CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Revalidation of the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS)

2018 Nº R-414

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.



Revalidation of the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS)

Shanna Farrell MacDonald

Tara Beauchamp

Cassandra Conley

Laurentiu Cociu

&

Terri Scott

Correctional Service of Canada

August 2018

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to extend their appreciation to Jennie Thompson and Dena Derkzen for their assistance with the conceptualization of this project. Special thanks to Jennie and Kaitlyn Wardrop for their on-going support with respect to data extraction, data analysis, and results interpretation. The editorial advice of Laura Hanby was greatly appreciated as well. Feedback provided by Dania Khanafer, Jennifer Luchtenerg, and Sarah Strickland was essential to improving the final version of this report.

Executive Summary

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

Classification and reclassification systems play an integral role in correctional environments both at the institutional and offender level. The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) uses the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) instrument in the security reclassification process for all men offenders. To ensure these tools are effective and adequately meeting the needs of the offender population, research must continue to test their reliability and validity.

Using data from the Offender Management System, 6,281 SRS assessments (28% for Indigenous offenders) were examined for the study period from April 2014 to March 2016. These assessments represented 5,433 federal men offenders (27% Indigenous).

Similar proportions of Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders were assessed at the various security levels, with almost two-thirds identified as medium security and about one-quarter assessed as minimum. On average, SRS assessments were completed within two years of the completion of the Custody Rating Scale or after admission to federal custody, which met the timelines set out in CSC policy. Timing of the SRS administration was the same for both groups.

Examination of discretionary ranges on the SRS (scores where the offender could be classified in one of two levels) and inconsistencies across the review process (when the SRS assessed level was discordant with the actual security placement) demonstrated comparable results for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. Over one-quarter of offenders had scores that fell in the discretionary ranges, but staff did not employ the discretionary range for almost two-thirds of these assessments. About 15% of assessments were identified as inconsistent, which is within the 5% to 20% range of inconsistencies identified in the assessment literature, with over two-thirds to a lower security classification. Manual coding of the reasons for inconsistencies showed that offenders' current behaviour/attitude, and identified needs were the typical rationales for these inconsistencies. Aboriginal Social History factors were identified for all Indigenous men coded.

The SRS had sufficient reliability for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders with over half of the items in the assessment having a moderate correlation with the total score and an acceptable Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Validity analyses demonstrated that the SRS and the actual security placement are associated with other measures of offender risk and need as well as offender institutional and post-release behaviour. These findings were comparable for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders and aligned with previous research.

The SRS continues to be a reliable and valid tool in the offender security reclassification process for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous men. Aboriginal Social History informs security decisions for Indigenous men. Additional factors such as institutional adjustment, escape risk, and risk to public safety are also taken into consideration before a final security placement decision is made. Future research could explore the inclusion or exclusion of other items in the SRS. However, the on-going use of this assessment for the reclassification of federal men offenders is warranted.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgementsii
Executive Summaryiii
List of Tablesv
List of Appendices
Introduction1
Classification Methods1
Classification in the Federal Correctional Context2
Importance of Validating Tools Regularly
Current Study
Method
Study Cohort
Security Reclassification Scale
Data Sources
Analysis
Results
Study Cohort Characteristics
SRS Descriptive Information
Reliability of the SRS
Validity of the SRS
Discussion
Conclusions
References

List of Tables

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the study cohort	8
Table 2 Offence and sentence characteristics of the study cohort	. 10
Table 3 SRS assessed level and score descriptives for all SRS assessments during the study	
period	. 11
Table 4 Timing of SRS administrations (mean number of months)	. 12
Table 5 Association between SRS assessed level, caseworker recommendation, and actual	
security placement	. 14
Table 6 Reasons for inconsistency between SRS assessed level and actual offender security	
placement	. 15
Table 7 Standardized SRS item-to-total correlations and descriptive statistics	. 16
Table 8 Cramer's V association between the SRS assessed level, actual security placement, and	ıd
measure of risk and need for men offenders	. 17

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) Items and Scoring Grid	. 25
Appendix B: Supplemental Analyses	. 28

Introduction

Classification systems play an integral role in correctional environments. They can have a significant impact on the institution as a whole, as well as the individual offender. At the institutional level, they contribute to efficiency and resource management, reduce the potential for violence and escape, as well as assist with accountability and forecasting (Austin & Hardyman, 2004; Hardyman et al., 2002; Makarios & Latessa, 2013; Shermer, Bierie, & Stock, 2012). For the individual offender, security level and classification have the ability to shape their overall correctional experience (Farr, 2000). Classification determines physical environment and housing structure (e.g., cell vs. community living), access to privileges, and release decisions (Austin & Hardyman, 2004; Gobeil, 2009; Shaw & Hannah-Moffat, 2000). The goal is to ensure appropriate services are available to offenders and that treatment needs related to programming, education, and physical and mental health are being met (Austin & Hardyman, 2004; Bellmore, 2011; Makarios & Latessa, 2013; Shaw & Hannah-Moffat, 2000; Shermer, et al., 2012; Vasquez & Bussert, 2016). This, in turn, aids in offenders' well-being, better prepares them for reintegration into the community, and helps reduce recidivism (Makarios & Latessa, 2013; Shaw & Hannah-Moffat, 2000; Shermer, et al., 2012). Furthermore, classification tools emphasize ethical and fair treatment and objective decision making (Bellmore, 2011). Offenders can benefit by receiving consistent messaging, communication, and a clear understanding of their assessment scores and the rationale behind their security placements (Gordon & Wong, 2015).

Classification Methods

The practice of offender risk assessment and classification has undergone numerous transformations over the years (Austin, 2003; Austin & Hardyman, 2004; Holsinger, Lowencamp, & Latessa, 2006; Shaw & Hannah-Moffat, 2000). Often described through four generations, early iterations relied heavily on unstructured clinical judgement and subjective criteria, however, in recent decades a shift towards actuarial-based instruments has emerged (Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2006; Austin, 2003; Austin & Hardyman, 2004; Holsinger, et al., 2006; Makarios & Latessa, 2013; Simourd, 2004; Young, Moline, Farrell, & Bierie, 2006). Supported by empirical research, objective assessment tools reduce the potential for bias, discrimination and inconsistency and in turn, are much more likely to accurately classify offenders (Andrews, et al., 2006; Bellmore, 2011; Makarios & Latessa, 2013; Young et al.,

1

2006). Contemporary actuarial instruments generally employ both static (historic) and dynamic (current) factors. For security reclassification scales, an emphasis on dynamic variables is particularly relevant, as they are useful for measuring change and rehabilitative progress over the course of an offender's sentence (Bellmore, 2011; Holsinger, et al., 2006; Simourd, 2004).

Classification in the Federal Correctional Context

An initial security designation tool, the Custody Rating Scale (CRS), was adopted by the Correctional Service Canada (CSC) in the 1990's as a way to standardize the decision-making process (Rugge, 2006). The CRS is an empirically-based actuarial tool which, in combination with professional clinical appraisal, assesses at admission¹ whether an offender will be assigned to minimum, medium, or maximum security (CSC, 2014a). CSC acknowledges that through appropriate treatment, intervention and rehabilitation, dynamic factors can and will change throughout an offender's incarceration. Observing offender's institutional adjustment, motivation and participation in programming, as well as their overall current functioning is a valuable approach to determine coping skills and ability to change over time (Gordon & Wong, 2015; Harer & Langan, 2001). Re-assessments, therefore, allow for offenders to be appropriately reclassified when warranted (National Institute of Corrections, 2003). Re-assessing changes in behaviour is necessary in order to aid offenders in cascading to lower custody levels, and ultimately to reintegrate successfully into the community (Austin & Hardyman, 2004; National Institute of Corrections, 2003). Reassessments are also important when an offender is disruptive or violent and there is a need for a shift upwards in their security level (Austin & Hardyman, 2004; Shermer, et al., 2012).

The Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) is the actuarial, evidence-based instrument utilized by CSC to periodically reassess offenders' current attitudes and behaviour. The SRS is mainly composed of dynamic variables that reflect change over the review period (e.g., Correctional Plan progress and motivation, disciplinary offences, etc.) (CSC, 2001; Luciani, Taylor, & Motiuk, 1998). Similar to the CRS, the SRS assessed level is one component considered in conjunction with clinical appraisal to ensure individual and/or exceptional factors not included in the scale are not overlooked (Luciani et al., 1998).²

¹ The Custody Rating Scale (CRS) is administered at initial admission to federal custody as well as at re-admission following release during the offender's sentence.

² In some instances, clinical appraisal and assessment recommendations do not align (with respect to both higher and lower classifications), as professional judgement may account for factors not explicitly used in the scoring process.

Legislation and policy dictate that in typical cases, security reclassification reviews should be conducted at least once every two years and more frequently when there is reason to believe the offender's security level has shifted or when decisions related to release or transfer are being made (CSC, 1992; CSC, 2014b).³ Security classification and reclassification decisions are legislatively required to consider institutional adjustment, escape risk and risk to the public in the event of an escape (CSC, 1992). Current reassessment decision practices comply with CCRA legislation; they ensure the use of limitations on offenders are necessary and proportionate, while at the same time maintaining protection of the Canadian public.

Currently, the SRS is utilized with Indigenous and non-Indigenous men.⁴ Prior research demonstrates that the SRS is appropriate for informing security reclassification decisions for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous men offenders (Gobeil, 2009). That said, practitioners who conduct risk assessments should be knowledgeable about Indigenous culture and historical context. This is further evidenced by case law such as *R. v. Gladue* (1999) which states that the context of Indigenous people should be taken into account when considering criminal sanctions and interventions (Rugge, 2006). One of the ways CSC ensures this is by taking into consideration an offender's Aboriginal Social History as part of the clinical appraisal for both initial classification and security reclassification decisions (CSC, 2014b). This provides context on the direct and indirect systemic and background factors that may have impacted the individual and contributed to their current circumstances.

Importance of Validating Tools Regularly

In order to ensure reclassification tools are effective and adequately meeting the needs of the offender population, research must continue to test their reliability and validity. Invalid assessment tools can have negative consequences for offenders' rehabilitation needs in instances where offenders are being over-classified (e.g., inability to access appropriate programming and parole denial; Bellmore, 2011). Ineffective tools can also have significant repercussions for the management of institutional risk in instances where offenders are being under-classified (e.g., violence and escape), and can ultimately have an impact on public safety.

³ Policy changes in January 2018 require an automatic security reclassification review for Indigenous offenders following the successful completion of a main program or at specific intervals while participating in Pre-Pathways interventions or Pathways units (CSC, 2018). As this change was outside of the study period, it was not examined. ⁴ A separate security reclassification tool is used for women: the Security Reclassification Scale for Women

⁽SRSW).

Prison populations are not static, and assessment tools may not readily transfer from one population to another (Makarios & Latessa, 2013). As prison populations change over time, research must re-validate instruments to ensure they are tailored to the population in which they are intended to serve (Austin & Hardyman, 2004; Bellmore, 2001; Hardyman et al, 2002; Makarios & Latessa, 2013; National Institute of Corrections, 2003). Studies of this nature began to emerge in the late 80's and continue to be regularly undertaken as a part of CSC's research program (Motiuk, Motiuk & Bonta 1992; Gobeil, 2009; Thompson, McConnell, & Paquin-Marseille 2013).

Current Study

The primary purpose of the study is to examine the scale's reliability, convergent validity, and predictive validity of relevant correctional outcomes (e.g., disciplinary charges and post-release outcomes) for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous men. This research will address the following research questions:

- What is the reliability of the SRS tool for incarcerated Indigenous and non-Indigenous men?
- 2) Is the SRS a valid measure of security reclassification for incarcerated Indigenous and non-Indigenous men?

Method

Study Cohort

All 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. A total of 6,281 SRS assessments were completed for the period from April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2016. These SRS assessments represented a total of 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%⁵ (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).

Security Reclassification Scale

The SRS is a 15-item actuarial security reclassification tool implemented in 1998 for men offenders (CSC, 2001; Luciani et al., 1998). An overview of the dynamic items used to measure institutional behaviour, item responses, and item scoring are shown in Table A1, Appendix A. Computed scores identify a security reclassification level of *minimum*, *medium* or *maximum* (see Table A2 for the score ranges for each security level and the discretionary range scores⁶).

The SRS is 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, 2014b). Minimum security offenders undergo security reclassification reviews prior to events indicating a potential change in 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,

⁵ Nineteen percent of assessments were for First Nations offenders while 7% were for Métis and 1% for Inuit men offenders.

⁶ The SRS includes score intervals where an individual is able to be classified in one of two security levels, otherwise known as discretionary ranges. These discretionary ranges fall within 5% +/- of the threshold scores for each security reclassification level. CSC staff may assess offenders in the discretionary range in either of the two security levels based on case factors without further justification.

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 placement decision (CSC, 2014b).

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 policy⁷, SRS scores, security level classification assessed by the SRS, staff recommended security level (caseworker recommendation), final security level placement (actual placement), and timing of the SRS assessment.

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, 2018) updated prior to SRS administration, and the Criminal Risk Index (CRI, Motiuk & Vuong, 2018). Initial security level obtained from the CRS and initial 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, caseworker recommendations for security classification, and actual security placement. Cramer's *V* 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.

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

⁷ 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.

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 SRS assessed level or the actual security placement with 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 and Harrell's *c* was used to determine the predictive validity of either the SRS assessed level or the final security placement with correctional outcomes (i.e., disciplinary offences or revocations of release). Area under the curve was used to determine the predictive validity for discretionary releases. To adjust for multiple assessments completed⁸, one assessment per offender was randomly selected for the convergent and predictive validity analyses.

⁸ 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, the ICC was 0.69 (0.66 for Indigenous and 0.71 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

The results are organized into four sections. The first examines the characteristics of the study cohort. The second shows the SRS descriptive analysis, including the SRS assessed level and mean scores. Examination of the discretionary ranges as well as exploring the discordance between the SRS assessed level, caseworker recommendations, and the final security placement were also presented in the second section. The reliability of the SRS assessment is presented third, followed by an examination of the convergent and predictive validity in the fourth section.

Study Cohort Characteristics

Indigenous offenders accounted for 27% of the offenders with SRS assessments. Among Indigenous offenders, the majority identified as First Nations (70%), while 26% were Métis and 4% were Inuit. Indigenous offenders were slightly younger at the time of assessment with an average age of 35 years compared to 38 years for non-Indigenous offenders. As shown in Table 1, over half of the study cohort were single, widowed, or divorced.

Table 1

	Percentage (<i>n</i>) of Offenders						
Characteristic	Indigenous $(N = 1,493)$		Non-Inc	ligenous	То	tal	
			(N=1)	3,940)	(N = 5)	5,433)	
Indigenous Ancestry							
Non-Indigenous			100	(3,940)	73	(3,940)	
Indigenous	100	(1,493)			27	(1,493)	
First Nations	70	(1,044)			19	(1,044)	
Métis	26	(389)			7	(389)	
Inuit	4	(60)			1	(60)	
Marital Status							
Single/Widowed/Divorced	55	(826)	55	(2,177)	55	(3,003)	
Married/Common-law	38	(568)	42	(1,632)	41	(2,200)	
Unknown	7	(99)	3	(131)	4	(230)	
Average Age at SRS (SD)	35	(10.8)	38	(11.8)	37	(11.6)	

Demographic characteristics of the study cohort

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

Index offence and sentence characteristics are provided in Table 2. Almost half (44%) of the offenders in the study cohort were serving sentences between 4 years and less than 10 years. Sixteen percent of all offenders were serving indeterminate sentences (e.g., life sentence, dangerous offender designation). The average determinate sentence length for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders was 5 years. The majority of the offenders (90% of Indigenous and 89% of non-Indigenous offenders, respectively) were serving the first term of their current sentence, in other words, they had not been previously released on the sentence examined.

Almost three-quarters of offenders committed violent offences; Indigenous offenders were more likely than non-Indigenous offenders to commit a violent offence (80% versus 71%, respectively). Overall, robbery and homicide related offences were the most common violent offences (see Table 2), although Indigenous offenders were more likely than non-Indigenous offenders to have committed an assault (20% versus 13%). Drug related charges were the most common non-violent offence, with a greater percentage committed by non-Indigenous offenders (16% compared to 9% for Indigenous).

Over half of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders (56%) were assessed as medium security at admission to federal custody, using the CRS. Almost three-quarters of offenders, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, were initially placed in medium security (72% and 70% respectively). Approximately one-quarter of each group were initially placed in maximum security with the lowest percentage of each group placed in minimum security (see Table 2).

Table 2

Offence and sentence characteristics of the study cohort

	Percentage (n) of Offenders					
Characteristic	Ind	igenous	Non-I	Non-Indigenous		Fotal
	(<i>N</i> =	= 1,493)	(<i>N</i> =	= 3,940)	(N = 5,433)	
Violent Offences	80	(1,197)	71	(2,783)	73	(3,980)
Homicide related	24	(362)	20	(791)	21	(1,153)
Assault	20	(297)	13	(515)	15	(812)
Robbery	16	(243)	19	(724)	18	(967)
Sexual offences	15	(224)	12	(470)	13	(694)
Other violent	5	(71)	7	(283)	6	(354)
Non-violent Offences	20	(296)	29	(1,157)	27	(1,453)
Drug offences	9	(127)	16	(631)	14	(758)
Property offences	6	(89)	7	(280)	7	(369)
Other non-violent offences	5	(80)	6	(246)	6	(326)
Aggregate Sentence Length (Years)						
Less than 4 years	34	(506)	29	(1,154)	31	(1,660)
4 years to less than 10 years	42	(628)	45	(1,766)	44	(2,394)
10 years or more	8	(126)	10	(384)	9	(510)
Indeterminate	16	(233)	16	(636)	16	(869)
Term Number						
First term	90	(1348)	89	(3496)	89	(4844)
Second term	7	(100)	7	(289)	7	(389)
Third term	3	(45)	4	(155)	4	(200)
CRS Security Classification Level						
Minimum	8	(111)	13	(512)	11	(623)
Medium	56	(839)	56	(2,207)	56	(3,046)
Maximum	36	(543)	31	(1,221)	33	(1,764)
Initial OSL Security Placement						
Minimum	3	(53)	6	(240)	5	(293)
Medium	72	(1,072)	70	(2,770)	71	(3,842)
Maximum	25	(368)	24	(930)	24	(1,298)
Average Sentence Length - Years (SD)	6	(3.4)	6	(6.1)	6	(4.5)

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

SRS Descriptive Information

SRS Assessed Security Level and Mean Scores

Table 3 presents the SRS assessed security level and mean scores for all SRS assessments during the study period. The overall SRS assessed security level was similar for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders as were the mean SRS scores across each level of security. Less than two-thirds of Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders were assessed as medium security based on the SRS, with a slightly higher proportion for non-Indigenous offenders (61% and 64%, respectively). One-quarter of Indigenous offenders were assessed as minimum security compared to one-fifth of non-Indigenous offenders. An identical proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders were assessed as maximum security (see Table 3).

Table 3

	Percentage (n) of Offenders					
SRS Security Classification	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Total			
	(N = 1,755)	(<i>N</i> = 4,526)	(N = 6,281)			
SRS Assessed Level						
Minimum	25 (447)	22 (1,005)	23 (1,452)			
Medium	61 (1,062)	64 (2,912)	63 (3,974)			
Maximum	14 (246)	14 (609)	14 (855)			
	Mean (SD)					
SRS Scores Across Level						
Minimum	15 (1.1)	15 (1.0)	15 (1.0)			
Medium	22 (3.0)	22 (3.0)	22 (3.0)			
Maximum	29 (1.5)	28 (1.3)	28 (1.4)			
Total Score	21 (4.8)	21 (4.5)	21 (4.6)			

SRS assessed level and score descriptives for all SRS assessments during the study period

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

Differences in assessed SRS levels were analyzed with respect to region at time of assessment, offence type, sentence length, and age of the offender at time of assessment (see Appendix B). Regional comparisons (Table B1) indicated that offenders in the Prairie region were most likely to be assessed by the SRS as minimum (35% versus 10% to 25% in the other regions) while Quebec was most likely to be assessed as maximum security (19% versus 8% to 17%). Both the Pacific and Quebec regions were more likely to have offenders assessed as

medium (71% for both versus 53% to 67%). Comparisons by offence type indicated that offenders who had a non-violent index offence were more likely to be identified by the SRS as minimum (31% versus 20%) while offenders with a violent index offence were more likely to be assessed as medium (61% versus 58%) or maximum (15% versus 11%, see Table B2). Table B3 shows the analysis of assessed SRS levels by sentence length. Of note, offenders serving less than four years were most likely to be assessed as minimum (29% versus 10% to 26%) while offenders serving indeterminate sentences were more likely to be assessed as medium (75% versus 57% to 74%). Analysis by age at SRS assessment indicates that younger offenders, aged 18 to 28 years, were most likely to be assessed as maximum (22% versus 5% to 14% in the other age categories) while offenders in the oldest age category (45 years and older) were most likely to be assessed as either minimum or medium (95% versus 78% to 88%; see Table B4). The mean SRS scores for each assessed level (minimum, medium, maximum) did not differ across region, offence type, sentence length, or age at SRS assessment.

Timing of SRS Administration

Most offenders had one SRS assessment (72% of Indigenous and 75% of non-Indigenous offenders), while the remaining men had up to four SRS assessments completed during the study period. As shown in Table 4, on average, the initial SRS during the study period was 24 months after admission to federal custody or the completion of the CRS. Almost two-thirds (66%) of men had their first SRS within two years (67% for Indigenous and 65% for non-Indigenous offenders). For the 34% with an SRS after two years, the range was between 24 and 108 months; the range was similar for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. On average, there were nine months between multiple SRS assessments during the study period.

Table 4

Time to Administration	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men	All Men
(in months)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Time to first SRS assessment ^a	24 (19.5)	24 (19.5)	24 (19.5)
Time between SRS assessments ^b	9 (5.2)	9 (5.1)	9 (5.2)

Timing of SRS administrations (mean number of months)

Note. ^a Time to first SRS assessment was calculated between the later of the admission date or the CRS and the SRS assessment completion date. Admission date would be used when the CRS was completed while offender was in remand. ^bTime between SRS assessments was only calculated for those with multiple SRS assessments.

Discretionary Ranges

As mentioned, offenders with SRS scores in the discretionary ranges were able to be classified in one of two security levels (see Table A2, Appendix A). Over one-quarter (27%) of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders had scores within the discretionary ranges. Of these scores, less than one-quarter of men were placed at a higher security level (22% of Indigenous offenders and 21% of non-Indigenous offenders). Fourteen percent of offenders were placed at a lower security level (13% of Indigenous offenders and 14% of non-Indigenous offenders). The SRS level and the actual security placement for the remainder were the same.

Inconsistencies in Security Classification

The SRS security reclassification process allows for examination of inconsistencies at two points of the assessment and decision process. First, the SRS assessed level can differ from the security level recommended by the caseworker. Second, the SRS level can differ from the final security placement decision made by the institutional head. Individuals who received SRS scores within the discretionary ranges were excluded from this analysis (n = 1,709), as they could be placed in a lower or higher level of security based on relevant case-related factors without requiring further justification for the decision.

Rates of Inconsistency

The rates of inconsistency between SRS assessed level, caseworker recommendation, and actual security placement are presented in Table 5. For all men offenders, there was 14% discordance between the SRS assessed level and the caseworker recommendation, 15% discordance between the SRS assessed level and the actual security placement, and 2% discordance between the caseworker recommendation and the actual security placement. Rates were similar for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders, with 1% to 2% variation between the three process points.

Among those with inconsistencies, approximately one-third were to a higher security level with the remainder to a lower security classification. This pattern was evident for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders, regardless of the process point compared.

		Indigenou	s Offenders		Non-Indigenous Offenders				All Men	Offenders		
	SRS A	ssessed Leve	el % (<i>n</i>)	Cramer's	SRS A	Assessed Level	% (<i>n</i>)	Cramer's	SRS	Assessed Level	l % (<i>n</i>)	Cramer's
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V
Caseworker R	ecommended S	Security Lev	el	0.78				0.73				0.75
Minimum	95 (280)	5 (47)	0 (0)		92 (575)	4 (108)	0 (0)		93 (855)	5 (155)	0 (0)	
Medium	5 (14)	85 (730)	5 (6)		8 (50)	85 (2,054)	9 (22)		7 (64)	84 (2,784)	8 (28)	
Maximum	0 (0)	10 (86)	95 (111)		0 (0)	11 (266)	91 (223)		0 (0)	11 (352)	92 (334)	
Actual Securit	y Placement			0.77				0.71				0.73
Minimum	94 (276)	6 (18)	0 (0)		88 (552)	5 (113)	0 (0)		90 (828)	5 (162)	0 (0)	
Medium	6 (49)	84 (727)	10 (87)		12 (73)	84 (2,035)	10 (24)		10 (91)	84 (2,762)	8 (30)	
Maximum	0 (0)	5 (6)	95 (111)		0 (0)	11 (280)	90 (221)		0 (0)	11 (367)	92 (332)	
	Caseworker Recommended		с ,	Casev	vorker Recomn	nended	с ,	Case	worker Recomm	nended	с ,	
	Sec	Security Level % (<i>n</i>)		Cramer s	Se	curity Level %	<i>(n)</i>	Cramer s	Se	ecurity Level %	<i>(n)</i>	Cramer s
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V
Actual Securit	y Placement			0.97				0.95				0.96
Minimum	97 (318)	1 (7)	0 (0)		95 (646)	1 (19)	0 (0)		95 (964)	1 (26)	0 (0)	
Medium	3 (9)	98 (738)	2 (4)		5 (37)	98 (2,084)	2 (11)		5 (26)	98 (2,822)	2 (15)	
Maximum	0 (0)	1 (5)	98 (193)		0 (0)	1 (23)	98 (478)		0 (0)	1 (28)	98 (671)	

Association between SRS assessed level, caseworker recommendation, and actual security placement

Note. Overall, 4,572 SRS assessments were examined for all men offenders; 1,274 were for Indigenous offenders and 3,298 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.

Table 5

Reasons for Inconsistencies

Reasons for inconsistencies between the SRS assessed level and the actual offender security level placement were examined by manual coding of offender assessment for decision and CSC board review files.⁹ SRS assessments where the SRS assessed level and the actual security placement agreed but the caseworker recommendation did not were excluded, as the discordance did not impact on the final security placement. Overall, 25% (n = 140) of the 565 assessments with an identified inconsistency were coded; of these one-quarter (n = 35) were coded for Indigenous men. Table 6 presents the main themes identified. Current behaviour and attitude of the offender (e.g. positive or negative institutional behaviour, attitude, or adjustment) was identified as the predominant theme for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders, followed by offender needs (e.g., offender required greater or less structure within the institution or has outstanding criminogenic needs to be addressed through programming). Table B5 in Appendix B outlines the sub-themes that were generated for all offenders, but due to small numbers for some themes, disaggregation by Indigenous ancestry was not possible. As part of the manual coding, coders recorded that Aboriginal Social History factors were considered for all Indigenous offenders by the caseworker and/or management team.

Table 6

Main Theme	Indigenous Men		Non-Indig	genous Men	All	Men
	%	(<i>n</i>)	%	(<i>n</i>)	%	(<i>n</i>)
Current Behaviour/Attitude	45	(45)	44	(129)	44	(174)
Offender Needs	27	(27)	31	(90)	30	(117)
Risk	15	(15)	16	(46)	15	(61)
Other ^a	4	(4)	6	(18)	6	(22)
Historical Behaviour/Attitude	9	(9)	3	(10)	5	(19)
Total Themes Identified	100	(100)	100	(293)	100	(393)

Reasons for inconsistency between SRS assessed level and actual offender security placement

Note. N = 140 offenders; 25% (n = 35) were Indigenous. ^a"Other" included subthemes such as "offender refused security level" and "assessment pre-mature" (see Table B5). Aboriginal Social History (ASH) factors were identified for all Indigenous offenders. One-third of cases coded were for lower security while 67% were for a higher classification. Offenders could have multiple categories endorsed; therefore, themes account for more than the number of files coded.

⁹ Assessment for decision documents are completed by CSC staff in advance of decision events (security classification/reclassification, parole, transfers) to outline relevant case factors and provide a recommendation for the decision. CSC board review documents outline the final decision made by the institutional head.

Reliability of the SRS

To assess the reliability of the SRS assessment, Cronbach's alpha and standardized itemto-total correlations were examined. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure internal consistency: for all men $\alpha = 0.68$, for Indigenous men $\alpha = 0.70$, and for non-Indigenous men $\alpha = 0.67$, which indicates sufficient homogeneity of the assessment. The standardized SRS item-to-total correlations are presented in Table 7, indicating that most items had a weak to moderate association with the total score. Overall, the SRS has sufficient reliability for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders.

Table 7

	Indigenous		Non-Indigenous		All Men Offenders	
SRS Items	Offenders		Offenders			
	r	M (SD)	r	M (SD)	r	M (SD)
Serious Disciplinary Offences	0.43	0.7 (0.4)	0.43	0.7 (0.4)	0.43	0.7 (0.4)
Minor Disciplinary Offences	0.27	0.5 (0.1)	0.32	0.6 (0.2)	0.31	0.5 (0.1)
Recorded Incidents	0.54	1.5 (1.0)	0.42	1.4 (1.0)	0.46	1.5 (1.0)
Pay Grade	0.38	0.8 (0.2)	0.42	0.8 (0.2)	0.41	0.8 (0.2)
Segregation Period	0.53	1.6 (1.2)	0.51	1.6 (1.2)	0.52	1.6 (1.2)
Detention Referral	0.11	0.9 (0.6)	0.03	0.8 (0.2)	0.06	0.8 (0.6)
Correctional Plan Progress	0.49	3.6 (0.9)	0.48	3.8 (1.0)	0.48	3.8 (1.0)
Correctional Plan Motivation	0.59	3.6 (1.4)	0.54	3.9 (1.4)	0.55	3.8 (1.4)
Drug and Alcohol Rating	0.22	1.0 (0.3)	0.22	0.9 (0.4)	0.22	0.9 (0.4)
Successful ETA Releases	0.26	2.3 (0.6)	0.15	2.4 (0.4)	0.18	2.4 (0.4)
Successful UTA/Work Releases	0.09	1.0 (0.05)	0.10	1.0 (0.05)	0.09	1.0 (0.05)
Age at Review	0.12	0.7 (0.2)	0.13	0.7 (0.2)	0.13	0.7 (0.2)
Psychological Concerns	0.19	0.7 (0.4)	0.13	0.7 (0.4)	0.15	0.7 (0.4)
CRS Escape History	0.07	0.5 (0.1)	0.07	0.5 (0.1)	0.07	0.5 (0.1)
CRS Incident History	0.32	1.4 (0.8)	0.35	1.3 (0.8)	0.34	1.3 (0.8)

Standardized SRS item-to-total correlations and descriptive statistics

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

Validity of the SRS

Convergent Validity

After randomly selecting one SRS assessment per offender, convergent validity was examined using the association between the SRS assessed level with measures of risk and need most recently completed prior to administering the SRS. These include: static factor rating, dynamic factor rating, reintegration potential, and the CRI (see Table 8). Analyses demonstrated comparable results for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders, with dynamic measures (dynamic factor rating and reintegration potential) having a stronger relationship with both the SRS assessed level and the actual security placement than measures of risk (static factor rating and CRI, see Tables B6 and B7 for detailed analysis information).

Table 8

Cramer's V association between the SRS assessed level, actual security placement, and measure of risk and need for men offenders

	Cramer's V Strength of Association									
Measure	SF	RS Assessed Level ^{a,b})	Actual Security Placement ^{a,b}						
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	All Men	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	All Men				
Static Risk ^a	0.19	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.18	0.19				
Dynamic Need ^b	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.34	0.34				
Reintegration Potential ^b	0.39	0.36	0.36	0.41	0.36	0.37				
CRI ^a	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.19	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.

Predictive Validity

To assess the predictive validity of the SRS for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous men, 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.

Both the SRS assessed level and the actual security placement were predictive of disciplinary charges, the rates of discretionary release, and returns to custody, with and without an offence. As shown in Table B8 in Appendix B, 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 (see Table B9). Offenders with higher security level on the SRS assessment or the actual security placement were also more likely to return to custody (see Table B10), including when a return with a new offence was examined (see Table B11). This pattern was evident after accounting for time at risk. The SRS assessment and actual security placement, however, were not as discriminant in identifying the differences between returns to custody for minimum and medium assessed offenders. The pattern was comparable for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders for all indicators examined.

Discussion

Based on the results of this study, and in alignment with previous research such as Gobeil (2009), the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) continues to be a reliable and valid tool in the security reclassification process, for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders.

Similar proportions of Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders were assessed at the various security levels, with almost two-thirds identified as medium security and about onequarter assessed as minimum. Even though Indigenous offenders were slightly younger and were more likely to have a violent index offence, these factors did not seem to adversely impact on the SRS assessed level or the final security placement. Gobeil (2009) found comparable results for Indigenous offenders but found that non-Indigenous offenders were slightly more likely to be identified as medium security than found in this study. Almost three-quarters of offenders, regardless of Indigenous ancestry, were initially placed in medium security, highlighting the importance of security reclassification to cascade offenders to lower security when appropriate.

On average, SRS assessments were completed within two years of the completion of the CRS or after admission to federal custody, which meets the minimum timing guidelines as set out in policy during the study period (CSC, 2014b). However, one-third of offenders had an SRS assessment completed longer than two years. Offenders serving longer sentences of ten years or more (including indeterminate offenders) were more often assessed outside of the two-year policy window: 51% versus 12% of those assessed within the two years; therefore, some attention to the timing of the SRS assessment for those serving longer sentences is needed. Timing of assessments was similar for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. In January 2018, CSC policies were modified to dictate automatic review periods for Indigenous offenders following the completion of a main program and at six-month intervals for Indigenous offenders participating in Pre-Pathways interventions or on Pathways units (CSC, 2018). Future research would need to account for this policy change and the potential impact on the security reclassification process for Indigenous offenders.

Examination of the use of discretionary ranges on the SRS and inconsistencies across the review process demonstrated comparable results for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. Over one-quarter of offenders had scores that fell in the discretionary ranges, but for almost two-thirds of these assessments, staff did not employ the discretionary range. For inconsistencies (i.e.,

19

when the SRS assessed level and either the caseworker recommendation or the actual security placement did not align) about 15% of assessments were identified as discordant, which was higher than the proportion found in previous revalidation studies (Gobeil, 2009), but is within the 5% to 20% range of inconsistencies identified in the assessment literature (Austin & Hardyman, 2004; NIC, 2003). Although these inconsistencies did not show a uniform 50-50 distribution between higher and lower security levels as recommended (Austin & Hardyman, 2004), over two-thirds were to a lower security classification. Reasons for the inconsistencies examined showed that offenders' current behaviour, attitude, and identified needs were the most used rationales for these inconsistencies. Aboriginal Social History factors were identified for all of the Indigenous men examined, although as shown by Keown and colleagues (2015), it is not always possible to measure the direct impact of these factors on the final decision made.

As with the other indicators examined, the reliability for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders was sufficient, with over half of the items in the assessment having a moderate correlation to the total score. However, it is important to note that the SRS was developed to include items which are independently related to relevant outcomes, and therefore there is no reason to believe the items should be consistent with one another (Gobeil, 2009). The exclusion of certain items was not explored in this study, nor was the inclusion of other factors that may enhance the reliability of the tool. Future research would be needed to adequately assess this, using the themes identified in the manual coding of inconsistencies to inform this process.

The validity measures demonstrated that the SRS assessed level and the actual security placement are associated with other measures of offender risk and need as well as offender institutional and post-release behaviour, although some of the predictive ability of the SRS assessment was weak to moderate. These findings were comparable for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders and were consistent with previous research (Gobeil, 2009). These findings demonstrate that offenders in higher security levels have more problematic institutional and post-release behaviour. There is a body of literature that exists, however, that speaks to the idea that tougher prisons themselves (i.e., higher security) are the reasons for more incidents of misconduct rather than the offenders having more violent tendencies themselves (Gobeil, 2014; Shermer, et al., 2012; Worrall & Morris, 2011). It is difficult to determine whether this is a causal relationship, or simply a strong association. Also, the exact factors in institutional environments that may influence offender behaviour are not fully understood (Gobeil, 2014).

20

Further research would be required to more fully understand this association.

Conclusions

The SRS continues to be a reliable and valid tool in the offender security reclassification process for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous men. Aboriginal Social History informs security decisions for Indigenous men. Additional factors such as institutional adjustment, escape risk, and risk to public safety are also taken into consideration before a final security placement decision is made as part of the SRS review process. Future research could explore the inclusion or exclusion of other items in the SRS. However, the on-going use of this reclassification assessment for federal men offenders is supported by the findings of this study.

References

- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J.S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52(1), 7-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705281756.
- Austin, J. (2003). Findings in prison classification and risk assessment. *National Institute of Corrections – Issues in Brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons.
- 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.
- Bellmore, A.R. (2011). *Gender, culture, and prison classification: Testing the reliability and validity of a prison classification system* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (1992). *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* [CCRA]. (S.C. 1992, c. 20). Retrieved from <u>http://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/FullText.html</u>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (1992). Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations [CCRR]. (SOR/92-620). Retrieved from <u>http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-92-620/page-2.html#h-11</u>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2001). Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) functional specification version 4.0.3. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2014a). *Commissioner's Directive 705-7: Security classification and penitentiary placement*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2014b). Commissioner's Directive 710-6: Review of inmate security classification. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2018). *Commissioner's Directive 710-6: Review of inmate security classification*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2018). Commissioner's Directive 705-6: Correctional planning and criminal profile. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Farr, K. (2000). Classification for female inmates: Moving forward. *Crime and Delinquency*, 46 (1), 3-17. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128700046001001</u>.
- Gobeil, R. (2009). Assessing security reclassification with male Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal offenders (R-203). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.

- Gobeil, R. (2014). *Offender behaviour: The influence of institutional design* (Research Report R-331). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Gordon, A. & Wong, S. (2015) The use of a structured guide to assess proxies of offending behaviours and change in custodial settings. *Journal of Forensic Practice*, *17*(2), 83-100. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFP-10-2013-0048.
- Hardyman, P.L., Austin, J., Alexander, J., Johnson, K.D., & Tulloch, O.C. (2002). Internal prison classification systems: Case studies in their development and implementation. *National Institute of Corrections*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Harer, M.D. & Langan, N.P. (2001). Gender differences in predictors of prison violence: Assessing the predictive validity of a risk classification system. *Crime and Delinquency*, 47(4), 513-536. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128701047004002</u>.
- Holsinger, A.M., Lowenkamp, C.T., & Latessa, E.J. (2006). Exploring the validity of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised with Native American offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 331-337. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.03.009</u>.
- Keown, L. A., Gobeil, R., Biro, S., & Beaudette, J. N. (2015). Aboriginal Social History factors in case management (Research Report R-356). Ottawa, Ontario: 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.
- Makarios, M. & Latessa, E.J. (2013). Developing a risk needs assessment instrument for prison inmates: The issue of outcome. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 40,* 1449-1471. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813496240.
- Motiuk, M.S., Motiuk, L.L, & Bonta, J. (1992) A comparison between self-report and interviewbased inventories in offender classification. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, *19*, 143-159.
- 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.
- National Institute of Corrections. (2003). *Comprehensive objective prison classification: Participant manual.* Washington, United States of America: Author.
- *R. v. Gladue.* (1999). 1 S.C.R. 688.
- Rugge, T. (2006). *Risk assessment of male Aboriginal offenders: A 2006 perspective*. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness.

- Shaw, M. & Hannah-Moffat, K. (2000). Gender, diversity and risk assessment in Canadian corrections. *Probation Journal*, 47(3), 163-172. https://doi.org/10.1177/026455050004700301.
- Shermer, L.O., Bierie, D.M., & Stock A. (2012). Endogeneity in prison risk classification. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 57(10), 1248-1274. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X12452404.
- Simourd, D.S. (2004). Use of dynamic risk/need assessment instruments among long-term incarcerated offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 31*, 306-323. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854803262507.
- Thompson, J., McConnell, A., & Paquin-Marseille, L. (2013). *The Security Reclassification Scale (SRSW) for shorter review periods among federal women offenders* (R-286). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Vasquez, A. & Bussert, T. (2016). Shedding light on the BOP's inmate classification and designation process. *Criminal Justice*, *31*(1), 19-22.
- Worrall, J. L. & Morris, R. G. (2011). Inmate custody levels and prison rule violations. *The Prison Journal*, *91*(2), 131-157. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885511404380</u>.
- 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. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/03610926.2011.575513</u>.
- Young, D., Moline, K., Farrell, J, & Bierie, D. (2006). Best implementation practices: Disseminating new assessment technologies in a juvenile justice agency. *Crime and Delinquency*, 52(1), 135-158. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705281752</u>.

Appendix A: Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) Items and Scoring Grid

Table A1

Items in SRS Assessment

SRS Item	Item Response Options	Response Scores
1. Serious Disciplinary Offences	None	0.5
	One	1.0
	Two	1.5
	Three or more	2.0
2. Minor Disciplinary Offences	None	0.5
	One	0.5
	Two	0.5
	Three or more	1.0
3. Recorded Incidents	No record	0.5
	One	1.0
	Two	2.0
	Three or more	3.0
4. 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
5. Segregation Period	None	0.5
	One or more	3.0
6. 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
7. Correctional Plan Progress	Has addressed factors	2.0
	Has partially addressed factors	3.5
	Has not addressed factors	5.0
8. Correctional Plan Motivation	Fully motivated/Participated in programs	2.0
	Partially motivated/Active in programs	4.0
	No motivation/Limited program participation	6.0

SRS Item	Item Response Options	Response Scores
9. Drug and Alcohol Rating	No identifiable problems	0.5
	Contributing factor/No evidence of use during review	1.0
	period	
	Contributing factor/Evidence of use during review period	1.5
10. Successful ETA Releases	No ETAs	2.5
	One ETAs	2.0
	Two ETAs	1.0
	Three or more ETAs	0.5
11. Successful UTA/Work Releases	None	1.0
	One or more	0.5
12. 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
13. Psychological Concerns	No psychological concerns	0.5
	Psychological concerns noted	1.5
14. 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
15. 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.

Table A2Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) Scoring Grid

SRS Security Level	Discretionary Range Level	Lower Score	Upper Score
Minimum		0	16.5
	Minimum (Minimum to Medium)	16.0	16.5
	Medium (Medium to Minimum)	17.0	
Medium		17.0	26.5
	Medium (Medium to Maximum)	26.0	26.5
	Maximum (Maximum to Medium)	27.0	28.0
Maximum		27	99.99999

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale.

Appendix B: Supplemental Analyses

Table B1

SRS Level and Score by Region

				R	egion	of SRS A	Assess	sment % (<i>r</i>	ı)			
- SPS Scale Level	Atla	ntic	Qu	ebec	Or	ntario	F	Prairie	Pa	cific	A 11	Pagions
SKS Seale Level	Reg	ion	Region		Re	egion	F	legion	Re	gion	(N -	- 6 281)
	(N = 1)	571)	(<i>N</i> =	1,328)	(<i>N</i> = 1,393) ((N = 2,022)		(N = 967)		(10 -	- 0,281)
Minimum	21	(121)	10	(130)	25	(355)	35	(717)	13	(129)	23	(1,452)
Medium	62	(351)	71	(942)	67	(930)	53	(1,063)	71	(688)	63	(3,974)
Maximum	17	(99)	19	(256)	8	(108)	12	(242)	16	(150)	14	(855)
					М	ean SRS	Scor	e (SD)				
Minimum	15	(1.0)	15	(0.9)	15	(1.0)	15	(1.1)	16	(0.8)	15	(1.0)
Medium	22	(2.9)	22	(2.9)	21	(2.9)	21	(3.0)	22	(3.0)	22	(2.9)
Maximum	29	(1.4)	28	(1.5)	28	(1.1)	28	(1.4)	28	(1.2)	28	(1.3)

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

Table B2

SRS Level and Score by Offence Type

		Offence Type % (<i>n</i>)	
SRS Scale Level	All Violent Offences	All Non-Violent Offences	All Regions
	(<i>N</i> = 4,620)	(<i>N</i> =1,661)	(<i>N</i> = 6,281)
Minimum	20 (927)	31 (525)	23 (1,452)
Medium	65 (3,016)	58 (958)	63 (3,974)
Maximum	15 (677)	11 (178)	14 (855)
		Mean SRS Score (SD)	
Minimum	15 (1.0)	15 (1.0)	15 (1.0)
Medium	22 (2.9)	22 (3.0)	22 (2.9)
Maximum	28 (1.4)	28 (1.1)	28 (1.3)

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

				Sen	tence L	ength % (n	ı)				
SRS Scale Level	Less that $(N = 1)$	n 4 years 1,861)	4 years to less than 10 years (N = 2,840)		10 years or more (<i>N</i> = 584)		Indete (N =	Indeterminate (N = 996)		Total (<i>N</i> = 6,281)	
Minimum	29	(542)	26	(729)	13	(78)	10	(103)	23	(1,452)	
Medium	57	(1,059)	61	(1,737)	74	(432)	75	(746)	63	(3,974)	
Maximum	14	(260)	13	(374)	13	(74)	15	(147)	14	(855)	
				Me	an SRS	Score (SD)				
Minimum	15	(1.0)	15	(1.0)	15	(1.1)	16	(0.8)	15	(1.0)	
Medium	22	(3.0)	22	(3.0)	21	(2.9)	22	(2.8)	22	(2.9)	
Maximum	28	(1.1)	28	(1.3)	29	(1.5)	29	(1.6)	29	(1.4)	

Table B3SRS Level and Score by Sentence Length

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

Table B4

SRS Level and Score by Age at Assessment

				Ag	e at Asse	ssment %	(<i>n</i>)			
SPS Scola Loval	18 to 28	years of	29 to 3	29 to 34 years		35 to 44 years		rs of age	Total	
SKS Scale Level	ag	age		of age		of age		nigher	(N - 6.291)	
	(<i>N</i> =1	,777)	(<i>N</i> =	1,476)	(<i>N</i> =	(<i>N</i> =1,524)		1,504)	(1) -	0,281)
Minimum	18	(325)	23	(339)	24	(373)	28	(415)	23	(1,452)
Medium	60	(1,070)	63	(924)	64	(972)	67	(1,008)	63	(3,974)
Maximum	22	(382)	14	(213)	12	(179)	5	(81)	14	(855)
				М	lean SRS	Score (SL))			
Minimum	15	(0.8)	15	(1.1)	15	(1.1)	15	(1.0)	15	(1.0)
Medium	22	(3.0)	22	(2.9)	22	(3.0)	21	(2.7)	22	(2.9)
Maximum	28	(1.3)	29	(1.5)	28	(1.3)	28	(1.2)	28	(1.3)

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

Main Theme (Sub-theme)	%	(<i>n</i>)
Current Behaviour/Attitude	44	(174)
Poor institutional behaviour	18	(69)
Poor attitude and/or adjustment	9	(35)
Positive institutional behaviour	10	(41)
Positive attitude/high motivation	7	(29)
Offender Needs	30	(117)
Offender required greater structure	15	(57)
Refused or un-cooperative with correctional plan/programming	3	(10)
Offender needed to build credibility	1	(5)
Required psychological assessment	0.3	(1)
Progress with correctional plan/programming	7	(29)
Offender required less structure/opportunities of alternate institution	4	(15)
Risk	15	(61)
Risk to institutional safety or security	6	(24)
Reduction in security risk ratings	3	(13)
Public safety risk	3	(11)
Escape risk	2	(9)
Risk to self	1	(4)
Other	6	(22)
Offender refuses security level	3	(10)
Program access/needs or programs not available prior to review	1	(5)
Positive support system	1	(3)
Application for transfer pre-mature	1	(3)
Lateral transfer sufficient	0.3	(1)
Historical Behaviour/Attitude	5	(19)
History of poor institutional behaviour	4	(16)
History of positive institutional behaviour	1	(3)
Total Themes Identified	100	(393)

Reasons for Inconsistency between SRS Assessed Level and Final Offender Security Classification Placement

Note. N = 140 offenders; 25% (n = 35) were Indigenous. Aboriginal Social History (ASH) factors were identified for all Indigenous offenders. One-third of cases coded were for a lower security classification while 67% were for a higher classification. Offenders could have multiple main theme categories endorsed and therefore, themes account for more than the number of offender files coded.

Association between SRS level and measures of static risk, dynamic need, reintegration potential, and CRI

		Indigenou	s Offenders			Non-Indigeno	us Offenders			All Men	Offenders	
	SRS As	ssessed Leve	el % (<i>n</i>)	Cramer's	SRS A	Assessed Level	% (<i>n</i>)	Cramer's	SRS	Assessed Leve	1 % (<i>n</i>)	Cramer's
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V
Static Factor R	ating			0.19				0.17				0.17
Low	38 (12)	56 (18)	6 (2)		46 (92)	51 (102)	3 (6)		45 (104)	52 (120)	3 (8)	
Medium	43 (190)	49 (217)	8 (35)		34 (421)	56 (684)	10 (118)		37 (611)	54 (901)	9 (153)	
High	18 (186)	65 (664)	17 (169)		16 (401)	69 (1,736)	15 (380)		17 (587)	68 (2,400)	15 (549)	
Dynamic Facto	r Rating			0.33				0.33				0.33
Low	76 (26)	24 (8)	0 (0)		71 (96)	29 (39)	0 (0)		72 (122)	28 (47)	0 (0)	
Medium	50 (247)	47 (236)	3 (14)		44 (599)	53 (731)	3 (40)		45 (846)	52 (967)	3 (54)	
High	12 (115)	68 (655)	20 (192)		9 (219)	72 (1,752)	19 (464)		10 (334)	71 (2,407)	19 (656)	
Reintegration F	otential			0.39				0.36				0.36
Low	5 (34)	72 (557)	23 (180)		4 (67)	72 (1,232)	24 (408)		4 (101)	72 (1,789)	24 (588)	
Medium	47 (300)	49 (316)	4 (26)		32 (580)	63 (1,142)	5 (92)		36 (880)	59 (1,458)	5 (118)	
High	67 (54)	33 (26)	0 (0)		64 (267)	35 (148)	1 (4)		64 (321)	35 (174)	1 (4)	
CRI				0.17				0.19				0.18
COIA/No	26 (12)	70 (32)	4 (2)		32 (64)	63 (125)	5 (10)		31 (76)	64 (157)	5 (12)	
rating												
Low	41 (49)	54 (66)	5 (6)		35 (266)	61 (466)	4 (35)		35 (315)	60 (532)	5 (41)	
Low-	37 (90)	57 (136)	6 (14)		29 (242)	62 (507)	9 (76)		31 (332)	60 (643)	9 (90)	
Moderate												
Moderate	33 (79)	56 (134)	11 (26)		19 (105)	69 (382)	12 (69)		23 (184)	65 (516)	12 (95)	
Moderate-	20 (47)	63 (151)	17 (40)		20 (106)	69 (371)	11 (63)		20 (153)	67 (522)	13 (103)	
High												
High	18 (111)	63 (380)	19 (118)		12 (131)	64 (671)	24 (251)		15 (242)	63 (1,051)	22 (369)	

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

Association between actual security placement and measures of static risk, dynamic need, reintegration potential, and CRI

		Indigenou	s Offenders		Non-Indigenous Offenders					All Men	Offenders	
	Actual Sec	curity Placer	ment % (<i>n</i>)	Cramer's	Actual S	ecurity Placem	ent % (<i>n</i>)	Cramer's	Actual S	Security Placem	nent % (n)	Cramer's
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	V
Static Factor Ra	ting			0.22				0.18				0.19
Low	44 (14)	50 (16)	1 (2)		42 (84)	50 (101)	8 (15)		42 (98)	51 (117)	7 (17)	
Medium	48 (214)	39 (170)	13 (58)		37 (451)	48 (586)	15 (186)		40 (665)	45 (756)	15 (244)	
High	18 (186)	58 (593)	24 (240)		15 (390)	62 (1,549)	23 (578)		16 (576)	61 (2,142)	23 (818)	
Dynamic Factor	Rating			0.34				0.34				0.34
Low	82 (28)	18 (6)	0 (0)		70 (95)	29 (39)	1 (1)		73 (123)	27 (45)	0.1 (1)	
Medium	53 (263)	42 (210)	5 (24)		45 (618)	48 (659)	7 (93)		47 (881)	47 (869)	6 (117)	
High	13 (123)	58 (563)	29 (276)		9 (212)	63 (1,538)	28 (685)		10 (335)	62 (2,101)	28 (961)	
Reintegration P	otential			0.41				0.36				0.37
Low	5 (37)	62 (477)	33 (257)		3 (44)	64 (1,094)	33 (569)		3 (81)	64 (1,571)	33 (826)	
Medium	49 (317)	44 (282)	7 (43)		34 (613)	55 (1,001)	11 (200)		38 (930)	52 (1,283)	10 (243)	
High	75 (60)	25 (20)	0 (0)		64 (268)	34 (141)	2 (10)		66 (328)	32 (161)	2 (10)	
CRI				0.19				0.19				0.18
COIA/No	41 (19)	54 (25)	5 (2)		34 (67)	56 (112)	10 (20)		35 (86)	56 (137)	9 (22)	
rating												
Low	43 (52)	46 (56)	11 (13)		33 (248)	58 (447)	9 (72)		34 (300)	57 (503)	9 (85)	
Low-	42 (101)	48 (114)	10 (25)		31 (253)	56 (458)	14 (114)		33 (354)	54 (572)	13 (139)	
Moderate												
Moderate	34 (82)	50 (118)	16 (39)		20 (112)	62 (346)	18 (98)		25 (194)	58 (464)	17 (137)	
Moderate-	19 (45)	61 (146)	20 (47)		18 (95)	61 (329)	21 (116)		18 (140)	61 (475)	21 (163)	
High												
High	19 (115)	52 (320)	29 (174)		14 (150)	52 (544)	34 (359)		16 (265)	52 (864)	32 (533)	

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

				Di	sciplinary	Charges			
SRS Assessed Level	Indigenous Men			No	n-Indigen	ous Men	All Men		
	%	<i>(n)</i>	HR	%	<i>(n)</i>	HR	%	(<i>n</i>)	HR
Minimum	27	(104)	(ref)	23	(206)	(ref)	24	(310)	(ref)
Medium	46	(417)	1.81***	40	(997)	1.80***	41	(1,414)	1.79***
Maximum	63	(130)	3.41***	64	(321)	4.14***	64	(451)	3.37***
Model fit									
Wald χ^2 (<i>df</i>)		87.60 (2)***		277.71 (2)***		362.04 (2)	***
Harrell's c		0.59)		0.60			0.60	
Actual Security Placement									
Minimum	26	(109)	(ref)	23	(217)	(ref)	24	(326)	(ref)
Medium	47	(364)	1.80***	38	(845)	1.64***	40	(1,209)	1.67***
Maximum	59	(178)	3.34***	59	(462)	3.56***	59	(640)	3.47***
Model fit									
Wald χ^2 (<i>df</i>)		101.14 (2	2)***		287.45 (2)***		383.37 (2)	***
Harrell's c		0.61			0.61			0.61	

Rates of disciplinary charges across SRS levels and actual security placements

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. df = degrees of freedom. Percentages do not account for time at risk, while the hazard ratios, Wald χ^2 , and Harrell's *c* account for time at risk. Harrell's *c* values of 0.56, 0.64, and 0.71 are considered small, moderate, and large effect sizes, respectively. *** *p* <.001.

		Discretionary Release	
SRS Assessed Level	Indigenous Men	Non-Indigenous Men	All Men
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Minimum	67 (145)	64 (486)	65 (631)
Medium	33 (71)	36 (270)	35 (341)
Maximum	0 (0)	0.1 (1)	0.1 (1)
Model fit			
Wald χ^2 (<i>df</i>)	96.22 (2)***	482.36 (2)***	565.66 (2)***
AUC	0.73	0.77	0.76
Actual Security Placement			
Minimum	79 (170)	70 (530)	72 (700)
Medium	21 (46)	30 (224)	28 (270)
Maximum	0 (0)	0.4 (3)	0.3 (3)
Model fit			
Wald χ^2 (<i>df</i>)	110.05 (2)***	546.25 (2)***	644.01 (2)***
AUC	0.79	0.81	0.80

Rates of discretionary release across SRS levels and actual security placements

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. df = degrees of freedom. AUC = Area under the curve. Percentages do not account for time at risk, while Wald χ^2 accounts for time at risk. AUC values of 0.56, 0.64, and 0.71 are considered small, moderate, and large effect sizes, respectively. *** p < .001.

				R	eturns to	Custody			
SRS Assessed Level	Indigenous Men			No	n-Indigeno	ous Men	All Men		
	%	<i>(n)</i>	HR	%	(<i>n</i>)	HR	%	<i>(n)</i>	HR
Minimum	42	(144)	(ref)	24	(191)	(ref)	29	(335)	(ref)
Medium	57	(331)	1.91***	38	(643)	2.28***	43	(974)	2.01***
Maximum	72	(76)	3.75***	60	(202)	5.67***	63	(278)	4.61***
Model fit									
Wald χ^2 (<i>df</i>)		89.05 (2)***		283.39 (2)***		341.14 (2)***
Harrell's c		0.60)		0.63			0.62	
Actual Security Placement									
Minimum	43	(163)	(ref)	23	(193)	(ref)	29	(356)	(ref)
Minimum Medium	43 56	(163) (253)	(ref) 1.77***	23 38	(193) (549)	(ref) 2.34***	29 42	(356) (802)	(ref) 1.98***
Minimum Medium Maximum	43 56 70	(163) (253) (135)	(ref) 1.77*** 3.30***	23 38 55	(193) (549) (294)	(ref) 2.34*** 4.94***	29 42 59	(356) (802) (429)	(ref) 1.98*** 4.01***
Minimum Medium Maximum Model fit	43 56 70	(163) (253) (135)	(ref) 1.77*** 3.30***	23 38 55	(193) (549) (294)	(ref) 2.34*** 4.94***	29 42 59	(356) (802) (429)	(ref) 1.98*** 4.01***
Minimum Medium Maximum Model fit Wald χ^2 (df)	43 56 70	(163) (253) (135) 101.40 (2	(ref) 1.77*** 3.30*** 2)***	23 38 55	(193) (549) (294) 287.77 (2	(ref) 2.34*** 4.94***)***	29 42 59	(356) (802) (429) 363.25 (2	(ref) 1.98*** 4.01***)***

Rates of returns to custody across SRS levels and actual security placements

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. df = degrees of freedom. Percentages do not account for time at risk, while the hazard ratios, Wald χ^2 , and Harrell's *c* account for time at risk. Harrell's *c* values of 0.56, 0.64, and 0.71 are considered small, moderate, and large effect sizes, respectively. *** *p* <.001.

	Returns with New Offence								
SRS Assessed Level	Indigenous Men			Non-Indigenous Men			All Men		
	%	<i>(n)</i>	HR	%	<i>(n)</i>	HR	%	<i>(n)</i>	HR
Minimum	6	(22)	(ref)	4	(32)	(ref)	5	(54)	(ref)
Medium	9	(51)	1.92*	4	(75)	1.66*	5	(126)	1.67**
Maximum	10	(11)	3.70**	10	(35)	6.27***	10	(46)	4.94***
Model fit									
Wald χ^2 (<i>df</i>)	13.23 (2)**			59.61 (2)***			63.27 (2)***		
Harrell's c	0.59			0.64			0.61		
Actual Security Placement									
Minimum	7	(27)	(ref)	4	(32)	(ref)	5	(59)	(ref)
Medium	9	(40)	1.67*	5	(66)	1.79**	6	(106)	1.61**
Maximum	9	(17)	2.59**	8	(44)	4.71***	8	(61)	3.56***
Model fit									
Wald χ^2 (<i>df</i>)	9.61 (2)**			45.48 (2)***			47.86 (2)***		
Harrell's c	0.58			0.64			0.61		

Rates of new offences committed on release across SRS levels and actual security placements

Note. SRS = Security Reclassification Scale. HR = Hazard Ratio. df = degrees of freedom. Percentages do not account for time at risk, while the hazard ratios, Wald χ^2 , and Harrell's *c* account for time at risk. Harrell's *c* values of 0.56, 0.64, and 0.71 are considered small, moderate, and large effect sizes, respectively. * *p* <.05, ** *p* <.01, *** *p* <.001.