

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Qualitative Examination of Overrides for Correctional Programming for Women Offenders

2023 - N° R-440

ISBN: 978-0-660-42039-4

Cat. No.: PS83-5/R440E-PDF

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.

**Qualitative Examination of Overrides for Correctional Programming for Women
Offenders**

Angela Smeth

Dena Derkzen

Sarah Cram

&

Thana Ridha

Correctional Service of Canada

2023

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to extend appreciation to everyone who were involved in the consultation process and provided report feedback from the Women Offender Sector (Andrea Moser, Karen Sorensen, Jennine Hamilton, Marie-Christine Pépin), Indigenous Initiatives Branch (Kristen Miller, Stephanie Chalifoux-Taylor), Evaluation Branch (Nick Chadwick), and the Reintegration Programs Division (Emmanuel Rutsimbo, Marie-Lynn Bériau, Mylène Duchemin, Marci Beitner). Special thanks to Shanna Farrell MacDonald for her assistance in the data extraction process.

Executive Summary

Key words: *criminal risk index, program referral, overrides*

Effective February 5, 2018, the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) changed its policy for program assignments, requiring all offenders to be referred to programs based on the Criminal Risk Index (CRI). The CRI is a tool used to assess static risk and guide offender intervention levels. A recent evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs (CSC, 2019) found that more than half of the women offenders who completed programming were overridden into a program, as they did not initially meet the program referral criteria.

The purpose of this study was to conduct a qualitative examination of the reasons of overrides of the CRI referral criteria for women offenders. Analyses were conducted with an admission dataset ($N = 709$; 34% Indigenous), which included all offenders whom were admitted to federal custody with a new warrant of committal during their first term between February 1, 2018 and December 31, 2019.

An examination of demographic characteristics indicated that the majority of women were serving shorter sentences and were convicted of drug-related offences. The criminogenic needs that were most salient for women offenders appeared to be those related to personal/emotional orientation, substance abuse, and associates. In addition, the majority of the study group were low (45%) to moderate (43%) criminal risk, based on the CRI.

While a large proportion of program referrals aligned with CRI scores ($n = 591$; 85%), there appeared to be higher than expected percentages of overrides from high to moderate intensity (21%) and from engagement only to moderate intensity (26%) and the extent to which varied by Indigenous ancestry, region, offence type, and sentence length. Further analyses demonstrated that of those women who completed moderate intensity programming, 20% ($n = 64$) did not initially meet the program referral criteria for moderate intensity and were overridden into the program. These results were consistent across Indigenous ancestry.

File reviews of the reasons for overrides showed that among women who were overridden from engagement only to moderate intensity, a large proportion were assessed as having a moderate to severe substance use problem and there was an established link between their substance use and their criminal behaviour. All women who were overridden from moderate to high intensity had exhibited a pattern of persistent violence where a large proportion of their current offence(s) included elements of gratuitous violence. The most frequently documented reason for an override to a lower intensity program was the presences of significant factors that would mitigate their risk (e.g., gaps in offending, limited history of violence).

Overall, the results of this study demonstrated that the rationale of program overrides was consistent with policy guidelines. Nonetheless, the proportion of overrides was higher than anticipated, which raises potential challenges in aligning programming needs with response strategies.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
List of Appendices.....	vi
Introduction.....	8
Method.....	13
Participants.....	13
Measures.....	13
Analytical Approach.....	15
Results.....	16
Sample Characteristics.....	16
Program Override Characteristics.....	20
Reasons for Overrides.....	23
Discussion.....	26
Conclusions.....	29
References.....	30

List of Tables

Table 1 Demographic, sentence and offence information	17
Table 2 Criminogenic risk and need characteristics	19
Table 3 Proportion of each type of override	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 4 Correctional programming participation information.....	23
Table 5 Reasons for overrides.....	25

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Additional Data Tables	32
--	----

Introduction

Effective February 5, 2018, the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) changed its policy for program assignments, requiring all offenders to be referred to programs based on the Criminal Risk Index (CRI). Prior to the policy change, program referrals were based on the Revised Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale (SIR-R1) for non-Indigenous men, the Custody Rating Scale (CRS) for women and Indigenous men and the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis, Revised (DFIA-R) for women.¹ The CRI is completed at intake and is a tool used to assess static risk and guide the development of correctional plans, such as program intensity (CSC, 2018b; Motiuk & Vuong, 2018). A recent evaluation of Correctional Programs at CSC found that more than half of the women offenders who completed programming were overridden into the program as they did not initially meet the program referral criteria (CSC, 2020).² Given the high proportion of overrides to programs, this study aims to explore the CRI referral criteria for women. In particular, this qualitative examination will examine the reasons of overrides of the CRI referral criteria of women offenders.

Development of the CRI

The CRI was developed from years of research on the Static Factor Assessment (SFA) in the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process that was implemented in 1994 (Helmus & Forrester 2014a, 2014b; Motiuk & Vuong, 2018). The SFA includes a structured way to look at three areas of static risk: (a) The Criminal History Record (CHR), which examines current and previous criminal offences; (b) The Offence Severity Record (OSR), which examines the extent of harm from the offender's criminal activity; and (c) The Offence History Checklist (SOHC), which evaluates the nature and extent of current and previous sex offending (if applicable). More specifically, the CRI was derived from the CHR subcomponent of the SFA. Using a sample of

¹ The SIR-R1 is an actuarial tool for predicting recidivism for non-Indigenous men. It includes items on demographic characteristics and criminal history. The CRS is an actuarial tool used to assess the appropriate security level for the penitentiary placement of an offender. The DFIA-R is an instrument used to identify and prioritize criminogenic needs within seven dynamic risk areas (CSC, 2018a). Other tools utilized in program referral decisions for men sex offenders are the Static-99R and the Stable-2007. The Static-99R is an actuarial tool used to assist in the estimation of sexual recidivism for sexual offenders. The Stable-2007 is a structured risk assessment tool that identifies stable dynamic risk factors for sexual offending (CSC, 2018a).

² This study used the previous program referral guidelines for women (i.e., the CRS and DFIA-R).

64,605 intake SFA assessments from 1997 to 2012, Helmus and Forrester (2014a) examined the construct validity³ of the SFA. Results demonstrated that the SFA, including the CHR subcomponent, were being used as intended. That is, the CHR items were found to be influencing the overall risk evaluations and the assessments were related to other measures of risk (e.g., SIR-R1 and CRS). The results were generally consistent across Indigenous and women offenders.

In a follow up study, Helmus and Forrester (2014b) examined the predictive accuracy of the SFA risk rating as well as the CHR and the OSR subcomponents. Based on 8,767 first releases (2006-2008) from federal custody, the results showed that the CHR was more predictive of community outcomes (i.e., revocations without an offence, readmissions with any offence, and readmissions with a violent offence) compared to the overall Static Factor risk rating and the OSR. The results were also consistent across gender and Indigenous ancestry subgroups.

Based on the aforementioned research studies (Helmus & Forrester, 2014a, 2014b), Motiuk and Vuong (2018) sought to transform the CHR into the CRI and examine the predictive validity of the tool on the entire federal population, as well as with major offence types (i.e., homicide, drug, sex and robbery offenders). The sample was based on six complete fiscal years (2006/07 to 2011/12) of first releases (men = 24,978 and women = 1,497; Indigenous = 5,526) for a total of 26,475 federal cases. Post release outcome data included returns to federal custody for any offence within a 3-year follow-up period. The results of the study revealed that the CRI was predictive of release outcome across all offenders, including men, women, and Indigenous offenders, and major offence types. More specifically, among all offender sub-groups, higher CRI scores were positively associated with more re-offending.

Overview of Women Offender Correctional Programs

CSC is mandated by the Corrections and Conditional Release Act to address offenders' needs and assist in their successful reintegration through effective correctional programming (CCRA, c.20, 1992). Beginning in 2010, CSC initiated implementation of a comprehensive model of women offender correctional programming where women progress through a series of program components from admission (Engagement Program) through incarceration (Moderate and High Intensity Programs) to community release (Self-Management Programs⁴; CSC, 2018b;

³ Construct validity refers to the extent to which a tool measures what it purports to measure.

⁴ Women offenders who complete high and/or moderate intensity correctional programs may participate in self-

Harris, Thompson & Derkzen, 2015; Wardrop & Pardoel, 2019).⁵ Participants must complete the lower intensity levels of programming prior to being referred to the higher intensity programs. Upon intake to a federal institution, criminal history relevant factors are gathered and this information is entered into the CRI. Those results are used to refer women to correctional programs that are appropriate to their risk level.

The Engagement Program is a low intensity, introductory program delivered to all women admitted into a federal institution. All women offenders who meet the criteria for a moderate and/or high intensity program, including the Women's Sex Offender Program, are referred to and must complete the Women's Engagement Program (WEP) or Indigenous Women's Engagement Program (IWEP) prior to participation in a higher intensity program (CSC, 2018b).

Women's Moderate and High Intensity Programs (WO-MIP/IWO-MIP and WO-HIP/IWO-HIP) are the second and third programs in the continuum. The overall goal of both programs is to help participants develop prosocial skills, abilities, and attitudes that will enhance their ability to lead a crime-free life lifestyle. Women offenders who score between 9 and 18 on the CRI are referred to the WO-MIP or IWO-MIP. Women offenders who score 19 or higher on the CRI are first referred to the moderate intensity program, and upon successful completion, are subsequently referred to the WO-HIP or IWO-HIP.

A woman is required to complete the Women's Sex Offender Program (WSOP) if they have been convicted of a sexual offence, been convicted of a non-sexual offence for which there was sexual motivation, and/or if she has admitted to a sexual offence for which she has not been convicted (CSC, 2018b). If they require a moderate intensity program, they will complete the WSOP as the second program in their continuum, whereas a high intensity offender will ideally complete the WSOP as the third program following a successful completion of a moderate intensity program (WO-MIP/IWO-MIP).

Program Overrides

The CRI is comprised of three sub-components, which include previous youth and adult offences as well as current offences. The items are summed to produce a total score that provides

management programs in the institution and/or community (CSC, 2018b).

⁵ There are two streams of correctional programs for women offenders -a general stream (WOCP) and an Indigenous stream (IWOC). Correctional programming is offered through the Continuum of Care for non-Indigenous women and through the Circle of Care for Indigenous women (CSC, 2018b).

an overview of the offender's involvement with the criminal justice system. The CRI is applied in conjunction with other assessment tools ⁶ to manage individual offenders and guide the development of correctional plans and supervision strategies to manage the risk to re-offend (CSC, 2018a).

While the CRI provides a static risk rating that is used as a basis for program referral and intervention level, Parole Officers (POs) may use their professional judgment to ensure that all available information is applied in making case-specific recommendations (CSC, 2018a). For example, an offender whose current offence caused death or serious harm but they have minimal criminal history will score low on the CRI due to their lack of criminal history. In these instances, the PO may request an override to a higher intensity program. Conversely, an offender may be overridden into a lower intensity program if there are mitigating factors that warrant a reduction in program intensity level.

Although a PO may request an override to account for these unique cases, a recent evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs (CSC, 2020) compared women offenders who were overridden and completed a program to women who completed a program but were not overridden (i.e., they met the program referral criteria). The sample included women offenders admitted to federal custody between April 1, 2016 and March 31, 2018.⁷ Results demonstrated that of the 723 women who completed programming, 52% ($n = 373$) did not initially meet the program referral criteria and were overridden into the program.⁸ Consequently, it was recommended that further research be conducted to examine the proportion of overrides used to refer women to correctional programs and the reasons for the overrides.

⁶ The Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA) is used in conjunction with the CRI for women offenders and the Static-99R and the Stable-2007 are used in conjunction with the CRI for male sex offenders.

⁷ Due to the time frame of this study, the previous program referral guidelines were used.

⁸ This included women who completed either WO-MIP/TWO-MIP.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to conduct a qualitative examination of the reasons of overrides of the CRI referral criteria for women offenders. The research questions are:

1. What proportion of women have been overridden?
2. What proportion of women who have completed programming did not initially meet the program referral criteria and were overridden?
3. What are the reasons of overrides of the CRI referral criteria for women offenders?
 - a. What are the reasons of overrides from engagement only to moderate intensity?
 - b. What are the reasons of overrides from moderate intensity to high intensity?
 - c. What are the reasons of overrides to a lower intensity program (i.e., from high to moderate and moderate to engagement only)?

Method

Participants

Data were extracted from CSC's Offender Management System (OMS), the automated system used by CSC to store decision-making and offender management data from the beginning of an offender's sentence until the sentence is complete. Analyses were conducted with an admission dataset ($N = 709$; 34% Indigenous), which included offenders whom were admitted to federal custody with a new warrant of committal during their first term between February 1, 2018 and December 31, 2019. The CRI scores and levels were extracted, as were basic demographic (gender, ethnicity), offender intake assessment, sentence, offence, program assignment information, and program overrides information.

Measures

Study cohort characteristics. The characteristics of the study cohort were examined, which included: (a) demographic information (e.g., age at admission, marital status, ethnicity); (b) sentence and offence information (e.g., sentence term and length); (c) and criminogenic risk and need information (e.g., static factor rating and dynamic factor rating).⁹

Criminal Risk Index (CRI). The CRI is composed of 11 items, grouped into three subscales: (a) Previous Offenses-Youth, (b) Previous Offenses-Adult, and (c) Current Offenses. The items are summed to produce a total score ranging from 0 to 38 that provides an overview of the offender's involvement with the criminal justice system and forms the basis of the women offender program selection criteria. Women who score 1 to 8 on the CRI are assigned to engagement only; women who score 9 to 18 are referred to moderate intensity; and women who score 19 or more are assigned to high intensity. Women sex offenders who score between 9 and 18 on the CRI will be referred to the Women's Sex Offender Program (WSOP). Women sex offenders who score 19 or higher on the CRI will first be referred to the Women Offender Moderate Intensity Program (WO-MIP) or Indigenous Women Offender Moderate Intensity Program (IWO-MIP), and will subsequently be referred to the WSOP.

Program override criteria. Women offenders whose level of risk, as measured by the CRI, did not fully reflect the correctional program need may be overridden to a higher or lower

⁹ Criminogenic risk and need information were derived from the OIA.

intensity program. The following information is pulled directly from Guidelines 726-2 and outlines the override criteria.

Overrides to moderate intensity. Women offenders who score 1 to 8 on the CRI may be considered for participation in a women offender moderate intensity program or Indigenous women offender moderate intensity program if they meet one or more of the following override criteria:

1. The offender's affiliation with a security threat group (STG) increases the likelihood of violence;¹⁰
2. The offender scores moderate to high need on the Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA)¹¹ and there is an established link between the current offence and substance abuse;
3. There is corroborated information demonstrating a pattern of violent behaviour not reflected in convictions and/or the CRI;¹²
4. The current offence caused death or serious harm to another person and/or there are risk factors present to believe, on reasonable grounds, the offender is likely to commit an offence causing death or serious harm to another person; and
5. The offender acted alone and/or the psychological risk assessment corroborates a level of risk which should be addressed through participation in a correctional program.¹³

Overrides to high intensity. In cases where a woman offender already meets the criteria for a moderate intensity correctional program, overrides from moderate to high intensity may only be considered in exceptional cases where one or both of the following criteria are met:

1. The current offence(s) included elements of gratuitous violence;¹⁴ and
2. The offender has exhibited a pattern of persistent violence.¹⁵

¹⁰ This criteria is adapted for women sex offenders where it specifies that the offender's affiliation with a security threat group, particularly that involved the exploitation of minors or vulnerable persons, increases the likelihood of violence.

¹¹ The W-CASA is a 261-item computerized assessment examining the scope and nature of women's substance use, with a focus on both lifetime substance use and use in the year preceding arrest. It is completed as part of women offenders' intake assessment process.

¹² This criteria is adapted for women sex offenders where it specifies that there is corroborated information demonstrating a pattern of violent and/or sexual offending behaviour not reflected in convictions and/or the CRI.

¹³ This criteria applies to women sex offenders only.

¹⁴ Gratuitous violence is defined as excessive violence beyond that which is "required" to meet an end; or evidence of sadistic behaviour, torture (CSC, 2018b).

¹⁵ Persistent violence is defined as three or more offences listed in Schedule I, irrespective of their mode of prosecution, where each conviction leads to a custodial sentence of at least six months duration and where the

Overrides to a lower intensity program. In order to be eligible for an override to a lower program intensity (i.e., high intensity to moderate intensity, or moderate intensity to engagement), the woman offender must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Indigenous social history (ISH) considerations, contextualizing risk, that warrants a reduction in program intensity level;¹⁶
2. Poor physical health that is determined to be sufficient to significantly reduce the offender's risk of reoffending or precludes program participation at a higher intensity level (e.g., significant physical disability);
3. Previous participation in a main correctional program; and
4. The presence of significant factors, mitigating risk, that warrant a reduction in program intensity level.

Analytical Approach

The study consisted of a mixed-method approach of analysis. The quantitative components conducted were descriptive in nature (e.g., frequency distributions as well as means and standard deviation). Sub-analyses for Indigenous and non-Indigenous women were also conducted.

The analyses of the qualitative components consisted of file reviews of various OMS files, such as Memo to File and decision documents. All offenders who were identified as having an override were coded. The coding focused on three areas:

1. The reasons for overrides to moderate intensity programming;
2. The reasons for overrides to high intensity programming;
3. The reasons for overrides to a lower program intensity (i.e., high intensity to moderate intensity and moderate intensity to engagement only).

offences occurred on different days (CSC, 2018b). Schedule 1 offences are generally violent and/or sexual in nature and include offences such as sexual interference or robbery. Offences designated as Schedule 1 offences are subject to changes in legislation. First degree and Second degree murder or other offences carrying an automatic life sentence are not Schedule 1 offences because life sentences and eligibility for parole are handled directly in the legislation for those offences.

¹⁶ ISH considerations are only applicable to Indigenous offenders.

Results

The results section is divided into three parts. The first section provides an overview of the characteristics of the study cohort, which includes demographic, sentence and offence information, and criminogenic risk and need information. Second, an examination of override characteristics are presented. This includes the proportion of overrides, an exploration of the pattern of overrides across different indicators, and an examination of the rates of program completion. The final section examines the reasons of overrides of the CRI referral criteria for women offenders.

Sample Characteristics

Demographic characteristics, sentence and offence information for the study cohort is displayed in Table 1. On average, offenders were 36 years of age during the study period with non-Indigenous women being older than Indigenous women (38 versus 32, respectively). Over half of the offenders were single at admission, with Indigenous women reporting the highest proportion of single offenders (62%) compared to non-Indigenous women (50%). Furthermore, almost half of the study group were admitted into the Prairie (42%) or Ontario (28%) regions during the study period, with Indigenous women comprising a higher proportion in the Prairie region (72%) and non-Indigenous women in the Ontario region (35%).

More than half of the study group were serving a sentence of less than three years, with comparable rates between Indigenous (57%) and non-Indigenous women (53%). Forty-two percent of women had drug related offences. A greater percentage of non-Indigenous women had drug related offences compared to Indigenous women (48% versus 29%, respectively). In addition, 43% of Indigenous women were a participant of Indigenous Intervention Centres (IICs)¹⁷. IICs aim to meet the needs of Indigenous offenders through an integrated and culturally responsive case management approach and was developed to address the specific needs of Indigenous offenders starting immediately at intake and continuing throughout the offender's sentence.

¹⁷ To qualify for participating in IICs, Indigenous offenders are expected to be willing to work with an Elder, serving a sentence of less than 6 years, and willing to participate in Indigenous moderate intensity programming, or have no programming needs.

Table 1

Demographic, sentence and offence information

Indicator	All women (<i>N</i> = 709)		Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 240)		Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 469)	
	%	(<i>n</i>)	%	(<i>n</i>)	%	(<i>n</i>)
Age at Study <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	35.7	(11.1)	32.0	(8.8)	37.5	(11.7)
Ethnicity						
<i>Black</i>	6.2	(44)	0.0	(0)	9.4	(44)
<i>White</i>	50.6	(359)	0.0	(0)	76.5	(359)
<i>Indigenous</i>	33.9	(240)	100.0	(240)	0.0	(0)
<i>Other</i> ^a	9.3	(66)	0.0	(0)	14.1	(66)
IIC Participant	14.5	(103)	42.5	(102)	0.2	(*)
Marital Status-Single ^b	54.0	(383)	62.1	(149)	49.9	(234)
Region of Admission						
<i>Atlantic</i>	11.3	(80)	3.8	(9)	15.1	(71)
<i>Quebec</i>	12.7	(90)	3.8	(9)	17.3	(81)
<i>Ontario</i>	27.6	(196)	12.5	(30)	35.4	(166)
<i>Prairies</i>	42.0	(298)	71.7	(172)	26.9	(126)
<i>Pacific</i>	6.3	(45)	8.3	(20)	5.3	(25)
Sentence Length						
<i>Less than 3 years</i>	54.6	(387)	57.1	(137)	53.3	(250)
<i>3 years or more</i>	43.2	(306)	40.0	(96)	44.8	(210)
<i>Indeterminate</i>	2.3	(16)	2.9	(7)	1.9	(9)
Offence Type ^c						
<i>Homicide related</i>	7.1	(50)	13.0	(31)	4.1	(19)
<i>Sex related</i>	2.8	(20)	1.3	(*)	3.7	(17)
<i>Robbery</i>	9.2	(65)	15.1	(36)	6.3	(29)
<i>Drug related</i>	41.7	(293)	29.3	(70)	48.1	(223)
<i>Assault</i>	9.0	(63)	14.2	(34)	6.3	(29)
<i>Other violent</i>	8.4	(59)	10.9	(26)	7.1	(33)
<i>Property related</i>	16.5	(116)	9.6	(23)	20.0	(93)
<i>Other non-violent</i>	5.3	(37)	6.7	(16)	4.5	(21)
Violent offence	36.6	(257)	54.4	(130)	27.4	(126)

Note. *M* = mean. *SD* = standard deviation. IIC = Indigenous Intervention Centre. ^a Other includes Arabic, Latin American, South Asian and other ethnocultural groups. ^b Marital status “other” category includes divorced, separated, widowed, and not specified. ^c Six women did not have offence type data. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

Table 2 shows relevant risk and need factors. Overall, women had moderate static risk

(47%) and high dynamic need (52%), with a moderate reintegration potential (56%) and (51%) motivation for change. Over half (62%) were assessed as moderately accountable for their criminal actions. One-quarter (25%) had identified responsivity issues and almost all of the study group (95%) were identified as engaged in their correctional plan. They were most likely to have a moderate to high need in the areas of personal/emotional orientation (78%), substance abuse (71%; 48% assessed as high severity), and associates (68%). At admission, the majority of women were assessed at minimum (52%) or medium (44%) security. Based on the W-CASA results, 82% of the women had an identified substance use issue, with 61% assessed as having a moderate to severe problem. The majority of the study group (88%) were low to moderate criminal risk, based on the CRI.

Comparisons across Indigenous ancestry indicated that Indigenous women had a higher dynamic need (75%) than non-Indigenous women (39%). Indigenous women also had a higher proportion of moderate to high need in all need domains compared to non-Indigenous women, particularly in the areas of substance abuse (92% versus 61%, respectively), personal/emotional orientation (90% versus 72%, respectively), and associates (84% versus 59%, respectively).

Table 2

Criminogenic risk and need characteristics

Indicator	All women (<i>N</i> = 709)		Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 240)		Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 469)	
	%	(<i>n</i>)	%	(<i>n</i>)	%	(<i>n</i>)
Static Factor Rating – Intake						
<i>Low</i>	33.8	(223)	16.7	(38)	42.9	(185)
<i>Moderate</i>	46.6	(307)	55.7	(127)	41.8	(180)
<i>High</i>	19.6	(129)	27.6	(63)	15.3	(66)
Dynamic Factor Rating – Intake						
<i>Low</i>	15.2	(98)	4.0	(9)	21.2	(89)
<i>Moderate</i>	33.3	(214)	20.6	(46)	40.0	(168)
<i>High</i>	51.5	(331)	75.3	(168)	38.8	(163)
Reintegration Potential – Intake						
<i>Low</i>	14.0	(90)	21.1	(47)	10.3	(43)
<i>Moderate</i>	56.2	(361)	67.3	(150)	50.4	(211)
<i>High</i>	29.8	(191)	11.7	(26)	39.4	(165)
Motivation Level – Intake						
<i>Low</i>	3.4	(22)	4.9	(11)	2.6	(11)
<i>Moderate</i>	50.8	(326)	60.1	(134)	45.8	(192)
<i>High</i>	45.8	(294)	35.0	(78)	51.6	(216)
Accountability Level – Intake						
<i>Low</i>	3.6	(23)	3.6	(8)	3.6	(15)
<i>Moderate</i>	61.5	(392)	68.5	(152)	57.8	(240)
<i>High</i>	34.9	(222)	27.9	(62)	38.6	(160)
Responsivity Issues	24.8	(158)	28.4	(63)	22.9	(95)
Engaged in Correctional Plan	94.8	(604)	94.1	(209)	95.2	(395)
DFIA-R Need Domains – Moderate to High Need						
<i>Associates</i>	67.9	(435)	83.9	(187)	59.3	(248)
<i>Attitudes</i>	49.3	(316)	56.5	(126)	45.5	(190)
<i>Community Functioning</i>	43.4	(278)	66.2	(147)	31.3	(131)
<i>Employment/Education</i>	52.4	(336)	70.7	(157)	42.7	(179)
<i>Marital/Family Relations</i>	57.0	(365)	81.5	(181)	44.0	(184)
<i>Personal/Emotional Orientation</i>	78.2	(502)	89.6	(199)	72.1	(303)

Table 2 (continued)

Indicator	All women (<i>N</i> = 709)		Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 240)		Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 469)	
	%	(<i>n</i>)	%	(<i>n</i>)	%	(<i>n</i>)
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	71.4	(459)	91.9	(205)	60.5	(254)
Offender Security Level at Admission						
<i>Minimum</i>	52.1	(323)	32.3	(70)	62.8	(253)
<i>Medium</i>	44.0	(273)	61.3	(133)	34.7	(140)
<i>Maximum</i>	3.9	(24)	6.5	(14)	2.5	(10)
Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA) Severity						
<i>None</i>	17.6	(116)	4.1	(9)	24.3	(107)
<i>Low</i>	21.2	(140)	13.7	(30)	24.9	(110)
<i>Moderate</i>	17.4	(115)	21.5	(47)	15.4	(68)
<i>High</i>	43.8	(289)	60.7	(133)	35.4	(156)
Criminal Risk Index (CRI) Level						
<i>Low</i>	45.0	(319)	31.3	(75)	52.0	(244)
<i>Moderate</i>	42.7	(303)	52.9	(127)	37.5	(176)
<i>High</i>	10.9	(77)	15.8	(38)	8.3	(39)
<i>No Rating</i>	1.4	(10)	0	(0)	2.1	(10)
Average CRI score <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	9.6	(6.9)	11.8	(6.8)	8.5	(6.7)

Note. *M* = mean. *SD* = standard deviation. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed. Cell counts may not add up to column totals due to missing values.

Program Override Characteristics

Table 3 shows the proportion of overrides between all women, Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. Among all women with a moderate CRI rating, 97% were appropriately referred to moderate intensity programming. Similarly, 74% with a low CRI rating were referred to the engagement program only. Among Indigenous and non-Indigenous women with a moderate CRI rating, the vast majority were referred to moderate intensity programming (98% vs. 97%, respectively). While a large proportion of program referrals aligned with CRI scores (*n* = 591; 85%), there appeared to be higher than expected percentages of overrides from high to moderate intensity (21%) and from engagement to moderate intensity (26%). Marked differences emerged when comparing Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. In particular, among Indigenous women with a low CRI rating, 32% were overridden to moderate intensity

programming compared to 25% of non-Indigenous women. In contrast, 13% of Indigenous women with a high CRI rating were overridden to moderate intensity compared to 28% of non-Indigenous women.

Table 3
Proportion of each type of override

		% (n)		
		All women	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
CRI Levels ^a	Program Status			
		(n = 319)	(n = 75)	(n = 244)
<i>Low</i>	No Override	73.6 (235)	68.0 (51)	75.4 (184)
	Override to moderate	26.3 (84)	32.0 (24)	24.6 (60)
		(n = 303)	(n = 127)	(n = 176)
<i>Moderate</i>	Override to engagement	0.7 (*)	0.8 (*)	0.6 (*)
	No override	97.4 (295)	97.6 (124)	97.1 (171)
	Override to high	2.0 (6)	1.6 (*)	2.3 (*)
		(n = 77)	(n = 38)	(n = 39)
<i>High</i>	Override to moderate	20.8 (16)	13.2 (5)	28.2 (11)
	No override	79.2 (61)	86.8 (33)	71.8 (28)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. ^aTen women did not have CRI scores. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

We also explored the patterns of overrides across each region, offence type, and sentence length to determine whether differential patterns existed between offenders who had been assigned to programming matching their CRI level and those who had not. Results demonstrated variability in the proportion of overrides within each region and within each CRI level for all women (see Table A1) as well as between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women (see Tables A2-A3). Among all women with a low CRI rating and admitted to the Ontario region, 36% were overridden to moderate intensity programming. Similarly, among women with a low CRI rating and admitted to the Atlantic region, 35% were overridden to moderate intensity. For women with a high CRI rating and admitted to the Prairie region, 27% were overridden from high to moderate intensity. These patterns of results were consistent among Indigenous and non-Indigenous women, where a higher proportion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous women with a low CRI

rating and admitted to the Ontario or Atlantic region were overridden to moderate intensity while women with a high CRI rating and admitted to the Prairie region were overridden to moderate intensity. In particular, among Indigenous women with a high CRI rating, the Prairie region accounted for all overrides from high to moderate intensity.

Results further demonstrated variability in the proportion of overrides across offence type for all women (see Table A4). For women with a low CRI rating and a drug related offence, 17% had an override to moderate intensity programming. Among women with a high CRI rating and a property related offence, 36% had an override to moderate intensity programming. Results were similar among Indigenous and non-Indigenous women (see Tables A5-A6), where a greater number of women with a low CRI rating and a drug related offence were overridden from engagement only to moderate intensity. Further, a greater number of Indigenous and non-Indigenous women with a high CRI rating and a property related offence were overridden from high to moderate intensity.

Lastly, the proportion of overrides across sentence length for all women were examined (see Table A7). Among women with a high CRI rating and a sentence length of less than three years, 28% had an override to moderate intensity programming. In addition, for women with a low CRI rating and a sentence length of greater than three years, 30% had an override to moderate intensity. Again, these results were consistent across Indigenous and non-Indigenous women (see Tables A8-A9), where a higher proportion of women with a high CRI and serving shorter sentences were overridden to moderate intensity while Indigenous and non-Indigenous women with low CRI ratings and serving longer sentences had a greater proportion of overrides from engagement only to moderate intensity.

Table 4 displays correctional programming participation for the study cohort and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. The majority of women completed an engagement program (88%), while almost half completed moderate intensity (47%)¹⁸. Indigenous women had slightly higher rates of moderate intensity completion compared to non-Indigenous women (53% versus 44%, respectively), whereas both groups had the same proportion of high intensity completion.

Further analyses demonstrated that of those women who completed moderate intensity programming, 20% ($n = 64$) did not initially meet the program referral criteria for moderate

¹⁸ This included women who completed either WO-MIP/IWO-MIP.

intensity and were overridden into the program. These results were consistent across Indigenous ancestry, where 16% ($n = 20$) of Indigenous and 22% ($n = 44$) of non-Indigenous women who completed moderate intensity programming were overridden into the program.

Table 4
Correctional programming participation information

Indicator	All Offenders ($N = 709$)		Indigenous ($N = 240$)		Non-Indigenous ($N = 469$)	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Completed engagement	88.3	(626)	87.5	(210)	88.7	(416)
Completed moderate intensity	46.7	(331)	52.9	(127)	43.5	(204)
Completed high intensity	3.2	(23)	3.3	(8)	3.2	(15)

Reasons for Overrides

When there are extenuating factors that are not captured in the CRI scores, the PO may submit an override request form that documents the rationale for an override. These documents were analyzed to examine the reason of program placement and their consistency with policy guidelines. Among women that had an override from engagement only to moderate intensity, more than half (64%)¹⁹ were assessed as having a moderate to severe substance use problem (based on the W-CASA results) and there was an established link between their substance use and their criminal behaviour (see Table 5). For example, their current offence was possession for the purpose of trafficking in order to support their drug addiction. For 42% of women who were overridden from engagement only to moderate intensity, their current offence caused death or serious harm and/or there were additional risk factors present that increased the likelihood of committing a similar offence. As such, it was determined that participation in a higher intensity program was required to address these risk factors and reduce the risk of re-offending. Among sex offenders, the most frequently documented reasons for an override were that a psychological risk assessment corroborated a level of risk that should be addressed through participation in a correctional program, their current offence caused death or serious harm, and/or they met the W-

¹⁹ It is important to note that some women met more than one override criteria. Proportions are based on the percent of cases rather than the percent of responses.

CASA criteria.

Comparisons across Indigenous ancestry showed that Indigenous women were more likely to have met the W-CASA criteria compared to non-Indigenous women (75% versus 60%, respectively) and they were more likely to have had a demonstrated pattern of violent behaviour that was not reflected in convictions and/or the CRI (42% versus 8%, respectively). Conversely, non-Indigenous women were more likely to have caused death or serious harm compared to Indigenous women (45% versus 29%, respectively).

All women who were overridden from moderate to high intensity had exhibited a pattern of persistent violence. For example, they had a criminal history that included multiple instances of violence. These results were consistent between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. In addition, for 67% of women who were overridden to high intensity their current offence(s) included elements of gratuitous violence, where non-Indigenous women were more likely to have met this criteria compared to Indigenous women (75% versus 50%, respectively).

Examination of the reasons of overrides to a lower intensity program showed that the majority of overrides were from high intensity to moderate intensity ($n = 16$) rather than overrides from moderate intensity to engagement only ($n = 2$). The most frequently documented reason for an override was the presences of significant factors that would mitigate their risk (67%). Examples included significant gaps in reoffending, de-escalation in offence severity, no known STG affiliation, and no history of violence. Half of the women (50%) had previous participation in a main correctional program listed as a reason for an override, with non-Indigenous women having a higher proportion compared to Indigenous women (58% versus 33%, respectively).

All Indigenous women that were overridden to a lower intensity program had ISH considerations that warranted a reduction in program intensity level. More specifically, there was a recognition that their criminal behaviour could be understood within the context of their ISH, where often times they were subjected to many levels of intergenerational trauma, loss of language, culture, and spiritual practices. Therefore, an override to a lower intensity program and the opportunity to follow a Traditional Healing path would allow them to examine their offence path in a cultural context and address their dynamic factors in a holistic manner. In fact, file reviews further revealed that IIC participants were overridden from high to moderate intensity in order to access and benefit from IICs, which was explicitly referenced in their override rationale

documents when considering ISH factors.

Table 5

Reasons for overrides

Indicator	All women	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overrides to Moderate Intensity	(n = 84)	(n = 24)	(n = 60)
<i>STG affiliation</i>	7.1 (6)	16.7 (*)	3.3 (*)
<i>W-CASA</i>	64.3 (54)	75.0 (18)	60.0 (36)
<i>Pattern of violent behaviour</i>	17.9 (15)	41.7 (10)	8.3 (5)
<i>Death or serious harm</i>	41.7 (35)	29.2 (7)	45.0 (27)
<i>Psychological assessment</i>	4.8 (*)	4.2 (*)	5.0 (*)
Overrides to High Intensity	(n = 6)	(n = 2)	(n = 4)
<i>Gratuitous violence</i>	66.7 (*)	50.0 (*)	75.0 (*)
<i>Persistent violence</i>	100.0 (6)	100 (*)	100 (*)
Overrides to a Lower Intensity Program	(n = 18)	(n = 6)	(n = 12)
<i>ISH factors</i>	33.3 (6)	100 (6)	0 (0)
<i>Physical health</i>	11.1 (*)	16.7 (*)	8.3 (*)
<i>Previous program participation</i>	50.0 (9)	33.3 (*)	58.3 (7)
<i>Significant factors</i>	66.7 (12)	66.7 (*)	66.7 (8)

Note. STG = Security threat group. W-CASA = Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse; ISH = Indigenous social history. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

Discussion

Program referral tools are needed to ensure that the level and intensity of programming is appropriately matched to the risk level of the offender in order to contribute to their successful reintegration upon release (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). This study provided a qualitative examination of the reasons of overrides of the CRI referral criteria and their consistency with policy guidelines. Basic demographic, sentence and offence information were examined as well as relevant risk and need factors. Further, the proportion of overrides and the proportion of women who had completed programming were also examined in order to better understand the extent of the issue.

Analyses were conducted with an admission cohort, which included offenders whom were admitted to federal custody with a new warrant of committal. On average, offenders were thirty-six years of age and tended to be single, to be serving shorter sentences, and to have been convicted of drug-related offences. Overall, women had moderate static risk and high dynamic need. The criminogenic needs that were most salient for women offenders appeared to be those related to personal/emotional orientation, substance abuse, and associates. Comparisons across Indigenous ancestry indicated that Indigenous women had a higher proportion of moderate to high need in all need domains. These results reflect previous research that has consistently shown that when compared to their non-Indigenous counterparts, Indigenous women have higher criminogenic needs assessed at intake, particularly in the areas of substance abuse and personal/emotional orientation (MacDonald, Gobeil, Biro, Ritchie, & Curno, 2015; Stewart et al., 2017; Wanamaker, 2018; Wardrop et al., 2018). Based on the W-CASA, over half of the study cohort was assessed as having a moderate to severe substance use problem, with Indigenous women demonstrating higher severity compared to non-Indigenous women. These results highlight the importance of addressing issues related to substance abuse, disengagement from criminal associates, and interventions that focus on skills that teach self-regulation and self-control.

In general, the results demonstrated that a large proportion of program referrals aligned with CRI scores. For instance, the majority of women scored low to moderate on the CRI and a considerable proportion of women with a moderate CRI were appropriately referred to moderate

intensity programming. Similarly, those with a low CRI were referred to engagement only. While the majority of program referrals aligned with CRI scores, there appeared to be higher than expected rates of overrides to moderate intensity programming and the extent to which varied by Indigenous ancestry, region, offence type, and sentence length. This raises potential concerns for the allocation of programming resources. To illustrate, findings highlighted that Indigenous women were more likely to be overridden from engagement only to moderate intensity compared to non-Indigenous women; and conversely, Indigenous women were less likely to be overridden from high to moderate intensity compared to non-Indigenous women. In addition, the Ontario and Atlantic region demonstrated higher rates of overrides from engagement only to moderate intensity while the Prairie region accounted for a greater proportion of overrides from high intensity to moderate intensity. The amount of overrides also varied across sentence length, where those women serving shorter sentences had higher rates of overrides from high to moderate intensity while women serving longer sentences had more overrides from engagement only to moderate intensity.

The majority of women completed the requisite engagement program, while almost half completed moderate intensity programming; however, completion of high intensity programming was substantially lower than in other programs within the WOCP continuum.²⁰ Encouragingly, Indigenous women had a higher number of program completion compared to non-Indigenous women. Overall, women were actively engaged in addressing their criminogenic needs during their incarceration. Although CSC's evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs (CSC, 2020) found that half of the women who completed moderate intensity programming were overridden, this study showed that a smaller proportion (20%) of women who completed moderate intensity programming were overridden. These differences are likely due to the different referral criteria used in the evaluation report (i.e., CRS and DRIA-R).

File coding allowed for an examination of the reasons of overrides and their consistency with guidelines. Among women that were overridden from engagement only to moderate intensity, a large proportion were assessed as having a moderate to severe substance use problem (based on the W-CASA) and there was an established link between their substance use and their criminal behaviour. Given that the study cohort had a higher proportion of drug-related offences

²⁰ This is because women need to complete engagement and moderate intensity programming prior to participation in a high intensity program.

and they were more likely to have a moderate to high need in the area of substance abuse, these results were expected. While the engagement program is required for higher intensity programming, it does not allow for the identification of specific program targets that would be more clearly identified and fully addressed in higher intensity programs. Thus, it was determined that an override to moderate intensity would provide the opportunity for women to identify their criminogenic factors and help them fully develop prosocial skills, abilities and attitudes that target their specific factors. In fact, Wardrop and Parodel (2018) found that women who participated in moderate intensity programs showed improvement in domains related to substance abuse, associates, marital/family, and community functioning.

All women who were overridden from moderate to high intensity had exhibited a pattern of persistent violence where a large proportion of their current offence(s) included elements of gratuitous violence. Although overrides from moderate to high intensity should only be considered in exceptional cases, file coding showed that this appeared to be the case. As high intensity programming focuses to a greater extent on violence and violent specific attitudes, overriding women with an entrenched and violent criminal history may provide them the opportunity to address these areas.

An analysis of the reasons of overrides to a lower intensity program showed that the most frequently documented reason was the presence of significant factors that would mitigate their risk. These included gaps in offending, limited history of violence, and lack of STG affiliation. As such, their risk was assessed to be best managed through an override to moderate intensity programming. All Indigenous women that were overridden to a lower intensity program had documented ISH considerations (e.g., loss of language, culture and spiritual practices) to contextualize their risk that warranted a reduction in program intensity level. In addition, a small proportion of women that were overridden from high to moderate intensity were involved in one of CSC's initiatives to address Indigenous-specific needs – participation in IICs. These results underscore the importance of providing culturally informed interventions for Indigenous women and the opportunity to address their dynamic factors in a holistic manner.

A major limitation of this study was that program referral assignment information for the women in the study cohort may not have been finalized for all women during the study period, especially those admitted since December 2019; therefore changes to this information may occur. For instance, women identified for high intensity programming would need to be assigned

and complete engagement and then moderate intensity programming prior to high intensity, which may impact assignment information. In addition, due to the relatively recent implementation of the CRI, examining institutional (e.g., incidents and charges) and post-release outcomes associated with overrides (including stream overrides) was beyond the scope of this study; however, this will be examined in the next phase of this research. Lastly, while the reasons for overrides were consistent with policy, the quality of these rationales were not examined.

Conclusions

The results of this study demonstrated that the rationale of program overrides was consistent with policy guidelines. Nonetheless, the proportion of overrides was higher than anticipated and there was considerable variation between regions, sentence length, and offence types. Collectively, these findings raise potential concerns about the implementation of the CRI for program referral and possible challenges in aligning programming needs with response strategies.

References

- Brown, S. (2017). *A review of the women offender risk/need research: In search of gender neutral, women-salient and women-specific risk factors* (Research Report R-386). Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2020). *Evaluation report: Evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs*. Ottawa, ON: CSC.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2018a). *Commissioner's Directive 705-6: Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2018b). *Guidelines 726-2: National Correctional Program Referral Guidelines*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act [CCRA]*. (1992). Retrieved from <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/>
- Derkzen, D., Harris, A., & Wardrop, K. (2017). *Assessment of Aboriginal Women Offender Correctional Program (AWOCP) outcomes*. (Research Report R-391). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Farrell MacDonald, S., Gobeil, R., Biro, S. M., Ritchie, M. B., & Curno, J. (2015). *Women offenders, substance use, and behaviour* (Research Report R-358). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Harris, A., Thompson, J., & Derkzen D. (2015). *Assessment of Women Offender Correctional Program (WOCP) outcomes*. (Research Report R-374). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Helmus, L. and Forrester, T. (2014a). *Construct validity of the Static Factor Assessment in the Offender Intake Assessment process*. (Research Report R-309). Ottawa, Canada: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Helmus, L. and Forrester, T. (2014b). *Static Factor Assessment (SFA) in the Offender Intake Assessment process: Relationship to release and community outcomes*. (Research Report R-339). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

- Motiuk, L. L., & Vuong, B. (2018). *The Development and Validation of a Criminal Risk Index (CRI) for Federally Sentenced Offenders in Canada*. (Research Report R-403). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Stewart, L. A., Wardrop, K., Wilton, G., Thompson, J., Derkzen, D., & Motiuk, L. (2017). Reliability and validity of the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (Research Report R-395). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Wanamaker, K.A. (2018). *Risk Factors Related to the Initial Classification of Women Offenders: A Literature Review*. (Research Report R-418). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Wardrop, K., & Pardoel, K. (2019). *Examining Change in Criminogenic Need Level Associated with Correctional Program Participation among Federally Sentenced Women*. (Research Report R-422). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Wardrop, K., Thompson, J., & Derkzen, D. (2018). *Minimum Security Women: A Profile*. (Research Report R-394). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Appendix A: Additional Data Tables

Table A1

Percentage of each type of override within each region: All women

		Region % (n)				
		Pacific (N= 45)	Prairies (N= 296)	Ontario (N= 193)	Quebec (N= 86)	Atlantic (N= 79)
CRI Levels	Program Status					
		<i>(n= 21)</i>	<i>(n= 112)</i>	<i>(n= 112)</i>	<i>(n= 40)</i>	<i>(n= 34)</i>
<i>Low</i>	No Override	90.5 (19)	79.5 (89)	64.3 (72)	82.5 (33)	64.7 (22)
	Override to moderate	9.5 (*)	20.5 (23)	35.7 (40)	17.5 (7)	35.3 (12)
		<i>(n= 19)</i>	<i>(n= 151)</i>	<i>(n= 62)</i>	<i>(n= 36)</i>	<i>(n= 35)</i>
<i>Moderate</i>	Override to engagement	0 (0)	0.7 (*)	0 (0)	17.5 (0)	2.9 (*)
	No override	84.2 (16)	99.3 (150)	95.2 (59)	100 (36)	97.1 (34)
	Override to high	15.8 (*)	0 (0)	4.8 (*)	0 (0)	0.0 (0)
		<i>(n= 5)</i>	<i>(n= 33)</i>	<i>(n= 19)</i>	<i>(n= 10)</i>	<i>(n= 10)</i>
<i>High</i>	Override to moderate	20.0 (*)	27.3 (9)	10.5 (*)	30.0 (*)	30.0 (*)
	No override	80.0 (*)	72.7 (24)	89.5 (17)	70.0 (7)	70.0 (7)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

Table A2

Percentage of each type of override within each region: Indigenous women

		Region % (n)				
		Pacific (N= 20)	Prairies (N= 172)	Ontario (N= 30)	Quebec (N= 9)	Atlantic (N= 9)
CRI Levels	Program Status					
		(n= 6)	(n= 53)	(n= 10)	(n= 4)	(n= 2)
<i>Low</i>	No Override	100 (6)	69.8 (37)	40.0 (*)	75.0 (*)	50.0 (*)
	Override to moderate	0 (0)	30.2 (16)	60.0 (6)	25.0 (*)	50.0 (*)
		(n= 10)	(n= 93)	(n= 15)	(n= 3)	(n= 6)
<i>Moderate</i>	Override to engagement	0 (0)	1.1 (*)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No override	90.0 (9)	98.9 (92)	93.3 (14)	100 (3)	100 (6)
	Override to high	10.0 (*)	0 (0)	6.7 (*)	0 (0)	0.0 (0)
		(n= 4)	(n= 26)	(n= 5)	(n= 2)	(n= 1)
<i>High</i>	Override to moderate	0 (0)	19.2 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No override	100 (*)	80.8 (21)	100 (5)	100 (*)	100 (*)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed

Table A3

Percentage of each type of override within each region: Non-Indigenous women

		Region % (n)				
		Pacific (N= 25)	Prairies (N= 172)	Ontario (N= 163)	Quebec (N= 77)	Atlantic (N= 70)
CRI Levels	Program Status					
<i>Low</i>	No Override	(n= 15) 86.7 (13)	(n= 59) 88.1 (52)	(n= 102) 66.7 (68)	(n= 36) 83.3 (30)	(n= 32) 65.6 (21)
	Override to moderate	13.3 (*)	11.9 (7)	33.3 (34)	16.7 (6)	34.4 (11)
<i>Moderate</i>		(n= 9)	(n= 58)	(n= 47)	(n= 33)	(n= 29)
	Override to engagement	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3.4 (*)
	No override	77.8 (7)	100 (58)	95.7 (45)	100 (33)	96.6 (28)
	Override to high	22.8 (*)	0 (0)	4.3 (*)	0 (0)	0.0 (0)
<i>High</i>		(n= 1)	(n= 7)	(n= 14)	(n= 8)	(n= 9)
	Override to moderate	100 (*)	57.1 (*)	14.3 (*)	37.5 (*)	11.1 (*)
	No override	0 (0)	42.9 (3)	85.7 (12)	62.5 (5)	88.9 (8)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed

Table A4

Percentage of each type of override across offence type: All women

CRI Levels	Program Status	Offence Type % (n)							
		Homicide Related (N= 49)	Sex Related (N= 20)	Robbery Related (N= 65)	Drug Related (N= 290)	Assault Related (N= 63)	Other violent (N= 59)	Property Related (N= 116)	Other non-violent (N= 37)
<i>Low</i>	No Override	(n= 23) 47.8 (11)	(n= 15) 40.0 (6)	(n= 16) 43.7 (7)	(n= 156) 82.7 (129)	(n=13) 52.7 (6)	(n= 28) 60.7 (17)	(n= 46) 91.3 (42)	(n= 21) 81.0 (17)
	Override to moderate	52.2 (12)	60.0 (9)	56.3 (9)	17.3 (27)	47.3 (7)	39.3 (11)	8.7 (*)	19.0 (*)
<i>Moderate</i>	Override to engagement	(n= 23) 0 (0)	(n= 5) 0 (0)	(n= 38) 0 (0)	(n= 120) 0.8 (*)	(n= 33) 0 (0)	(n= 24) 0 (0)	(n= 43) 2.3 (*)	(n= 12) 0 (0)
	No override	91.3 (21)	100 (5)	100 (38)	99.2 (119)	90.9 (30)	95.8 (23)	97.7 (42)	100 (12)
	Override to high	8.7 (*)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.1 (0)	9.1 (*)	4.2 (*)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<i>High</i>	Override to moderate	(n= 3) 0 (0)	(n= 0) 0 (0)	(n= 11) 9.1 (*)	(n= 14) 28.6 (*)	(n= 17) 5.9 (*)	(n= 6) 16.7 (*)	(n= 22) 36.4 (8)	(n= 4) 25.0 (*)
	No override	100 (*)	0 (0)	90.9 (10)	71.4 (10)	94.1 (16)	83.3 (5)	63.6 (14)	75.0 (*)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

Table A5

Percentage of each type of override across offence type: Indigenous women

CRI Levels	Program Status	Offence Type % (n)							
		Homicide Related (N= 31)	Sex Related (N= 3)	Robbery Related (N= 36)	Drug Related (N= 70)	Assault Related (N= 34)	Other violent (N= 26)	Property Related (N= 23)	Other non-violent (N= 16)
<i>Low</i>	No Override	(n= 13) 61.5 (8)	(n= 2) 0 (0)	(n= 10) 50.0 (5)	(n= 31) 77.4 (24)	(n=3) 66.7 (2)	(n= 8) 75.0 (6)	(n= 2) 50.0 (*)	(n= 6) 83.3 (5)
	Override to moderate	38.5 (5)	100 (*)	50.0 (5)	22.6 (7)	33.3 (*)	25.0 (*)	50.0 (*)	16.7 (*)
<i>Moderate</i>	Override to engagement	(n= 15) 0 (0)	(n= 1) 0 (0)	(n= 21) 0 (0)	(n= 35) 0 (0)	(n= 20) 0 (0)	(n= 14) 0 (0)	(n= 13) 7.7 (*)	(n= 7) 0 (0)
	No override	93.3 (14)	100 (*)	100 (21)	100 (35)	95.0 (19)	100 (14)	92.3 (12)	100 (7)
	Override to high	6.7 (1*)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5.0 (*)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<i>High</i>	Override to moderate	(n= 3) 0 (0)	(n= 0) 0 (0)	(n= 5) 20.0 (*)	(n= 4) 50.0 (*)	(n= 11) 0 (0)	(n= 4) 0 (0)	(n= 8) 25.0 (*)	(n= 3) 0 (0)
	No override	100 (*)	0 (0)	80.0 (*)	50.0 (*)	100 (11)	100 (*)	75.0 (6)	100 (*)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

Table A6

Percentage of each type of override across offence type: Non-Indigenous women

		Offence Type % (n)							
		Homicide Related (N= 18)	Sex Related (N= 17)	Robbery Related (N= 29)	Drug Related (N= 220)	Assault Related (N= 29)	Other violent (N= 32)	Property Related (N= 88)	Other non-violent (N= 16)
CRI Levels	Program Status								
<i>Low</i>	No Override	(n= 10) 30.0 (*)	(n= 13) 46.2 (6)	(n= 6) 33.3 (*)	(n= 125) 84.0 (105)	(n=10) 40.0 (*)	(n= 20) 55.0 (11)	(n=44) 93.2 (41)	(n= 15) 80.0 (12)
	Override to moderate	70.0 (7)	53.8 (7)	66.7 (*)	16.0 (20)	60.0 (6)	45.0 (9)	6.8 (*)	20.0 (*)
<i>Moderate</i>	Override to engagement	(n= 8) 0 (0)	(n= 4) 0 (0)	(n= 17) 0 (0)	(n= 85) 1.2 (*)	(n= 13) 0 (0)	(n= 10) 0 (0)	(n= 30) 0 (0)	(n= 5) 0 (0)
	No override	87.5 (7)	100 (*)	100 (17)	98.8 (84)	84.6 (11)	90.0 (9)	100 (30)	100 (5)
	Override to high	12.5 (*)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15.4 (*)	10.0 (*)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<i>High</i>	Override to moderate	(n= 0) 0 (0)	(n= 0) 0 (0)	(n= 6) 0 (0)	(n= 10) 20.0 (*)	(n= 6) 16.7 (*)	(n= 2) 50.0 (*)	(n= 14) 42.9 (6)	(n= 1) 100 (*)
	No override	0(0)	0 (0)	100 (6)	80.0 (8)	83.3 (5)	50.0 (*)	57.1 (8)	0 (0)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

Table A7

Percentage of each type of override across sentence length: All women

		Sentence length % (n)		
		< 3 Years (N= 383)	>= 3 Years (N= 301)	Indeterminate (N= 15)
CRI Levels	Program Status			
		(n= 155)	(n= 156)	(n= 8)
<i>Low</i>	No Override	79.4 (123)	70.5 (110)	25.0 (*)
	Override to moderate	20.6 (32)	29.5 (46)	75.0 (6)
		(n= 181)	(n= 117)	(n= 5)
<i>Moderate</i>	Override to engagement	1.1 (*)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No override	98.9 (179)	95.7 (112)	80.0 (*)
	Override to high	0 (0)	4.3 (5)	20.0 (*)
		(n= 47)	(n= 28)	(n= 2)
<i>High</i>	Override to moderate	27.7 (13)	10.7 (*)	0 (0)
	No override	72.3 (34)	89.3 (25)	100 (*)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

Table A8

Percentage of each type of override across sentence length: Indigenous women

CRI Levels	Program Status	Sentence length % (n)		
		< 3 Years (N= 137)	>= 3 Years (N= 96)	Indeterminate (N= 7)
<i>Low</i>	No Override	(n= 42) 78.6 (33)	(n= 31) 51.6 (16)	(n= 2) 100 (*)
	Override to moderate	21.4 (9)	48.4 (15)	0 (0)
<i>Moderate</i>	Override to engagement	(n= 73) 1.4 (*)	(n= 51) 0 (0)	(n= 3) 0 (0)
	No override	98.6 (72)	98.0 (50)	66.7 (*)
	Override to high	0 (0)	2.0 (*)	33.3 (*)
<i>High</i>	Override to moderate	(n= 22) 22.7 (5)	(n= 14) 0 (0)	(n= 2) 0 (0)
	No override	77.3 (17)	100 (14)	100 (*)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed

Table A9

Percentage of each type of override across sentence length: Non-Indigenous women

CRI Levels	Program Status	Sentence length % (n)		
		< 3 Years (N= 246)	>= 3 Years (N= 205)	Indeterminate (N= 8)
<i>Low</i>		(n= 113)	(n= 125)	(n= 6)
	No Override	79.6 (90)	75.2 (94)	0 (0)
	Override to moderate	20.4 (23)	24.8 (31)	100 (6)
<i>Moderate</i>		(n= 108)	(n= 66)	(n= 2)
	Override to engagement	0.9 (*)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No override	99.1 (107)	93.9 (62)	100 (*)
	Override to high	0 (0)	6.1 (*)	0 (0)
<i>High</i>		(n= 25)	(n= 14)	(n= 0)
	Override to moderate	32.0 (8)	21.4 (*)	0 (0)
	No override	68.0 (17)	78.6 (11)	0 (0)

Note. CRI = Criminal Risk Index. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed