (127)	12 (245)	13 (372)	13 (108)	12 (241)	12 (349)
Other violent	6 (45)	7 (143)	7 (188)	4 (32)	8 (162)	7 (194)
Non-violent offences	21 (160)	28 (593)	26 (753)	20 (161)	31 (633)	26 (794)
Drug offences	9 (69)	15 (315)	13 (384)	9 (70)	17 (351)	14 (421)
Property offences	7 (54)	7 (151)	7 (205)	5 (41)	7 (145)	6 (186)
Other non-violent offences	5 (37)	6 (127)	6 (164)	6 (50)	7 (137)	6 (187)
Aggregate sentence length (Years)						
Less than 4 years	33 (267)	28 (591)	30 (858)	34 (277)	29 (612)	31 (889)
4 years to less than 10 years	42 (345)	46 (951)	45 (1,296)	42 (343)	45 (953)	44 (1,296)
10 years or more	8 (66)	10 (202)	9 (268)	9 (70)	10 (212)	10 (282)
Indeterminate	17 (136)	16 (341)	16 (477)	15 (119)	16 (327)	15 (446)
Term number						
First term	91 (740)	89 (1,854)	89 (2,594)	90 (727)	88 (1,859)	89 (2,586)
Second term	6 (50)	7 (151)	7 (201)	7 (57)	8 (158)	7 (215)
Third term	3 (24)	4 (80)	4 (104)	3 (25)	4 (87)	4 (112)

Characteristic	Construction Sample % (<i>n</i>)			Validation Sample % (<i>n</i>)		
	Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 814)	Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 2,085)	Total (<i>N</i> = 2,899)	Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 809)	Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 2,104)	Total (<i>N</i> = 2, 913)
CRS Security Classification Level						
Minimum	8 (67)	11 (266)	11 (333)	6 (50)	13 (267)	11 (317)
Medium	54 (439)	70 (1,155)	55 (1,594)	58 (470)	57 (1,192)	57 (1,662)
Maximum	38 (308)	32 (664)	34 (972)	36 (289)	31 (645)	32 (934)
Initial OSL Security Placement						
Minimum	3 (26)	7 (136)	6 (162)	4 (30)	6 (119)	5 (149)
Medium	70 (571)	70 (1,456)	70 (2,072)	73 (587)	70 (1,480)	71 (2,067)
Maximum	27 (217)	24 (493)	24 (710)	24 (191)	24 (505)	24 (697)
Average sentence length – Years (<i>SD</i>)	6 (3.8)	6 (4.5)	6 (4.3)	6 (3.8)	6 (4.9)	6 (4.6)

Note. CRS = Custody Rating Scale; OSL = Offender Security Level; *SD* = Standard Deviation.

Table A3

Criminogenic characteristics of the study cohort

Characteristic	Construction sample % (n)			Validation sample & (n)		
	Indigenous offenders (N = 814)	Non-Indigenous offenders (N = 2,085)	All men offenders (N = 2899)	Indigenous offenders (N = 809)	Non-Indigenous offenders (N = 2,104)	All men offenders (N = 2,913)
Original SRS assessed level						
Minimum	26 (212)	23 (478)	24 (690)	26 (209)	24 (486)	24 (695)
Medium	60 (491)	64 (1,328)	63 (1,819)	60 (484)	64 (1,352)	63 (1,836)
Maximum	14 (111)	13 (279)	13 (390)	14 (116)	13 (266)	13 (382)
Offender security level placement						
Minimum	28 (229)	24 (498)	25 (727)	26 (208)	23 (474)	23 (382)
Medium	50 (410)	56 (1,166)	54 (1,576)	55 (443)	57 (1,206)	57 (1,649)
Maximum	22 (175)	20 (421)	21 (596)	20 (158)	20 (424)	20 (582)
Static factor rating						
Low	2 (19)	5 (112)	5 (131)	2 (17)	6 (117)	5 (134)
Medium	29 (232)	29 (597)	29 (829)	27 (220)	32 (665)	30 (885)
High	69 (563)	66 (1,376)	67 (1,939)	71 (572)	63 (1,332)	65 (1,894)
Dynamic factor rating						
Low	1 (6)	2 (43)	2 (49)	1 (4)	2 (33)	1 (37)
Medium	17 (137)	23 (477)	21 (614)	19 (152)	25 (520)	23 (672)
High	82 (671)	75 (1,565)	77 (2,236)	81 (653)	74 (1,551)	76 (2,204)
Reintegration potential						
Low	67 (547)	48 (1,000)	53 (1,547)	64 (520)	47 (989)	52 (1,509)
Medium	29 (236)	40 (824)	37 (1,060)	31 (248)	40 (833)	37 (1,081)
High	4 (31)	13 (261)	10 (292)	5 (41)	13 (282)	11 (323)

Characteristic	Construction sample % (<i>n</i>)			Validation sample & (<i>n</i>)		
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	All men	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	All men
	offenders (<i>N</i> = 814)	offenders (<i>N</i> = 2,085)	offenders (<i>N</i> = 2899)	offenders (<i>N</i> = 809)	offenders (<i>N</i> = 2,104)	offenders (<i>N</i> = 2,913)
CRI						
COIA/No rating	3 (27)	6 (112)	5 (139)	1 (22)	5 (105)	4 (127)
Low	8 (65)	18 (383)	15 (448)	7 (60)	19 (402)	16 (462)
Low-moderate	15 (120)	20 (416)	18 (536)	15 (125)	15 (427)	19 (552)
Moderate	15 (125)	15 (302)	15 (427)	14 (117)	13 (271)	13 (388)
High-moderate	15 (118)	13 (272)	13 (390)	16 (128)	14 (287)	14 (415)
High	44 (359)	29 (600)	33 (959)	44 (357)	30 (612)	33 (969)

Note. SRS = Security Classification Scale; CRI = Criminal Risk Index

Appendix B: Adjusted Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) Items and Weighting

Table B1

Items in Adjusted SRS Assessment

SRS Item	Item Response Options	Response Scores
Serious Disciplinary Offences	None	0.5
	One	1.0
	Two	1.5
	Three or more	2.0
Minor Disciplinary Offences	None	0.5
	One	0.5
	Two	0.5
	Three or more	1.0
Recorded Incidents	No record	0.5
	One	1.0
	Two	2.0
	Three or more	3.0
Pay Grade	Zero pay	1.5
	Basic allowance	1.0
	Allowance	1.0
	Level A	0.5
	Level B	0.5
	Level C	1.0
	Level D	1.0
Detention Referral	Not referred	0.5
	Anticipated referral	2.0
	Referred for detention review	2.0
	Detained	2.0
	Life or indeterminate sentence	2.0
Correctional Plan Progress	Has addressed factors	2.0
	Has partially addressed factors	3.5
	Has not addressed factors	5.0
Correctional Plan Motivation	Fully motivated/Participated in programs	2.0
	Partially motivated/Active in programs	4.0
	No motivation/Limited program participation	6.0
Drug and Alcohol Rating	No identifiable problems	0.5
	Contributing factor/No evidence of use during review period	1.0
	Contributing factor/Evidence of use during review period	1.5

SRS Item	Item Response Options	Response Scores
Successful ETA Releases	No ETAs	2.5
	One ETAs	2.0
	Two ETAs	1.0
	Three or more ETAs	0.5
Successful UTA/Work Releases	None	1.0
	One or more	0.5
Age at Review	22 years or less	1.0
	23 to 29 years	1.0
	30 to 25 years	0.5
	36 or older	0.5
Psychological Concerns	No psychological concerns	0.5
	Psychological concerns noted	1.5
CRS Escape History	Score of 0	0.5
	Score of 4	0.5
	Score of 12	1.0
	Score of 20	1.0
	Score of 28	1.0
CRS Incident History	Score of 0	0.5
	Score of 16	1.0
	Score of 24	1.0
	Score of 32	1.5
	Score of 40	1.5
	Score of 48	2.0
	Score of 56	2.0
	Score of 64	2.0
	Score of 72	2.0
	Score of 80	3.0
Score of 88	3.0	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. CRS = Custody Rating Scale. ETA = Escorted Temporary Absence. UTA = Unescorted Temporary Absence.

Appendix C: Calculation of Adjusted SRS score cut-offs

Table C1

Original SRS score and cut-offs

The original SRS has a total range of score of 25 (10 to 35) – based on original scoring weights

Level	Cut-offs	Range	Proportion of total scale
Minimum	10 to 16.5	7	$7/25 = 0.28$, 28%
Medium	17 to 26.5	10	$10/25 = 0.40$, 40%
Maximum	27 to 35	8	$8/25 = 0.32$, 32%

Table C2

Adjusted SRS score and cut-offs

Level	Cut-offs	Range	Proportion of total scale
Minimum	9.5 to 15.5	6.5	$6.5/22.5 = 0.289$, 28.9%
Medium	16.0 to 24.0	8.5	$8.5/22.5 = 0.378$, 37.8%
Maximum	24.5 to 32	7.5	$7.5/22.5 = 0.333$, 33.3%

Note. As the increments for scoring are 0.5, the upper limit for minimum is 15.5 and for medium is 24.0, but the ranges do not equal 22.5 if those number are used to calculate ranges and percentages.

Table C3

Comparison of original and adjusted SRS discretionary ranges

SRS Assessed level	Discretionary Ranges	Original SRS	Adjusted SRS
		Discretionary Ranges Cut-Point	Discretionary Ranges Cut-Point
Maximum	Maximum-to-Medium	27.0-28.0	24.5-25.5
Medium	Medium-to-Maximum	26.0-26.5	23.5-24.0
Minimum	Minimum-to-Medium	16.0-16.5	15.0-15.5
Medium	Medium-to-Minimum	17.0	16.0

Note. For the original SRS, 27% of the SRS assessment scores were within the discretionary ranges. For the adjusted SRS, 29% had an adjusted score that were within one of the discretionary ranges. Comparisons by Indigenous ancestry demonstrated no difference in the proportion within discretionary ranges for the original SRS (27% each), but a small difference in the proportion within the discretionary ranges for the adjusted SRS (31%) for Indigenous offenders compared to 29% for non-Indigenous offenders, although the magnitude was very weak, (Cramer's $V = 0.02$).

Alternative Scoring Options Explored

Table C4

Option 2

Overall concordance of 85.5%, with 9.4% moved up and 5.1% moved down – need more equal distribution of up and down discordance.

Level	Cut-offs	Range	Proportion of total scale (check)
Minimum	9.5 to 15.0	6	$6/22.5 = 0.267$, 26.7%
Medium	15.5 to 24.0	9	$9/22.5 = 0.40$, 40%
Maximum	24.5 to 32	7.5	$7.5/22.5 = 0.333$, 33.3%

Note. As the increments for scoring are 0.5, the upper limit for minimum is 15.0 and for medium is 24.0, but the ranges do not equal 22.5 if those number are used to calculate ranges and percentages.

Table C5

Option 3

Overall concordance of 87.0%, with 5.4% moved up and 7.6% moved down – need more equal distribution of up and down discordance.

Level	Cut-offs	Range	Proportion of total scale (check)
Minimum	9.5 to 15.5	6.5	$6.5/22.5 = 0.289$, 28.9%
Medium	16.0 to 24.5	9	$9/22.5 = 0.400$, 40.0%
Maximum	25.0 to 32	7	$7/22.5 = 0.311$, 31.1%

Note. As the increments for scoring are 0.5, the upper limit for minimum is 15.5 and for medium is 24.5, but the ranges do not equal 22.5 if those number are used to calculate ranges and percentages.

Table C6

Option 4

Overall concordance of 92.5%, with 1.5% moved up and 6.1% moved down – need more equal distribution of up and down discordance.

Level	Cut-offs	Range	Proportion of total scale (check)
Minimum	9.5 to 16.0	7	$7/22.5 = 0.311$, 31.1%
Medium	16.5 to 24.0	8	$8/22.5 = 0.356$, 35.6%
Maximum	24.5 to 32	7.5	$7.5/22.5 = 0.333$, 33.3%

Note. As the increments for scoring are 0.5, the upper limit for minimum is 16.5 and for medium is 24.0, but the ranges do not equal 22.5 if those number are used to calculate percentages.

Appendix D: Analysis for the Validation Sample

Table D1

Segregation period across the original SRS assessed security level for the validation sample

SRS Assessed Level	No Segregation Period	One or More Segregation Periods
	% (n)	% (n)
Minimum	97 (710)	3 (19)
Medium	53 (1,047)	47 (945)
Maximum	2 (7)	98 (412)

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale.

Table D2

Mean scores and assessed security levels for the original and adjusted SRS scores for the validation sample

Mean SRS scores across Security Level <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)						
Assessed Security Level	Original SRS			Adjusted SRS		
	All Men	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men	All Men	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men
Minimum	15.2 (1.0)	15.2 (1.1)	15.3 (1.0)	14.4 (0.9)	14.4 (1.0)	14.5 (0.9)
Medium	21.7 (3.0)	21.9 (3.0)	21.6 (3.0)	20.0 (2.5)	20.0 (2.5)	19.9 (2.5)
Maximum	28.3 (1.3)	28.5 (1.4)	28.2 (1.3)	25.7 (1.2)	25.8 (1.3)	25.6 (1.2)
Total	21.1 (4.6)	21.1 (4.8)	21.0 (4.5)	19.5 (3.8)	19.5 (3.9)	19.5 (3.7)

SRS Assessed Levels % (n)						
Assessed Security Level	Original SRS			Adjusted SRS		
	All Men	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men	All Men	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men
Minimum	23 (729)	25 (222)	22 (507)	21 (658)	22 (196)	21 (462)
Medium	64 (1,992)	60 (529)	65 (1,463)	67 (2,114)	65 (569)	68 (1,545)
Maximum	13 (419)	15 (126)	13 (293)	12 (368)	13 (112)	11 (256)

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard Deviation.

Table D3

Association between Adjusted SRS level compared to the original SRS assessed level, caseworker recommendation, and offender security level placement for the validation sample

	Indigenous Offenders				Non-Indigenous Offenders				All Men Offenders			
	Adjusted SRS Level % (n)			Cramer's V	Adjusted SRS Level % (n)			Cramer's V	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level % (n)			Cramer's V
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum	
Original SRS Assessed Level				0.83				0.79				0.80
<i>Minimum</i>	95 (186)	6 (36)	0 (0)		91 (421)	6 (86)	0 (0)		92 (607)	5 (122)	0 (0)	
<i>Medium</i>	5 (10)	89 (507)	11 (12)		9 (41)	89 (1,383)	15 (39)		8 (51)	89 (1,890)	14 (51)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	4 (26)	89 (100)		0 (0)	5 (76)	85 (217)		0 (0)	5 (102)	86 (317)	
Caseworker Recommended Security Level				0.66				0.64				0.64
<i>Minimum</i>	89 (175)	9 (52)	0 (0)		85 (392)	8 (130)	0 (0)		86 (567)	9 (182)	0 (0)	
<i>Medium</i>	11 (21)	75 (427)	21 (24)		15 (70)	75 (1,161)	19 (49)		14 (91)	75 (1,588)	20 (73)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	16 (90)	79 (88)		0 (0)	17 (254)	81 (207)		0 (0)	16 (344)	80 (295)	
Offender Security Level Placement				0.65				0.61				0.62
<i>Minimum</i>	88 (172)	9 (54)	0 (0)		81 (372)	8 (130)	0 (0)		83 (544)	9 (184)	0 (0)	
<i>Medium</i>	12 (24)	75 (429)	22 (25)		19 (90)	75 (1,150)	21 (54)		17 (114)	75 (1,579)	21 (79)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	15 (86)	78 (87)		0 (0)	17 (265)	79 (202)		0 (0)	16 (351)	79 (289)	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. Overall, 3,140 SRS assessments were examined for all men offenders in the construction sample; 877 were for Indigenous offenders and 2,263 were for non-Indigenous offenders. For every SRS assessment, CSC staff (caseworker) make a recommendation concerning the final security placement, which may not agree with the SRS assessed level. The institutional head then uses both the SRS assessed level and the caseworker recommendation, which includes a clinical appraisal of various offender-specific factors including Aboriginal Social History, to come to a final placement decision. The final decision may or may not align with either the SRS assessed level or the caseworker recommendation. It is important to note that the caseworker recommendation and final decision placement examined included consideration of segregation placements, which the adjusted SRS level excludes. Finally, the one offender who had a offender security level placement of maximum but would be identified as minimum based on the adjusted SRS level had a medium score at the lower end of the original SRS medium range but was placed in maximum due to institutional security concerns related to a violent incident.

Table D4

Standardized SRS item-to-total correlations and descriptive statistics for the Adjusted SRS, based on the validation sample

SRS Items	Indigenous		Non-Indigenous		All Men Offenders	
	Offenders		Offenders			
	<i>r</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Serious Disciplinary Offences	0.41	0.7 (0.4)	0.42	0.7 (0.4)	0.42	0.7 (0.4)
Minor Disciplinary Offences	0.28	0.6 (0.2)	0.30	0.5 (0.1)	0.30	0.5 (0.1)
Recorded Incidents	0.53	1.6 (1.0)	0.37	1.4 (1.0)	0.42	1.5 (1.0)
Pay Grade	0.37	0.8 (0.2)	0.39	0.8 (0.2)	0.38	0.8 (0.2)
Detention Referral	0.08	0.8 (0.6)	0.05	0.8 (0.6)	0.06	0.8 (0.6)
Correctional Plan Progress	0.46	3.7 (0.9)	0.46	3.8 (1.0)	0.47	3.8 (1.0)
Correctional Plan Motivation	0.55	3.6 (1.4)	0.52	3.8 (1.4)	0.52	3.8 (1.4)
Drug and Alcohol Rating	0.22	1.0 (0.3)	0.19	0.9 (0.4)	0.20	0.9 (0.4)
Successful ETA Releases	0.27	2.3 (0.6)	0.17	2.4 (0.4)	0.19	2.4 (0.5)
Successful UTA/Work Releases	0.10	1.0 (0.04)	0.10	1.0 (0.05)	0.10	1.0 (0.05)
Age at Review	0.10	0.7 (0.2)	0.11	0.7 (0.2)	0.11	0.7 (0.2)
Psychological Concerns	0.19	0.7 (0.4)	0.15	0.7 (0.4)	0.16	0.7 (0.4)
CRS Escape History	0.06	0.5 (0.1)	0.06	0.5 (0.1)	0.06	0.5 (0.1)
CRS Incident History	0.30	1.4 (0.8)	0.32	1.3 (0.8)	0.32	1.3 (0.8)
Cronbach's alpha	0.67		0.63		0.64	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. ETA = Escorted Temporary Absences. UTA = Unescorted Temporary Absences. CRS = Custody Rating Scale.

Table D5

Cramer's V association between the adjusted SRS assessed level, offender security level placement, and measure of risk and need for men offenders in the validation sample

Measure	Cramer's V Strength of Association					
	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level ^{a,b}			Offender Security Level Placement ^{a,b}		
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	All Men	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	All Men
Static Risk ^a	0.14	0.18	0.16	0.19	0.18	0.18
Dynamic Need ^b	0.33	0.34	0.34	0.37	0.35	0.36
Reintegration Potential ^b	0.37	0.33	0.34	0.39	0.35	0.35
CRI ^a	0.12	0.17	0.15	0.17	0.20	0.18

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. ^a Cramer's V between 0.1 and 0.3 indicates a weak association. ^b Cramer's V between 0.3 and 0.5 indicates a moderate association.

Table D6

Association between adjusted SRS level and measures of static risk, dynamic need, reintegration potential, and CRI for the validation sample

	Indigenous Offenders			Cramer's V	Non-Indigenous Offenders			Cramer's V	All Men Offenders			Cramer's V
	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level		%		Adjusted SRS Assessed Level		% (n)		Adjusted SRS Assessed Level		% (n)	
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum	
Static Factor Rating				0.14				0.18				0.16
Low	3 (5)	1 (7)	1 (1)		8 (32)	5 (63)	1 (2)		6 (37)	4 (70)	1 (3)	
Medium	43 (73)	25 (120)	20 (20)		51 (209)	30 (400)	16 (36)		48 (282)	28 (520)	17 (56)	
High	54 (92)	74 (354)	79 (80)		42 (172)	66 (886)	83 (186)		45 (264)	68 (1,240)	82 (266)	
Dynamic Factor Rating				0.33				0.34				0.34
Low	8 (14)	1 (4)	0 (0)		11 (45)	1 (20)	0 (0)		10 (59)	1 (24)	0 (0)	
Medium	66 (113)	29 (140)	6 (6)		69 (286)	31 (418)	5 (12)		68 (399)	30 (558)	5 (18)	
High	25 (43)	70 (337)	94 (95)		20 (82)	68 (911)	95 (212)		21 (125)	68 (1,248)	94 (307)	
Reintegration Potential				0.37				0.33				0.34
Low	9 (15)	60 (288)	85 (86)		7 (29)	47 (636)	84 (188)		7 (44)	50 (924)	84 (274)	
Medium	74 (125)	38 (183)	15 (15)		67 (276)	46 (619)	16 (36)		69 (401)	44 (802)	16 (51)	
High	18 (30)	2 (10)	0 (0)		26 (108)	26 (108)	0 (0)		24 (138)	6 (104)	0 (0)	
CRI				0.12				0.17				0.15
COIA/No rating	3 (5)	3 (13)	2 (2)		5 (21)	5 (72)	0 (1)		4 (26)	5 (85)	1 (3)	
Low	9 (15)	8 (39)	5 (5)		26 (109)	20 (270)	7 (15)		21 (124)	17 (309)	6 (20)	
Low- Moderate	24 (41)	15 (71)	9 (9)		27 (110)	20 (275)	15 (33)		26 (151)	19 (346)	13 (42)	
Moderate	16 (28)	16 (75)	12 (12)		13 (52)	13 (182)	13 (28)		14 (80)	14 (257)	12 (40)	
Moderate- High	12 (20)	17 (83)	20 (20)		14 (56)	14 (188)	15 (33)		13 (76)	15 (271)	16 (53)	
High	36 (61)	42 (200)	52 (53)		16 (65)	27 (362)	51 (114)		22 (126)	31 (562)	51 (167)	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. COIA = Compressed Offender Intake Assessment.

Table D7

Association between offender security level placement and measures of static risk, dynamic need, reintegration potential, and CRI for the validation sample

	Indigenous Offenders			Cramer's V	Non-Indigenous Offenders			Cramer's V	All Men Offenders			Cramer's V
	Offender Security Level Placement				Offender Security Level Placement				Offender Security Level Placement			
	% (n)				% (n)				% (n)			
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum	
Static Factor Rating				0.19				0.18				0.18
Low	2 (4)	2 (8)	1 (1)		7 (33)	5 (54)	3 (10)		6 (37)	4 (62)	2 (11)	
Medium	48 (94)	21 (88)	22 (31)		52 (237)	28 (315)	24 (93)		51 (331)	26 (403)	23 (124)	
High	50 (97)	77 (318)	78 (111)		40 (183)	68 (769)	74 (292)		43 (280)	70 (1,087)	75 (403)	
Dynamic Factor Rating				0.37				0.35				0.36
Low	8 (16)	1 (2)	0 (0)		10 (47)	1 (17)	0 (1)		10 (63)	1 (19)	0.2 (1)	
Medium	67 (131)	28 (117)	8 (11)		70 (317)	31 (355)	11 (44)		69 (448)	30 (472)	10 (55)	
High	25 (48)	71 (295)	92 (132)		20 (89)	67 (766)	87 (350)		21 (137)	68 (1,061)	89 (482)	
Reintegration Potential				0.39				0.35				0.35
Low	11 (21)	59 (246)	85 (122)		6 (26)	48 (544)	72 (283)		7 (47)	51 (790)	75 (405)	
Medium	73 (142)	39 (160)	15 (21)		67 (304)	46 (522)	26 (105)		69 (446)	44 (682)	23 (126)	
High	16 (32)	2 (8)	0 (0)		27 (123)	6 (72)	2 (7)		24 (155)	5 (80)	1 (7)	
CRI				0.17				0.19				0.18
COIA/No rating	3 (6)	3 (13)	1 (1)		6 (29)	5 (54)	3 (11)		5 (35)	4 (67)	2 (12)	
Low	10 (19)	7 (31)	6 (9)		27 (121)	21 (239)	9 (34)		22 (140)	17 (270)	8 (43)	
Low- Moderate	26 (51)	14 (57)	9 (13)		27 (124)	21 (238)	14 (56)		27 (175)	19 (295)	13 (69)	
Moderate	18 (36)	15 (62)	12 (17)		12 (54)	14 (162)	12 (46)		14 (90)	14 (224)	12 (63)	
Moderate- High	10 (19)	19 (81)	16 (23)		11 (51)	15 (168)	15 (58)		11 (70)	16 (249)	15 (81)	
High	33 (64)	41 (170)	56 (80)		16 (74)	24 (277)	48 (190)		21 (138)	29 (447)	50 (270)	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. COIA = Compressed Offender Intake Assessment.

Table D8

Rates of disciplinary charges, discretionary release, and returns to custody between the adjusted SRS assessed level and the offender security level for men offenders in the validation sample

Predictive Validity Indicator	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level			Offender Security Level Placement		
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Minimum	Medium	Maximum
Disciplinary Charges						
% (<i>n</i>)***	23 (132)	42 (765)	62 (202)	23 (148)	40 (624)	61 (327)
HR	(ref)	1.90***	4.01***	(ref)	1.86***	4.24***
AUC		0.61			0.63	
Discretionary Release						
% (<i>n</i>)***	59 (280)	41 (192)	0 (0)	70 (333)	29 (136)	1 (3)
AUC		0.74			0.80	
Return to Custody						
% (<i>n</i>)***	29 (151)	42 (534)	60 (110)	30 (178)	41 (402)	57 (215)
HR	(ref)	2.00***	4.86***	(ref)	1.80***	3.86***
AUC		0.59			0.60	
Return with New Offence						
% (<i>n</i>)	4 (21)**	5 (66)**	10 (19)	5 (28)*	5 (47)*	8 (31)*
HR	(ref)	1.84*	6.51***	(ref)	1.38 ^{n.s.}	3.75***
AUC		0.57			0.55	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. AUC = Area under the curve. n.s.= not significant. *** < .0001

Table D9

Rates of disciplinary charges, discretionary release, and returns to custody between the adjusted SRS assessed level and the offender security level for Indigenous men offenders in the validation sample

Predictive Validity Indicator	Indigenous Offenders					
	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level			Offender Security Level Placement		
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Minimum	Medium	Maximum
Disciplinary Charges						
% (n)***	26 (45)	50 (241)	57 (58)	26 (51)	50 (206)	61 (87)
HR	(ref)	1.99***	3.12***	(ref)	2.00***	3.56***
AUC		0.60			0.63	
Discretionary Release						
% (n)***	61 (66)	39 (42)	0 (0)	75 (81)	25 (27)	0 (0)
AUC		0.72			0.79	
Return to Custody						
% (n)	46 (70) ^{n.s.}	57 (181) ^{n.s.}	58 (29) ^{n.s.}	46 (83)**	55 (130)**	65 (67)**
HR	(ref)	1.60**	2.76***	(ref)	1.47**	2.77***
AUC		0.55			0.57	
Return with New Offence						
% (n) ^{n.s.}	7 (11)	8 (26)	8 (4)	7 (13)	8 (19)	9 (9)
HR	(ref)	1.44 ^{n.s.}	2.56 ^{n.s.}	(ref)	1.35 ^{n.s.}	2.42*
AUC		0.51			0.52	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. AUC = Area under the curve. n.s. = not significant. * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .0001.

Table D10

Rates of disciplinary charges, discretionary release, and returns to custody between the adjusted SRS assessed level and the offender security level for Non-Indigenous men offenders in the validation sample

Predictive Validity Indicator	Non-Indigenous Offenders					
	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level			Offender Security Level Placement		
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Minimum	Medium	Maximum
Disciplinary Charges						
% (n)***	21 (87)	39 (524)	64 (144)	21 (97)	37 (418)	61 (240)
HR	(ref)	1.88***	4.47***	(ref)	1.82***	4.60***
AUC		0.62			0.64	
Discretionary Release						
% (n)***	59 (214)	41 (150)	0 (0)	69 (252)	30 (109)	1 (3)
AUC		0.75			0.80	
Return to Custody						
% (n)***	22 (81)	38 (353)	61 (81)	23 (95)	36 (272)	54 (148)
HR	(ref)	2.45***	7.06***	(ref)	2.23***	5.10***
AUC		0.61			0.62	
Return with New Offence						
% (n)	3 (10)**	4 (40)**	11 (15)**	4 (15)**	4 (28)**	8 (22)**
HR	(ref)	2.46*	12.65***	(ref)	1.58 ^{n.s.}	5.48***
AUC		0.60			0.58	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. AUC = Area under the curve. n.s. = not significant. * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .0001.

Appendix E: Supplementary Analysis for the Construction Sample

Table E1

Association between adjusted SRS level and measures of static risk, dynamic need, reintegration potential, and CRI for the construction sample

	Indigenous Offenders				Non-Indigenous Offenders				All Men Offenders			
	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level % (n)			Cramer's V	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level % (n)			Cramer's V	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level % (n)			Cramer's V
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum	
Static Factor Rating				0.24				0.16				0.18
Low	4 (8)	2 (11)	0 (0)		12 (47)	4 (54)	1 (2)		10 (55)	4 (65)	1 (2)	
Medium	56 (98)	26 (121)	10 (10)		42 (169)	27 (365)	21 (44)		47 (267)	27 (486)	17 (54)	
High	41 (72)	72 (333)	90 (88)		46 (183)	69 (922)	79 (168)		45 (255)	69 (1,255)	82 (256)	
Dynamic Factor Rating				0.29				0.31				0.30
Low	6 (11)	1 (5)	0 (0)		12 (46)	2 (24)	0 (0)		10 (57)	2 (29)	0 (0)	
Medium	59 (105)	28 (129)	4 (4)		63 (251)	29 (386)	8 (17)		62 (356)	29 (515)	7 (21)	
High	35 (62)	71 (331)	96 (95)		26 (102)	92 (197)	92 (197)		28 (164)	70 (1,262)	93 (291)	
Reintegration Potential				0.40				0.37				0.37
Low	6 (10)	60 (279)	95 (93)		5 (21)	49 (654)	84 (179)		5 (31)	52 (933)	87 (272)	
Medium	81 (144)	37 (170)	5 (5)		61 (243)	45 (607)	15 (33)		67 (387)	43 (777)	12 (38)	
High	13 (24)	3 (16)	0 (0)		34 (135)	6 (80)	1 (2)		28 (159)	5 (96)	1 (2)	
CRI				0.22				0.16				0.16
COIA/No rating	3 (5)	5 (21)	0 (0)		7 (29)	5 (70)	3 (6)		6 (34)	5 (91)	2 (6)	
Low	15 (27)	7 (33)	2 (2)		27 (108)	19 (251)	7 (14)		23 (135)	16 (284)	5 (16)	
Low-Moderate	25 (44)	15 (70)	5 (5)		27 (107)	19 (261)	18 (39)		26 (151)	18 (331)	14 (44)	
Moderate	22 (39)	15 (72)	13 (13)		12 (48)	16 (209)	17 (37)		15 (87)	16 (281)	16 (50)	
Moderate-High	12 (21)	17 (79)	15 (15)		10 (38)	15 (202)	11 (23)		10 (59)	16 (281)	12 (38)	
High	24 (42)	41 (190)	64 (63)		17 (69)	26 (348)	44 (95)		19 (111)	30 (538)	51 (158)	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. COIA = Compressed Offender Intake Assessment.

Table E2

Association between offender security level placement and measures of static risk, dynamic need, reintegration potential, and CRI for the construction sample

	Indigenous Offenders			Cramer's V	Non-Indigenous Offenders			Cramer's V	All Men Offenders			Cramer's V
	Offender Security Level Placement				Offender Security Level Placement				Offender Security Level Placement % (n)			
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum		Minimum	Medium	Maximum	
Static Factor Rating				0.26				0.19				0.20
Low	5 (10)	2 (8)	1 (1)		11 (51)	5 (47)	1 (5)		9 (61)	4 (55)	1 (6)	
Medium	55 (120)	22 (82)	17 (27)		45 (214)	25 (271)	24 (93)		48 (334)	24 (353)	22 (120)	
High	41 (89)	75 (275)	28 (129)		44 (207)	71 (780)	74 (286)		43 (296)	72 (1,055)	77 (415)	
Dynamic Factor Rating				0.32				0.19				0.32
Low	5 (12)	1 (4)	0 (0)		11 (51)	5 (47)	1 (5)		9 (60)	2 (26)	0 (0)	
Medium	60 (132)	25 (93)	8 (13)		45 (214)	25 (271)	25 (93)		63 (433)	27 (397)	11 (62)	
High	35 (75)	73 (268)	92 (144)		44 (207)	71 (780)	75 (286)		29 (198)	71 (1,040)	89 (479)	
Reintegration Potential				0.43				0.38				0.39
Low	7 (16)	63 (231)	86 (135)		4 (18)	50 (550)	74 (286)		5 (34)	53 (781)	78 (421)	
Medium	80 (175)	33 (122)	14 (22)		65 (309)	44 (479)	25 (95)		70 (484)	41 (601)	22 (117)	
High	13 (28)	3 (12)	0 (0)		31 (145)	6 (69)	1 (3)		25 (173)	6 (81)	1 (3)	
CRI				0.23				0.19				0.19
COIA/No rating	6 (13)	3 (12)	1 (1)		8 (38)	5 (58)	2 (9)		7 (51)	5 (70)	2 (10)	
Low	15 (33)	7 (25)	3 (4)		27 (127)	19 (208)	10 (38)		23 (160)	16 (233)	8 (42)	
Low- Moderate	23 (50)	16 (57)	8 (12)		27 (129)	20 (220)	15 (58)		26 (179)	19 (277)	13 (70)	
Moderate	21 (46)	15 (56)	14 (22)		12 (58)	17 (184)	14 (52)		15 (104)	16 (240)	14 (74)	
Moderate- High	12 (26)	18 (65)	15 (24)		9 (44)	15 (161)	15 (58)		10 (70)	15 (226)	15 (82)	
High	23 (51)	41 (150)	60 (94)		16 (76)	24 (267)	44 (169)		18 (127)	29 (417)	49 (263)	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. COIA = Compressed Offender Intake Assessment.

Table E3

Rates of disciplinary charges, discretionary release, and returns to custody between the adjusted SRS assessed level and the offender security level for Indigenous men offenders in the construction sample

Predictive Validity Indicator	Indigenous Offenders					
	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level			Offender Security Level Placement		
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Minimum	Medium	Maximum
Disciplinary Charges						
% (<i>n</i>)***	27 (48)	43 (198)	62 (61)	26 (58)	43 (158)	58 (91)
HR	(ref)	1.60**	2.97***	(ref)	1.60**	3.15***
AUC		0.61			0.62	
Discretionary Release						
% (<i>n</i>)***	67 (72)	33 (36)	0 (0)	82 (89)	18 (19)	0 (0)
AUC		0.73			0.79	
Return to Custody						
% (<i>n</i>)***	37 (61)	59 (179)	84 (31)	40 (80)	57 (123)	76 (68)
HR	(ref)	2.34***	5.74***	(ref)	2.14***	3.97***
AUC		0.63			0.64	
Return with New Offence						
% (<i>n</i>)	5 (8) ^{n.s.}	10 (32) ^{n.s.}	8 (3) ^{n.s.}	7 (14) ^{n.s.}	10 (21) ^{n.s.}	9 (8) ^{n.s.}
HR	(ref)	3.13**	4.57*	(ref)	2.09*	2.80*
AUC		0.58			0.54	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. AUC = Area under the curve. n.s. = not significant. * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .0001.

Table E4

Rates of disciplinary charges, discretionary release, and returns to custody between the adjusted SRS assessed level and the offender security level for Non-Indigenous men offenders in the construction sample

Predictive Validity Indicator	Non-Indigenous Offenders					
	Adjusted SRS Assessed Level			Offender Security Level Placement		
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Minimum	Medium	Maximum
Disciplinary Charges						
% (n)***	26 (104)	39 (529)	64 (136)	25 (120)	39 (427)	58 (222)
HR	(ref)	1.41**	2.89***	(ref)	1.49**	2.81***
AUC		0.59			0.61	
Discretionary Release						
% (n)***	59 (232)	40 (159)	1 (2)	71 (278)	29 (115)	0 (0)
AUC		0.75			0.82	
Return to Custody						
% (n)***	25 (90)	39 (351)	63 (80)	23 (98)	39 (277)	56 (146)
HR	(ref)	2.30***	5.42***	(ref)	2.51***	4.80***
AUC		0.60			0.63	
Return with New Offence						
% (n)	4 (16)**	5 (45)**	13 (16)**	4 (17)*	5 (38)*	8 (22)*
HR	(ref)	1.68 ^{n.s.}	6.16***	(ref)	2.00*	4.22***
AUC		0.57			0.57	

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. AUC = Area under the curve. n.s. = not significant. * < .05, ** < .01, *** < .0001.