

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

The Timing of Correctional Reintegration Program Delivery: A Review of International Correctional Agencies

2023 N° R-448

ISBN: 978-0-660-45770-3

Cat. No.: PS83-5/R448E-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.

**The Timing of Correctional Reintegration Program Delivery: A Review of International
Correctional Agencies**

Mansanga Tanga

Kaitlyn Wardrop

&

Chelsea Sheahan

Correctional Service of Canada

2023

Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed to the success of this research. The authors would like to express their gratitude to individuals in the Evaluation Division and the Reintegration Programs Division who contributed invaluable advice, guidance, and feedback on the project proposal. The authors would like to thank Jason Dunn, Shirley Steller, and Krishna Tiwari of the Evaluation Division, as well as Emmanuel Rutsimbo, Christian-Simon Ferlatte, Mylène Duchemin, Veronique Dagenais, and Thana Ridha of the Reintegration Programs Division for their feedback and editorial comments on the draft report that contributed to making this report a success. Finally, the authors would like to thank Geoff Wilton and Andrea Moser for their insights, assistance, and recommendations throughout the project.

Executive Summary

Key words: *correctional reintegration programs (CRP), timely delivery, correctional agencies*

Correctional reintegration programs (CRPs) are an essential part of many correctional agencies' efforts to rehabilitate incarcerated men and women. While it was previously thought that relatively few CRPs were effective at reducing offender recidivism, recent empirical evidence has found that CRPs that adhere to the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) principles reduce offenders' risk of reoffending by 17 to 35 percent. Given these findings, scholars and correctional agencies are now exploring additional ways to optimize the efficacy and efficiency of correctional interventions, such as determining the best practices in timely access to correctional programming, including the best practices in timing of access to improve program completion rates and help reduce the risk of recidivism. The Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) recent evaluation of its CRPs highlighted ongoing challenges with the delivery of correctional programs; only 16% and 52% of men with enrollments in CRPs were able to complete their programs before day and full parole eligibility dates, respectively (CSC, 2020). Therefore, the purpose of this review is to examine how various correctional agencies in different regions and jurisdictions structure CRP delivery to identify best practices for timely enrollment and completion of correctional programs to help reduce the risk of recidivism, and to consider how these practices could be applied in the Canadian federal correctional context.

The government webpages of 70 correctional agencies in 13 countries were reviewed for publicly available documentation, policy, legislation, and research pertaining to the timing of correctional reintegration programs. In total, 21 correctional agencies representing three countries were included in the final review with evidence in how and when they delivered CRPs prior to community release. These timing strategies were classified into four broad categories: 1) timing of CRP adapted to the offender, 2) timing of CRP based on available resources, 3) timing of CRP based on the offender's release date, and 4) other timing strategies.

Most agencies did not have publically available information on how and when CRPs are delivered. Among those with available information, the most common strategy for CRP delivery was based on the offender's release date (15 correctional agencies). CSC's correctional planning falls under this category, giving priority to offenders serving four years or less for correctional programs to ensure program completion is achievable before parole eligibility dates. However, due to a lack of available evidence-based information on the optimal timing of program enrollment and completion at each correctional agency under review, it was difficult to determine whether such timing of correctional programs was effective in improving program completion rates and reducing recidivism rates, and thus a best practice in program delivery. Additional evidence-based research assessing the overall effectiveness of the various strategies outlined in this review is required to advise the Correctional Service of Canada on the best practices for CRP delivery. Nevertheless, these findings provide some insight into when and how correctional agencies in different regions and jurisdictions deliver correctional programs.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	vi
Introduction.....	1
Method	4
Results.....	5
Timing of CRP Adapted to the Offender.....	5
Timing of CRP Based on Available Resources	9
Timing of CRP based on Release Dates	10
Other Timing Strategies	14
Discussion	16
Limitations and Future Research	18
Conclusion	20
References.....	21

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Overview of correctional agencies with timing of correctional reintegration programs adapted to the offender by country</i>	6
Table 2 <i>Overview of correctional agencies with timing of correctional reintegration programs based on available resources by country</i>	9
Table 3 <i>Overview of correctional agencies with timing of correctional reintegration programs based on release dates by country</i>	11
Table 4 <i>Overview of correctional agencies with timing of correctional reintegration programs based on other timing strategies by country</i>	14

List of Appendices

Appendix A: List of Correctional Agencies Reviewed	27
Appendix B: Description of Correctional Agencies included in the Review	29

Introduction

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) offers a range of correctional services with the goal of facilitating offenders' rehabilitation and reintegration into the community. These services include educational programs (e.g., basic literacy, academic and personal development), employment and employability programs (e.g., CORCAN), and social programs (e.g., parenting skills training, social integration programs, leisure activities), which help develop or provide relevant skills and knowledge in preparation for release (CSC, 2019). Importantly, CSC is also responsible for delivering correctional reintegration programs (CRPs), which are a key component of many correctional agencies' offender rehabilitation efforts (Andrew & Bonta, 2010). CRPs, also known simply as correctional programs, differ from other services in that they are structured interventions designed specifically to reduce reoffending by targeting risk factors directly associated to criminal behaviour (CSC, 2018a). Since 2010, CSC has transitioned to an integrated multi-target or holistic correctional program model for both men and women, targeting multiple need areas within the same program rather than focusing on specific offence histories (e.g., substance abuse programs). The purpose of the new integrated correctional program model was to address effectively the needs of participants with multiple risk factors, to improve access to programs, and to ensure the timely completion of programs prior to parole eligibility (CSC, 2018a).

Historically, it was believed that very few CRPs were effective at reducing offender recidivism since it was difficult to discern with certainty whether rehabilitative efforts had a significant effect on recidivism based on existing empirical research (Lipton, Martinson, & Wilks, 1975; Martinson, 1974; 1976). This was often due to methodological reasons such as the limits in generalizing what works for one offender population to another, the lack of replicated studies, and the use of different measures of offender behaviour (Martinson, 1974). However, with additional studies over the last 30 years regarding "what works" with respect to interventions for offenders, empirical evidence that some CRPs, particularly those that abide by the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) principles and based on cognitive-behavioural and social learning models are effective (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990; Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990; Dowden & Andrews, 2000; Hanson, Bourgon, Helmus, & Hodgson, 2009; Gobeil, Blanchette, & Stewart, 2016). According to the

RNR principles, to reduce offenders' risk of recidivism, CRPs should be more intensive for higher risk offenders (risk principle); target needs related to criminal behaviour (need principle); and match the offenders' learning style, abilities, and motivation level (responsivity principle; Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990). CRPs that follow the RNR principles can reduce offenders' risk of reoffending by between 17% and 35% (Bonta & Andrews, 2007). Having observed this, scholars and correctional agencies, including CSC, are now focusing on additional ways to optimize the efficacy and efficiency of correctional interventions, particularly in identifying the optimal timing of CRPs in an offender's sentence to help reduce the risk of recidivism.

Notably, there is an ongoing scholarly debate on whether it is preferable to prioritize rehabilitative efforts towards the beginning of an offender's custodial sentence or closer to their estimated release from prison, and existing empirical evidence is inconclusive (Duwe, 2018; Papp et al., 2019; Scaggs et al., 2016; Wardrop & Sheahan, 2022; Wexler, Falkin, & Lipton, 1990). Some put forth the potential benefits of commencing rehabilitative efforts as soon as possible after conviction, as a method of maximizing the effects of rehabilitative services and interventions. This may have a positive effect of both allowing offenders to practice learned skills within the controlled prison environment and potentially minimizing any possible deleterious affects of incarceration (Papp et al., 2019). Others, however, highlight the potential benefits of later CRP participation, as newly released offenders may struggle to retain the lessons learned from interventions completed years prior (Papp et al., 2019; Scaggs et al., 2016).

Wardrop and Sheahan (2022) examined the relationship between the timing of CRP completions and revocation outcomes for federally sentenced Canadian offenders to inform the optimal timing of CRP delivery throughout an offender's sentence. Results showed that later CRP completions were generally associated with reductions in revocations, but that reductions in revocations largely plateaued for completions after offenders' day parole eligibility date.¹ Given the importance of preparing offenders for rehabilitation by their earliest possible release,

¹ There are several types of conditional releases that Canadian federal offenders may be granted (CSC, 2018c). Day parole allows an offender to participate in community-based activities, but requires them to return nightly to a community-based residential facility. For offenders serving determinate sentences, they are eligible to apply for day parole six months before full parole eligibility date or six months into their sentence, whichever is greater (CSC, 2018c). Full parole allows offenders to serve part of their sentence under community supervision, although offenders are typically permitted to reside in a private residence. Most offenders are eligible for full parole after serving one-third of their sentences or seven years, whichever is less. Statutory release, however, is a presumptive release by law, and generally offenders serving determinate sentences must be released after serving two-thirds of their sentence, if parole has not already be granted.

Wardrop and Sheahan (2022) concluded that it is prudent to have offenders complete their required programs in close proximity to their parole eligibility dates as offenders are likely to benefit from the recency of their experience in applying learned skills in the community. However, completing programs by day and full parole eligibility dates is a recognized challenge highlighted by CSC (2020).

CSC's (2020) recent evaluation of its CRPs highlighted ongoing challenges with the delivery of correctional programs by offenders' parole eligibility dates. To illustrate, only 24% of offenders with enrollments in CRPs were able to complete their main program (i.e., programs of moderate to high intensity) before day parole eligibility dates, while 57% of offenders were able to complete their program before full parole eligibility dates. These findings differed considerably by gender, with 72% and 94% of women completing their main program before day and full parole eligibility dates, respectively, compared to 16% and 52% of men. Furthermore, a higher proportion of offenders completed their main program before day and full parole eligibility when they had longer sentences (44% and 75%, respectively)² than shorter sentences (20% and 55%, respectively). There were no differences found between Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders (CSC, 2020). Based on these findings, the evaluation report recommended identifying the best practices that allow for timely enrollment and completion of correctional reintegration programs (Recommendation 3, CSC, 2020).

A first step in identifying best practices of timely enrollment and completion of correctional programs is to examine how other correctional agencies determine when to provide programs and whether these practices have demonstrated improved program completion rates and recidivism outcomes. Promising approaches can then be assessed for their applicability to the Canadian federal correctional context. Therefore, the goal of the current project was to conduct an environmental scan, searching for and examining documentation publicly available from other correctional agencies to determine how they structure CRP delivery, whether these practices have demonstrated improved program completion rates and recidivism outcomes, and to consider how these practices could be applied in the Canadian federal correctional context.

² Defined as sentences of more than four years (CSC, 2020).

Method

The government webpages of 70 correctional agencies in 13 countries were reviewed for documentation, policy, legislation, and research pertaining to the timing of correctional reintegration programs. This included the 50 state prisons in the United States of America, which are operated independently of the federal government and sentences differed based on state charges (i.e. offenders serving a sentence for a state offence). See Appendix A for a list of all the correctional agencies reviewed. In order to be included in this review, the following criteria had to be met:

- An agency's webpage must have information in either French or English
- Evidence of adherence to the RNR principles
- Evidence of correctional programs that address, at the very least, offenders' criminogenic needs such as attitudes, associates, and substance abuse (in recognition that correctional agencies may have different criteria for what constitutes a reintegration program than CSC, for instance, distinctions between educational, vocational, and RNR-based programs were not always made)
- Documentation, policy, legislation, or research pertaining to the timing of CRPs in relation to the length of offenders' custodial sentence

Results

In total, the webpages of 21 correctional agencies from three countries – Australia, Singapore, and the United States of America (USA) – were included in the review. This total entailed five correctional agencies from Australia, one from Singapore, and fifteen from the USA. Appendix B contains an overview of each correctional agency, including information on the offender population, how offenders are referred to programs, and CRP delivery timing strategies. The review identified a number of strategies employed by the 21 correctional agencies in how and when they deliver CRPs prior to community release, though, in reality, these strategies may be interconnected for many agencies. The timing strategies identified were: 1) timing of CRP adapted to the offender, 2) timing of CRP based on available resources, 3) timing of CRP based on the offender's release date, and 4) other timing strategies (e.g., program delivery early in the sentence). Some correctional agencies employed more than one timing strategy and so agencies may be classified under more than one theme. Furthermore, while some strategies may be used by all correctional agencies (for instance, the timing based on the availability of resources), this review focuses on the agencies that discussed these strategies in the materials analyzed.

Timing of CRP based on the offender's release date was identified as the most common strategy for CRP delivery, followed by timing of CRP adapted to the offender. Notably, no correctional agencies provided empirical support that their approach to structuring the timing of program delivery resulted in improved correctional program completion rates and recidivism outcomes, meaning best practices were unable to be identified at this time. The following discussion on the timing of CRP delivery is divided into four categories based on the timing strategies under review.

Timing of CRP Adapted to the Offender

Under this theme, CRPs are delivered to offenders based on their needs. This includes an offender's immediate need for program, the offenders' willingness to participate, and programs tailored to target risk factors and criminogenic needs at specific stages or phases during the offender's sentence to maximize treatment efficacy. There were ten correctional agencies that delivered CRPs according to this theme (see Table 1).

Table 1

Overview of correctional agencies with timing of correctional reintegration programs adapted to the offender by country

Country (Jurisdiction)	Correctional Agency	CRP Delivery
Australia (Territory Level)	Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services (ACTCS)	Programs scheduled based on identified areas of offenders' need.
Singapore (National Level)	Singapore Prison Service (SPS)	Timing of programs vary depending on the phase of the offender's sentence.
USA (State Level)	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)	Timing of programs vary depending on where the offender is in their sentence. When delivering a program in a flexible manner to meet offenders' needs, the program may be completed in an accelerated manner by increasing the number of sessions per week.
USA (State Level)	Delaware Department of Correction	Timing of programs vary depending on the phase of the offender's sentence.
USA (Federal Level)	Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP)	Program offerings vary based on the needs of the offender population.
USA (State Level)	Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections (DPS&C)	Timing of programs vary depending on the phase of the offender's sentence.
USA (State Level)	Oregon Department of Corrections	Program resources are limited to offenders in imminent need of services.
USA (State Level)	Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ)	Participation is prioritized based on the offender's immediate need for program.
USA (State Level)	Utah Department of Corrections (UDC)	Program participation is prioritized based on the offender's willingness to participate and change.
USA (State Level)	Virginia Department of Corrections (VADOC)	Timing of programs vary depending on the phase of the offender's sentence and the offender's needs.

The above correctional agencies delivered programs depending on the needs of offenders, while it was not always evident how the needs of offenders influenced the timing of correctional programs for these agencies. Some correctional programs at the ACTCS in Australia, for example, are scheduled on a non-ongoing basis depending on identified areas of offenders' needs (ACTCS, 2019). Furthermore, offenders in imminent need of services are prioritized for program participation at the Oregon Department of Corrections (2011) in the USA. Yet, it was unclear from both agencies how offenders' needs influence the timing of correctional programs or what is considered an imminent need for services, for instance, whether high-risk offenders should be enrolled in program as soon as possible or whether imminent need is determined by risk factors, criminogenic needs (e.g., high needs rating in a certain domain), or both. In contrast, program participation at the TDCJ in Texas, USA is prioritized based on the offenders' needs, where an offender's program needs are ranked and prioritized to determine the immediacy for placement (TDCJ, 2017). For the Sex Offense Treatment Program (SOTP) at the UDC in Utah, USA, offenders on the SOTP's tracking list to await program participation are prioritized based on their willingness to participate and change (UDC, 2020).

Because programs are tailored to the needs of offenders, some correctional agencies administer each of their programs at different time frames that offenders can participate in. For instance, in the USA, the Federal BOP's Bureau Rehabilitation and Values Enhancement (BRAVE) Program is a cognitive-behavioural treatment program for medium-security men offenders aged 32 and younger serving their first federal sentence of 60 months or more. It aims to reduce recidivism by confronting antisocial attitudes and criminality (BOP, 2017). The program also encourages favourable institutional adjustment by focusing on building interpersonal skills and prosocial behaviours in prison. As a result, the BRAVE program is assigned to offenders at the beginning of their sentence to help them adjust favourably to incarceration. The Challenge Program, on the other hand, is a cognitive-behavioural treatment program for high security men offenders that targets substance use disorders, mental illnesses, and criminality (BOP, 2017). Offenders may participate in the program at any time throughout their sentence, though they must have at least 18 months remaining to complete the program, as the length of the program varies depending on the needs of the offender, requiring a minimum duration of nine months.

Similarly, the VADOC's Thinking for a Change is a mandated evidence-based practices

program designed to teach social skills and problem-solving strategies to decrease criminal thinking and conduct for all offenders who score *probable* or *highly probable* on the Cognitive Behavioural scale of COMPAS, a tool used to assess the risk of recidivism (VADOC, 2021, n.d.-b). These offenders must be assigned to the program within 180 days of arrival at their first institution. On the other hand, offenders recommended to the Intensive Re-entry Program, a program that prepares offenders for release by offering cognitive and educational programs based on needs, must be enrolled in Phase 1 of the program no later than one year prior to release and Phase 2 within six months of their release dates (VADOC, 2021).

Other correctional agencies deliver programs at specific phases of an offender's sentence that are considered important in addressing the risk or needs of the offender in preparation for release. For example, the CDCR's Division of Rehabilitative Programs in California, USA offers a 7-step rehabilitative process, with program participation varying based on where the offender is in their sentence (CDCR, 2021e). To illustrate, in Step 3 (Day 90 up to 60 months left to serve), the offender may be placed in programs centred on educational achievements. In Step 4 (48 to 60 months left to serve), the offender may be placed in programs that address criminogenic needs. In Step 5 (12 to 24 months left to serve), the offender may continue to receive treatment, such as Cognitive Behavioural Interventions (CDCR, 2021b). The Delaware Department of Corrections in the USA structures offenders' rehabilitation journey into three phases, with the institutional phase serving as an integral stage for offenders to participate in programs in preparation for release while incarcerated. At SPS in Singapore, the rehabilitation journey for offenders is similarly structured into four phases, with the pre-release phase being an important stage for offenders to participate in programs in preparation for reintegration back into the community (SPS, 2019).

Finally, at the Louisiana DPS&C in the USA, offenders in custody participate in rehabilitative and reintegration programs in Phase I and Phase II of their sentence. Phase I (Getting Ready) is the institutional phase in which offenders are assessed for risk, needs, and responsivity to identify their rehabilitative needs in custody (DPS&C, 2021b). Once this is determined, an individualized Reentry Accountability Plan is created for offenders that details their program needs, such as cognitive-behavioural interventions, that they must attend. Phase II (Going Home) is the transitional phase before the offender's scheduled release date, during which they prepare for release by completing reintegration-specific programs recommended by

the Reentry Accountability Plan.

Timing of CRP Based on Available Resources

Under this theme, the timing of correctional programs at each correctional agency will often vary depending on the availability of resources. This includes the availability of staff and room locations. There were six correctional agencies that delivered CRPs according to this theme (see Table 2).

Table 2

Overview of correctional agencies with timing of correctional reintegration programs based on available resources by country

Country (Jurisdiction)	Correctional Agency	CRP Delivery
Australia (Territory Level)	Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services (ACTCS)	Programs are scheduled based on staff availability.
Australia (State Level)	Corrective Services New South Wales (CSNSW)	The timing of each program will depend on staff resources.
Australia (State Level)	Department for Correctional Services South Australia	Programs are scheduled based on staff availability and prison room locations.
USA (Federal Level)	Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP)	Program offerings can vary based on resource availability.
USA (State Level)	Oklahoma Department of Corrections (ODOC)	Placement and duration of programs are dependent on available resources.
USA (State Level)	The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ)	Program offerings can vary based on program availability.

In general, the above correctional agencies delivered programs based on available resources. For instance, the Federal BOP specifies that program offerings may vary depending on resource availability (BOP, 2017). The ODOC in Oklahoma, USA also specifies that the placement and duration of treatment, such as cognitive-behavioural programs, are contingent on available resources (ODOC, 2021). However, it was unclear from these correctional agencies what types of resources were being specified that affect the timing of correctional programs. The remaining four correctional agencies, on the other hand, did define the resources. For instance, the ACTCS in Australia noted that participation in programs scheduled on a non-ongoing basis

depends on staff availability (ACTCS, 2019). Staff resources also determine the timing of each program at the CSNSW in New South Wales, Australia (CSNSW, 2017a). When scheduling programs at the Department for Correctional Services South Australia, not only is staff availability considered, but also prison room location; indeed, offenders may be required to relocate in order to participate in a program (Department for Correctional Services, 2020). Lastly, at the TDCJ in Texas, USA, program enrollment is prioritized based on program availability (TDCJ, 2017).

Timing of CRP based on Release Dates

Under this theme, CRPs are administered to offenders based on their sentence length, earliest date of release, or pre-release stage. There were fifteen correctional agencies that delivered CRPs according to this theme (see Table 3).

Table 3

Overview of correctional agencies with timing of correctional reintegration programs based on release dates by country

Country (Jurisdiction)	Correctional Agency	CRP Delivery
Australia (Territory Level)	Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services (ACTCS)	There must be sufficient time to complete programs in the participant's order or sentence.
Australia (State Level)	Corrective Services New South Wales (CSNSW)	The timing of each program will depend on offenders' earliest possible release date or sentence length at each location.
Australia (State Level)	Department for Correctional Services South Australia	Programs are delivered towards the end of offenders' sentences, prioritizing offenders based on conditional release dates and sentence end dates.
Australia (Territory Level)	Northern Territory Correctional Services	Priority for program is given to offenders based on their earliest possible release dates.
Australia (State Level)	Queensland Corrective Services (QCS)	Timing of program participation is determined by the offender's sentence length.
Singapore (National Level)	Singapore Prison Service (SPS)	Programs are offered in the pre-release phase in preparation for release.
USA (State Level)	Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation & Reentry (ADCRR)	Program participation is based on earned release date.
USA (State Level)	Delaware Department of Correction	Programs are offered in the pre-release stage in preparation for release.
USA (State Level)	Kentucky Department of Corrections	Timing of program participation often takes the offender's parole eligibility date or minimum expiration date into account.

Table 3

Continued

Country (Jurisdiction)	Correctional Agency	CRP Delivery
USA (State Level)	Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC)	Priority for program is given to offenders based on their Earliest Release Date.
USA (State Level)	Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS)	Program completion dates should consider offenders' parole eligibility dates.
USA (State Level)	Oklahoma Department of Corrections (ODOC)	Priority for program is given to offenders who have sufficient time to complete the program and are expected to be released upon program completion.
USA (State Level)	Oregon Department of Corrections	Program participation is limited to offenders preparing for release.
USA (State Level)	South Dakota Department of Corrections	Program participation is based on release dates.
USA (State Level)	Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ)	Program participation is prioritized based on the offender's parole or discharge date.

Notably, offenders with the shortest sentences; the closest release, parole eligibility, or sentence end dates; or those preparing for release are prioritized for correctional programs, often to ensure program completion before being released into the community. For instance, at the QCS in Queensland, Australia, offenders are assessed for their suitability to participate in programs, which includes determining how much longer they will be incarcerated and the timing of the program (QCS, 2018b). At the ODOC in Oklahoma, USA, offenders are referred to core correctional programs, which include education, substance abuse treatment, cognitive-behavioural programs, and re-entry programs if they have sufficient time to complete the program (ODOC, 2021). In some ODOC programs, such as the substance abuse treatment, priority is given to offenders who have ample time to complete the program and are expected to be released upon completion of the program. The CSNSW in New South Wales, Australia

provides correctional services to offenders, such as the Explore, Question, Understand, Investigate, Practise, Succeed (EQUIPS) program suite, which assists medium to high risk offenders understand what led to their criminal behaviour and build skills to manage their risk of reoffending (CSNSW, 2021a). When assessing program eligibility for all EQUIPS programs, the time remaining on offenders' sentences/orders is considered, and offenders with a short sentence are given the highest priority for program referrals (CSNSW, 2017b). This is to ensure that medium to high risk offenders have sufficient time to complete the program and be eligible for external leave.

The CSNSW also provides a range of intensive therapeutic programs tailored to specific offending behaviour, such as violent, sexual, and substance-use offending (CSNSW, 2021b). When determining offender suitability for these therapeutic programs, time to earliest possible release date is considered, as it is not best practice to begin treatment when it is clear that an offender will not have time to complete it. As a result, offenders with the closest earliest possible release date must be prioritized for participation over those with a later earliest possible release date. Many of the correctional agencies listed above under this theme also used this strategy, in which offenders with the closest release, parole eligibility, or sentence end dates are prioritized for correctional programs. To give a few examples, at the Kentucky Department of Corrections in the USA, offenders must be within four years of their parole eligibility date and 24 months of parole eligibility or minimum expiration date to participate in the Sex Offender Treatment Program and the Substance Abuse Program, respectively. At the MDOC in Michigan, USA, offenders with current sex offence convictions and those with a history of sexual offending are placed into the Michigan Sex Offender Program based on their Earliest Release Date, with those with the earliest dates being placed at the top of the placement list and given priority (MDOC, 2021b). This is related, in part, to the length of treatment. To illustrate, offenders classified as high risk and have current sex offence convictions as well as a history of sexual offending must complete 250 to 300+ hours of the program and at least 9 to 18 months of clinician-led Sex Offender Therapy. Furthermore, the NDCS in Nebraska, USA requires that case plan goals include realistic schedules that outline expected program completion dates based on the offender's parole eligibility date.

Lastly, a few correctional jurisdictions prioritize program participation for offenders preparing for release, such as at the Department for Correctional Services South Australia in

Australia, which prioritizes program participation towards the end of offenders’ prison sentences so that they can apply learned skills to their transition and eventual release into the community (Department for Correctional Services, 2020). Therefore, while programs are scheduled based on need, referrals to programs are prioritized based on conditional release dates and sentence end dates. The pre-release phase at SPS in Singapore and the institutional phase at the Delaware Department of Correction in the USA are considered important stages for offenders to participate in program in preparation for reintegration back into the community (Delaware Correctional Reentry Commission, n.d.-b; SPS, 2019). Finally, the Oregon Department of Corrections (2011) limits program resources to offenders preparing for release.

Other Timing Strategies

Under this theme, correctional agencies used timing strategies that were less common in the review. Just four correctional agencies delivered CRPs according to this theme (see Table 4).

Table 4

Overview of correctional agencies with timing of correctional reintegration programs based on other timing strategies by country

Country (Jurisdiction)	Correctional Agency	CRP Delivery
Australia (Territory Level)	Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services (ACTCS)	Programs are offered continually with rolling entry.
Australia (State Level)	Corrective Services New South Wales (CSNSW)	If low risk offenders are referred to program, they should be referred as early as possible as part of their whole sentence case plan.
USA (State Level)	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)	Beginning rehabilitative programs early in the sentence to prepare offenders for successful reintegration upon release.
USA (State Level)	Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS)	Programs should be delivered for a period of time and at a point in the offender’s sentence that is considered the most effective for achieving case plan goals and objectives.

Overall, three timing strategies could be identified among the above correctional agencies. The first is the administering of programs early in offenders' sentences. For instance, the Division of Rehabilitative Programs, a branch of the CDCR in California, USA, considers beginning rehabilitative programs early in the sentence in order to prepare offenders for successful reintegration upon release (CDCR, 2021c). At the CSNSW in New South Wales, Australia, low risk violent offenders who are referred to EQUIPS should be referred to the program as early as possible as part of their whole sentence case plan to allow sufficient time to complete the program. Otherwise, if there is considerable time to serve their sentence, low risk violent offenders should not be referred to program until eight years prior to their earliest release date (CSNSW, 2017b). The second timing strategy is to administer programs continually with rolling entry as identified at the ACTCS in Australia (ACTCS, 2019). The final strategy is to administer programs during a period in offenders' sentences that would be considered the most effective in achieving their case plan goals and objectives identified at the Maryland DPSCS (2016), though available information was unclear how this is determined during an offender's sentence.

Discussion

This review explored how various correctional agencies structured CRP delivery in an effort to identify the best practices for timely enrollment and completion of correctional reintegration programs, as well as the best practices for maximizing the impact of rehabilitative services and interventions on offenders' reintegration potential, and how these practices could be applied in the Canadian federal correctional context. In total, 21 correctional jurisdictions were included in the final review. Based on the review that was conducted, a number of timing strategies were identified and classified into four broad categories: 1) timing of CRP adapted to the offender, 2) timing of CRP based on available resources, 3) timing of CRP based on the offender's release date, and 4) other timing strategies. These strategies should not be viewed as completely distinct; rather, there are interconnections between strategies, such as the timing of CRP adapted to the offender and the timing of CRP based on the offender's release date. As a result, strategies may be more complex in practice, and correctional agencies may fall under several categories. However, the distinctions among the categories were used in this study to emphasize the common strategies employed by correctional agencies for timely enrollment and completion of correctional programs.

Under the first category – timing of CRP adapted to the offender – CRPs are delivered to offenders based on their needs, including offenders' immediate need for program or their willingness to participate, as well as programs tailored to target risk factors and criminogenic needs at specific phases in offenders' sentences. Under the second category – timing of CRP based on available resources – the timing of CRPs may vary depending on the availability of resources, such as the availability of staff or room locations. Under the third category – timing of CRP based on the offender's release date – offenders participate in programs based on their sentence length, earliest date of release, or pre-release stage in their sentence. Notably, priority for programs are given to offenders with the closest release date or those preparing for release to ensure program completion and successful reintegration. The final category – other timing strategies – includes a few additional timing strategies that were not as common in the review, such as administering programs early in offenders' sentences, on a rolling basis, or during a period in offenders' sentences that would be considered the most effective in achieving their case plan goals and objectives.

Overall, this review reveals the diversity of strategies in when correctional programs are delivered across and within the 21 correctional agencies. Nonetheless, the timing of CRP based on the offender's release date was identified as the most prevalent strategy for CRP delivery. This could imply, then, that the majority of correctional agencies perceive the optimal time for offenders to enroll in and complete programs is closest to their release dates. That being said, given the lack of available and accessible evidence-based information on the optimal timing of program enrollment and completion at each correctional agency under review, it is very difficult to rely on the information that currently exists to inform the best practices of CRP delivery. Further to that, under the National Correctional Program Referral Guidelines, CSC's correctional planning requires that referrals to correctional programs prepare offenders for timely and safe integration by giving priority to offenders serving four years or less for correctional programs during intake and considering parole eligibility dates to ensure that program completion is achievable and available within the offender's sentence (CSC, 2018b). Significantly, CSC employs the same timing strategies as the majority of correctional agencies under this review, delivering CRPs based on the offender's release date. Despite this, CSC's (2020) evaluation report found low program completion rates by day and full parole eligibility dates for men due to multiple barriers to timely program completion. These included offender-related factors such as illness, responsivity needs, and behaviours, as well as program unavailability or the perceived lack of program availability, a lack of human resources, and operational constraints such as lockdowns or placements in segregation that hindered program completion prior to parole eligibility dates. As a result, prior to determining that the CRP timing strategy based on the offender's release date is best practice, CSC must first identify ways to mitigate some of these barriers to improve the number of offenders completing programs by day parole eligibility date (particularly for men). This may include adopting alternative methods of program delivery, make-up sessions, or additional resources to address responsivity needs during program.

Moreover, it is possible that the optimal time for correctional programs depends on the content and purpose of the programs. To illustrate, part of the program objective of the Federal BOP's BRAVE program is to foster favourable institutional adjustment by focusing on developing interpersonal skills and prosocial behaviours in prison; therefore, program enrollment and completion are judged significant at the beginning of offenders' sentences. Whereas programs that address specific risk factors and criminogenic needs, such as the Michigan Sex

Offender Program, often prioritize the enrollment of offenders based on their earliest release dates to ensure program completion prior to returning to the community. Comparing the effects associated with timing of such programs may be misguided. Both approaches may effectively achieve their respective purposes because the time of delivery is appropriate to the content.

Some studies on the optimal timing of CRP delivery have found support for earlier intervention, particularly in reducing recidivism (e.g., Papp et al., 2019), whereas others have found that programs of longer length and completion closer to the offender's release date or day parole eligibility date were significantly associated with lower recidivism rates (e.g., Duwe, 2018; Wardrop & Sheahan, 2022). However, given the contrasting findings of the small number of studies that examined the timing of correctional programs, more research is needed to determine the best practices and under what conditions, taking into account the variety of considerations identified in this review, in order to develop evidence-based guidance for CSC.

Furthermore, the review suggests that each agency's strategic framework are guided by the RNR principle of assessing offenders' risk, needs and responsivity at admission, and 'matching' program recommendations (see Appendix B for more details under each correctional agency). In many cases, these assessments and case plan objectives determined the best time to deliver programs. As such, timing strategies that work in one correctional agency may not work in another. Differences across correctional agencies' offender populations in terms of custodial sentence length (e.g., the MDOC offender population serves statutory maximum sentences of more than one year), offender type (e.g., adults, juveniles, offenders on remand), and offence types (e.g., drug, violent, and sexual offences) are likely important considerations.

To better advise on the best practices for CRP delivery for CSC, additional evidence-based research that assesses the overall effectiveness of the various strategies outlined in this review in ensuring program completion and reducing offenders' recidivism rates is required. Nonetheless, Wardrop and Sheahan's (2022) study may suggest that CSC is on the right path in ensuring that offenders with shorter sentences are prioritized for correctional programs to complete correctional programs closer to earliest possible release dates, thus establishing strategies to ensure this is attainable will be critical.

Limitations and Future Research

The findings of this review should be interpreted with a few limitations in consideration. The main limitation is that the findings were based on publicly available information on

correctional agencies' webpages. Thus, access to all relevant information related to the timing of CRPs may not have been obtained and analyzed. This includes having access to research or policies that explain the best practices of timely program delivery to optimize the impact of rehabilitative services and interventions on offenders' reintegration potential, or empirical evidence of the most effective timing strategies in ensuring higher rates of program completions or improved recidivism rates. As a result, there is insufficient information in this review to make critical evaluations about the timing of CRPs in the 21 correctional agencies or to identify best practices for the optimal timing of correctional programs. Furthermore, this review was limited to institutions with publicly available information in English or French, thus potentially leaving out correctional agencies that use the RNR principles in their correctional planning while also relying heavily on data from the USA. Consultations with other correctional agencies to gain additional information on the effectiveness of correctional program delivery strategies may be considered in future reviews or research, as well as consultations with correctional agencies excluded in this review.

A second limitation is that the review focused solely on timing strategies for CRP delivery that may promote effective outcomes in offenders' rehabilitation and reintegration into the community. These strategies are often offender-focused (i.e., depending on the needs of the offender population as established by the RNR principle and the offender's sentence length). Yet, the effectiveness of programs are not dependent exclusively on the optimal timing of the program delivery. The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI), for example, was designed to assess the ability of a correctional program to reduce recidivism (Gendreau & Andrews, 1996). It measures eight components of a correctional program and the criteria that defines an effective program or intervention. These components include program implementation (e.g., cost effectiveness and documented need for the program), client pre-service assessment (e.g., the application of the RNR principle), program characteristics (e.g., the adequate use of cognitive behavioural techniques, and targeting relevant criminogenic needs), and staff characteristics (e.g., staff training). The CPAI provides a holistic examination of the effectiveness of correctional programs, identifying important aspects of rehabilitation that includes much more than just the best timing of programs for offenders. Logistical barriers to programs such as lockdowns or other operational constraints may also impact both the timing and effectiveness of correctional programs, as identified in CSC's (2020) evaluation report.

Future research will need to examine these components in order to determine evidence-based guidance in this regard.

Conclusion

Overall, the findings of this review offered insight into current efforts by correctional agencies across various jurisdictions in ensuring the timely enrollment and completion of correctional programs. The most common strategy for correctional program delivery was based on the offender's release date, and CSC's policy giving priority to offenders serving four years or less for correctional programs and considering eligibility and release dates for programming falls in line with what was found to be common practice in most correctional agencies. Given that little research has been conducted on the timing of program participation, these findings contribute to understanding the practices that various correctional agencies have chosen to establish when and how correctional programs should be delivered to ensure program completion prior to release and reduce the risk of recidivism. However, more research and consultations with correctional agencies into timing strategies and the effectiveness of the strategies identified in this review are needed to affirm that current practices CSC and other agencies have put in place are indeed best practices, as well as identifying ways to mitigate the barriers to program completion by earliest possible release dates.

References

- Arizona Department of Corrections. (2019). *Department order: 923 – Sex Offender Education and Treatment Manual*.
https://corrections.az.gov/sites/default/files/policies/900/0923_112919.pdf
- Arizona Department of Corrections Rehabilitation & Reentry. (n.d.). *Inmate programs & re-entry*. <https://corrections.az.gov/programs-services/inmate-programs-reentry>
- Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services (ACTCS). (2019). *ACT Corrective Services Compendium of Programs 2020*. Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct (5th ed.)*. Routledge.
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R.D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17(1), 19-52.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854890017001004>
- Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F.T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28(3), 369-404.
- Bonta, J. & Andrews, D.A. (2007). *Risk-Need-Responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation*. Public Safety Canada.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). (2021a). *About CDCR*.
<https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/about-cdcr/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). (2021b). *Cognitive Behavioral Interventions*. <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/rehabilitation/cbi/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). (2021c). *Division of Rehabilitation Programs (DRP)*. <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/rehabilitation/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). (2021d). *Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)*. <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/juvenile-justice/>
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). (2021e). *Rehabilitative Process*. <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/rehabilitation/about/process/>
- Correctional Service of Canada (2018a). *Commissioner's Directive 726: Correctional Programs*.
<https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/726-cd-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada (2018b). *National Correctional Program Referral Guidelines*.
<https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/726-2-gl-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada (2018c). *Types of conditional release*.
<https://www.canada.ca/en/parole-board/services/parole/types-of-conditional-release.html>

- Correctional Service of Canada (2019). *Programs for offenders*. <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/002/002-index-en.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2020). *Evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs*. Correctional Service of Canada.
- Corrective Services New South Wales. (2017a). *Policy for compendium program planning and scheduling*. <https://correctiveservices.dcj.nsw.gov.au/csnsw-home/resources/policies-and-publications/policies.html>
- Corrective Services New South Wales. (2017b). *Policy for implementation, delivery and integrity monitoring of the EQUIPS suite of programs*. <https://correctiveservices.dcj.nsw.gov.au/csnsw-home/resources/policies-and-publications/policies.html>
- Corrective Services New South Wales. (2021a). *Compendium of offender behaviour change programs*. <https://correctiveservices.dcj.nsw.gov.au/csnsw-home/resources/policies-and-publications/policies.html>
- Corrective Services New South Wales. (2021b). *Policy for intensive therapeutic programs for violent, sexual and substance-use related offending*. <https://correctiveservices.dcj.nsw.gov.au/csnsw-home/resources/policies-and-publications/policies.html>
- Delaware Correctional Reentry Commission (DCRC). (n.d.-a). *Delaware Correctional Reentry Commission*. <https://doc.delaware.gov/dcrc/aboutus.shtml>
- Delaware Correctional Reentry Commission (DCRC). (n.d.-b). *Reentry Planning Process*. <https://doc.delaware.gov/dcrc/assets/docs/reentryplanningprocess.pdf>
- Delaware Department of Corrections. (n.d.). *About the DOC*. <https://doc.delaware.gov/views/about.blade.shtml>
- Delaware Department of Corrections. (2018). *Policy Number 3.4: Range of Services*. https://doc.delaware.gov/assets/documents/policies/policy_3-4.pdf
- Department for Corrections. (2020). *Rehabilitation Programs Branch: Model of Service*. <https://www.corrections.sa.gov.au/Rehabilitation-education-and-work/rehabilitation>
- Dowden, C., & Andrews, D.A., (2000). Effective correctional treatment and violent reoffending: A meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42(4), 449-467.
- Duwe, G. (2018). The effects of the timing and dosage of correctional programming on recidivism. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 57(3-4), 256-271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2017.1401025>
- Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). (n.d.-a). *About our Agency*. <https://www.bop.gov/about/agency/>

- Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). (n.d.-b). *Inmate Custody & Care*.
https://www.bop.gov/inmates/custody_and_care/
- Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). (2017). *Directory of National Programs*.
https://www.bop.gov/inmates/custody_and_care/docs/20170913_Directory_of_National_Programs1.pdf
- Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D.A. (1996). *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory*. University of New Brunswick.
- Gobeil, R., Blanchette, K., & Stewart, L. (2016). A meta-analytic review of correctional interventions for women offenders: Gender-neutral versus gender-informed approaches. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 43(3), 301-322.
- Hanson, R.K., Bourgon, G., Helmus, L., & Hodgson, S. (2009). The principles of effective correctional treatment also apply to sexual offenders: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(9), 865-891.
- Kentucky Department of Corrections. (2020). *Policy Number 29.1 Risk and Needs Assessment*.
<https://corrections.ky.gov/About/cpp/Documents/29/29.1%20Risk%20and%20Needs%20Assessment%20-%20Eff%208-4-2020%20-%20Supersedes%20Date%20Filed%20Version%201-12-2018.pdf>
- Kentucky Department of Corrections. (2021a). *Adult Institutions*.
<https://corrections.ky.gov/Divisions/programs/Pages/ai.aspx>
- Kentucky Department of Corrections. (2021b). *Policy Number 30.5 Sex Offender Treatment Program*.
[https://corrections.ky.gov/About/cpp/Documents/30/30.5%20\(13.6\)%20-%20SOTP%20-%20Effective%207-20-2021.pdf](https://corrections.ky.gov/About/cpp/Documents/30/30.5%20(13.6)%20-%20SOTP%20-%20Effective%207-20-2021.pdf)
- Kentucky Department of Corrections. (2021c). *Policy Number 30.6 Division of Addiction Services Substance Abuse Program*.
[https://corrections.ky.gov/About/cpp/Documents/30/30.6%20\(13.8\)%20-%20SAP%20-%20Effective%207-20-2021.pdf](https://corrections.ky.gov/About/cpp/Documents/30/30.6%20(13.8)%20-%20SAP%20-%20Effective%207-20-2021.pdf)
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies*. Praeger.
- Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections (DPS&C). (2021a). *About DPS&C*.
<https://doc.louisiana.gov/about-the-dpsc/>
- Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections (DPS&C). (2021b). *Reentry Initiatives & Transitional Work Programs*. <https://doc.louisiana.gov/imprisoned-person-programs-resources/transition-reentry/>
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 22, 22-54.

- Martinson, R. (1976). California research at the crossroads. *Crime & Delinquency*, 22(2), 180-191.
- Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS). (n.d.). *Division of Correction*. <https://www.dpscs.state.md.us/corrections/>
- Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS). (2016). *Executive Directive OPS.165.0001: Reentry- Assessment, Planning, and Programming*. <https://itcd.dpscs.state.md.us/PIA/ShowFile.aspx?fileID=1203>
- Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC). (2021a). *Agency Purpose*. https://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,4551,7-119-68886_68900---,00.html
- Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC). (2021b). *Michigan Sex Offender Program*. https://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,4551,7-119-68854_68856_74016---,00.html
- Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC). (2021c). *Prisoner Programming*. https://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,4551,7-119-33218_68926---,00.html
- The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS). (n.d.-a). *About*. <https://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/about>
- The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS). (2018). *2019-2023 Strategic Plan*. https://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/sites/default/files/files/41/2019-2023_strategic_plan_final.pdf
- The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS). (2020). *Policy Number 201.6: Case Management Services*. https://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/system/files/rules_reg_files/201.06_2020.pdf
- Northern Territory Government (2021). *Prisoner treatment and rehabilitation programs*. <https://nt.gov.au/law/prisons/prisoner-treatment-and-rehabilitation-programs>
- Oklahoma Department of Corrections (ODOC). (2019). *Policy Statement No. P-010300 entitled "Mission and Organization of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections"*. <https://oklahoma.gov/content/dam/ok/en/doc/documents/policy/section-01/p010300.pdf>
- Oklahoma Department of Corrections (ODOC). (2021). *Policy Statement No. P-090100 entitled "Provisions of Programs"*. <https://oklahoma.gov/content/dam/ok/en/doc/documents/policy/section-09/p090100.pdf>
- Oregon Department of Corrections. (n.d.-a). *About Oregon DOC*. <https://www.oregon.gov/doc/about/Pages/home.aspx>
- Oregon Department of Corrections. (n.d.-b). *Adult in Custody Programs*. <https://www.oregon.gov/doc/aic-programs/Pages/home.aspx>
- Oregon Department of Corrections. (n.d.-c). *Intake and Assessment: Assessments and Case*

Planning. <https://www.oregon.gov/doc/intake-and-assessment/Pages/assessments-and-case-planning.aspx>

Oregon Department of Corrections. (2011). *DOC Policy 90.1.3: Correctional Case Management*. <https://www.oregon.gov/doc/rules-and-policies/Documents/90-1-3.pdf>

Papp, J., Wooldredge, J., & Pompoco, A. (2019). Timing of prison programs and the odds of returning to prison. *Corrections*, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23774657.2019.1598308>

Queensland Corrective Services. (2018a). *Daily life in prison*. <https://www.qld.gov.au/law/sentencing-prisons-and-probation/prisons-and-detention-centres/daily-life-in-prison>

Queensland Corrective Services. (2018b). *Intervention while in custody*. <https://www.qld.gov.au/law/sentencing-prisons-and-probation/rehabilitation-and-community-service/intervention-while-in-custody>

Scaggs, S., Bales, W.D., Clark, C., Ensley, D., Coltharp, P., & Blomberg, T.G. (2016). *An assessment of substance abuse treatment programs in Florida's prisons using a random assignment experimental design*. National Institute of Justice.

Singapore Prison Service (SPS). (2019). *Rehabilitation Process*. <https://www.sps.gov.sg/volunteer/rehabilitation-process>

Singapore Prison Service (SPS). (2020a). *Organization*. <https://www.sps.gov.sg/who-we-are/organisation>

Singapore Prison Service (SPS). (2020b). *Research Year-in-Review 2020*. Correctional Research Branch: Psychological and Correctional Rehabilitation Division.

South Dakota Department of Corrections. (2019). *DOC Policy 1.4.A.3 – Sex Offender Management Program*. <https://doc.sd.gov/documents/Sex%20Offender%20Management%20Program1162020.pdf>

South Dakota Department of Corrections. (2021a). *About Us*. <https://doc.sd.gov/about/>

South Dakota Department of Corrections. (2021b). *South Dakota Department of Corrections Inmate Living Guide*. <https://doc.sd.gov/documents/Inmate%20Living%20Guide4232021.pdf>

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ). (n.d.-a). *Inside TDCJ*. https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/kss_inside.html

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ). (n.d.-b). *Rehabilitation Programs Division*. <https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/divisions/rpd/index.html>

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ). (2017). *Offender Orientation Handbook*. https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/Offender_Orientation_Handbook_English.pdf

- United States Department of Justice. (2014). *Program Statement 5322.12: Inmate Classification and Program Review*. https://www.bop.gov/policy/progstat/5322_013.pdf
- Utah Department of Corrections (UDC). (n.d.). *Programs for Inmates*. <https://corrections.utah.gov/index.php/family-friends/programs-for-inmates>
- Utah Department of Correction (UDC). (2020). *UDC Sex Offense Treatment Program Description*. <https://corrections.utah.gov/index.php/family-friends/programs-for-inmates/sex-offense-programs>
- Virginia Department of Corrections (VADOC). (2021). *Operating Procedure 841.1, Inmate Management and Programs*. <https://vadoc.virginia.gov/files/operating-procedures/800/vadoc-op-841-1.pdf>
- Virginia Department of Corrections (VADOC). (n.d.-a). *Programs*. <https://vadoc.virginia.gov/offender-resources/incoming-offenders/facility-programs/>
- Virginia Department of Corrections (VADOC). (n.d.-b). *Thinking For a Change*. <https://vadoc.virginia.gov/offender-resources/incoming-offenders/facility-programs/cognitive/thinking-for-a-change/>
- Wardrop, K., & Sheahan, C. (2022). *The relationship between the timing of completion of correctional programs and recidivism outcomes*. (Research Report-439). Correctional Service of Canada.
- Wexler, H.K., Falkin, G.P., & Lipton, D.S. (1990). Outcome evaluation of a prison therapeutic community for substance abuse treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17(1), 71-92.

Appendix A: List of Correctional Agencies Reviewed

List of correctional agencies reviewed for inclusion in the review:

* *represents correctional agencies included in this review*

- Alabama Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Alaska Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation & Reentry (United States of America)
- Arkansas Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services (Australia)
- Belgian Prison Service (Belgium)
- *California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (United States of America)
- Colorado Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Connecticut State Department of Correction (United States of America)
- Corrections Victoria (Australia)
- *Corrective Services New South Wales (Australia)
- Criminal Sanctions Agency (Finland)
- Custodial Institutions Agency (Netherlands)
- *Delaware Department of Correction (United States of America)
- Department of Corrections (New Zealand)
- *Department for Correctional Services South Australia (Australia)
- Directorate of Prison Administration France (France)
- *Federal Bureau of Prisons (United States of America)
- Florida Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Georgia Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Hawaii Department of Public Safety (United States of America)
- Her Majesty's Prison & Probation Service (England and Wales)
- Idaho Department of Correction (United States of America)
- Illinois Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Indiana Department of Correction (United States of America)
- Iowa Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Irish Prison Service (Ireland)
- Kansas Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Kentucky Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Kriminal Forsorgen (Denmark)
- Kriminalomsorgen (Norway)
- *Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections (United States of America)
- Maine Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (United States of America)
- Massachusetts Department of Correction (United States of America)
- *Michigan Department of Corrections (United States of America)

- Minnesota Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Mississippi Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Missouri Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Montana Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (United States of America)
- Nevada Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- New Hampshire Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- New Jersey Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- New Mexico Corrections Department (United States of America)
- New York Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (United States of America)
- North Carolina Department of Public Safety (United States of America)
- North Dakota Corrections and Rehabilitation (United States of America)
- *Northern Territory Correctional Services (Australia)
- Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (United States of America)
- *Oklahoma Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Oregon Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Queensland Corrective Services (Australia)
- Rhode Island Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Singapore Prison Service (Singapore)
- South Carolina Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *South Dakota Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Swedish Prison and Probation Service (Sweden)
- Tasmania Corrective Services (Australia)
- Tennessee Department of Correction (United States of America)
- *Texas Department of Criminal Justice (United States of America)
- *Utah Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Vermont Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- *Virginia Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Washington Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- West Virginia Division of Corrections and Rehabilitation (United States of America)
- Western Australia Department of Corrections (Australia)
- Wisconsin Department of Corrections (United States of America)
- Wyoming Department of Corrections (United States of America)

Appendix B: Description of Correctional Agencies included in the Review

Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation & Reentry. The Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation & Reentry (ADCRR) provides corrective services for state-level offenders, which include education, employment opportunities, counseling and treatment services, and a sex-offender treatment program (ADCRR, n.d.). Most relevant to the current review is the Sex Offender Education and Treatment Program (SOETP), which delivers education and treatment programs like counseling to meet the needs of offenders convicted of sex offenses (Arizona Department of Corrections, 2019). To participate in the SOETP, the offender must be eligible for medium custody placement, have Mental Health and Medical scores of three or lower, be functionally literate, and have an earned release date in no fewer than 13 months.

Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services. The Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services (ACTCS) provides correctional services to both remand and sentenced adults within the Australian Capital Territory. Services at ACTCS include a range of correctional programs such as preparation programs (i.e., an introductory program that familiarizes the offender to the group work environment), offence specific programs (i.e., targeting dynamic factors affecting offenders' criminal behaviour), offence related programs (i.e., programs to address substance misuse), and wellbeing programs (e.g., mental health and personal development programs) (ACTCS, 2019). While some programs are offered continually with rolling entry, others are scheduled on a non-ongoing basis depending on staff availability and identified areas of offenders' need (ACTCS, 2019). Program suitability is determined by individually assessing participants, including their specific risks of reoffending, a process that can take up to six weeks. This process may be even longer if the participant's offending history requires more investigation (e.g., multiple interviews, interstate information). However, to begin a program, there must be sufficient time to complete the program in the participant's order or sentence (ACTCS, 2019).

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) provides correctional services to men and women offenders in-custody and on parole, as well as juveniles up to the age of 25, to facilitate their successful reintegration into the community through education and treatment, as well as active participation in rehabilitative programs (CDCR, 2021a, 2021d). The Division of Rehabilitative

Programs (DRP) is a branch of the CDCR that provides rehabilitative services and programs to in-custody offenders based on their needs, which may include education, job training, and cognitive behavioural treatment programs (CDCR, 2021c). In terms of program participation, the DRP considers beginning rehabilitative programs early in the sentence as the most effective way of preparing offenders for successful reintegration upon release. However, based on the DRP's 7-step rehabilitative process, which begins with the classification process and concludes with parole or community reintegration, timing of programs vary depending on where the offender is in their sentence (CDCR, 2021e). To illustrate, offenders at Step 3 (Day 90 up to 60 months left to serve) may generally be placed in programs focused on educational achievements. At Step 4 (48 to 60 months left to serve), offenders may be placed in programs that address criminogenic needs. And at Step 5 (12 to 24 months left to serve), offenders may continue to receive treatment, such as Cognitive Behavioural Interventions, which require offenders to be within 15 to 24 months of their Earliest Possible Release Date (CDCR, 2021b).

Corrective Services New South Wales. Corrective Services New South Wales (CSNSW) provides correctional services to individuals on remand and those sentenced within the state of New South Wales, Australia. Services at CSNSW include a range of correctional programs to offenders such as general offender programs (i.e., the Explore, Question, Understand, Investigate, Practise, Succeed [EQUIPS] program suite), alcohol and/or drug treatment, sex offender programs, violent offender programs, high intensity program units for high-risk offenders serving shorter sentences, and a short sentence intensive program (CSNSW, 2021b). Program planning meetings occur regularly so that interventions addressing specific offending behaviour can be scheduled for the following six months; however, the timing of each program will depend on staff resources, the number of medium to high-risk offenders at each location, and earliest release date of offenders at each location (CSNSW, 2017a). A summary of a select few of the correctional programs offered by CSNSW are reviewed below to illustrate the timing of programming.

EQUIPS. EQUIPS is a suite of programs that assist medium to high-risk offenders to understand the factors that led to their criminal behaviour, as well as to develop skills to manage their risk of reoffending. It is comprised of four programs: EQUIPS Foundation (suitable for all offenders regardless of offence type), EQUIPS Addiction, EQUIPS Domestic Abuse, and EQUIPS Aggression (the latter three of which are specific to offenders with specific needs)

(CSNSW, 2017b). For all EQUIPS programs, the time remaining on offenders' sentence/order is considered when determining program eligibility and offenders with a short sentence are highest priority for program referrals. Staff review offenders with between two and three years to their earliest release date so that medium to high-risk offenders have an appropriate amount of time to complete the program and be eligible for external leave (CSNSW, 2017b).

Offenders assessed as medium risk should participate in two EQUIPS programs (80 hours), while offenders assessed as medium-high or high risk should participate in three or four EQUIPS programs where relevant (120-160 hours). Where medium-high or high risk offenders have a very short custodial sentence, participation in three or four EQUIPS programs can commence in custody and be completed in the community (CSNSW, 2017b). Low risk violent offenders may be referred to EQUIPS based on their criminogenic needs; however, their placement in the program should not take priority over shorter sentenced offenders, higher risk offenders, or other offenders eligible for external leave programs. If referred to the program, low risk violent offenders should be referred to the program as early as possible as part of their whole sentence case plan; however, if there is still considerable time to serve, they should not be allocated to the relevant program until eight years prior to their earliest release date. At that time, the offender's suitability for the program should be reviewed (CSNSW, 2017b).

When delivering a program in a flexible manner to meet the needs of the individuals or the location, the number of hours delivered is not to be reduced. While a program may be completed in an accelerated manner, this is done by increasing the number of sessions per week, not by reducing the number of treatment hours (CSNSW, 2017b). As a general rule, repeating EQUIPS programs within a 12-month period is not recommended at the expense of untreated, shorter sentenced offenders (CSNSW, 2017b).

Intensive therapeutic programs for violent, sexual, and substance-use offending. CSNSW provides a range of therapeutic programs specific to certain offending behaviour: violent, sexual, and substance-use offending. The aim of these therapeutic programs is to help offenders understand the factors that led them to offend, learn skills to manage their risk of reoffending, and enhance positive skills and characteristics they already possess (CSNSW, 2021b). Time to earliest possible release date is considered when determining offender suitability for these therapeutic programs, as it is not best practice to begin treatment when it is known that an offender will not have time to complete it. As such, men and women offenders must have at

least 12 months and 6 months, respectively, to serve prior to earliest possible release date. All candidates are prioritized according to their earliest possible release date; those candidates with the closest earliest possible release date must be prioritized for participation over candidates who have a further earliest possible release date. Referrals to these intensive programs take priority over participation in other criminogenic programs (e.g., EQUIPS; CSNSW, 2021b).

High Intensity Program Units (HIPU). HIPU are available across seven locations and provide intensive rehabilitation services, programs, and enhanced release planning for offenders serving shorter sentences. The goal of HIPU is to provide participants with up to 200 hours of criminogenic intervention over a 16-week period. This includes criminogenic program participation in combination with concurrent participation with reintegration services and community engagement. To be eligible for HIPU, offenders must be assessed as having the highest risk of return to custody and to have between five months and three years remaining on their sentence (CSNSW, 2021a).

Delaware Department of Correction. The Delaware Department of Corrections is a unified correctional system that manages offenders in pre-trial detention, custody, and under community supervision, and offers a range of evidence-based services and programs to meet the needs of the offender population (Delaware Department of Corrections, n.d). This includes rehabilitative programs offered by the Delaware Correctional Reentry Commission (DCRC), which oversees re-entry services for offenders transitioning from custody to the community (DCRC, n.d.-a). Offenders' rehabilitation journey is structured into three phases: the institutional phase (prison), the re-entry phase (release preparation), and the community phase (treatment and supervision) (DCRC, n.d.-b). At intake and orientation, newly admitted offenders are assessed to identify their security level classification and needs, which serve to determine the optimal program to respond to their needs (Delaware Department of Corrections, 2018). While the timing of correctional programs is not specified, the DCRC (n.d.-b) notes that the institutional phase is an important stage for offenders to participate in program in preparation for release while incarcerated.

Department for Correctional Services South Australia. The Department for Correctional Services within the state of South Australia provides adult corrective services for remand and sentenced offenders. A wide variety of rehabilitation programs are available to moderate to high risk offenders, including those that target violence, sex offending, substance

misuse, and pro-criminal attitudes (Department for Corrective Services, 2020). For in-custody offenders, the Department for Correctional Services targets participation in programs towards the end of offenders' prison sentence, so that they can apply learned skills to their transition and eventual release into the community (Department for Corrective Services, 2020). Programs are scheduled according to need; however, program referrals are prioritized based on conditional release dates and sentence end dates. Program scheduling also takes into account staff availability and prison room locations. Offenders may be required to move locations in order to participate in a program (Department for Correctional Services, 2020).

Federal Bureau of Prisons. The Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) in the United States is responsible for the custody and care of federal offenders (including special needs offenders such as women offenders, juveniles, and Tribal offenders³), with facilities located in the Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, North Central, Western, South Central, and Southeast regions (BOP, n.d.-a, n.d.-b). The BOP offers a range of national programs and services standardized across institutions that address the criminogenic needs of federal offenders in custody to facilitate a successful return to the community (BOP, 2017). These include educational programs (i.e., opportunities to acquire literacy and marketable skills to assist in obtaining employment after release), mental health programs (i.e., mental health treatments and services), and substance abuse treatment (e.g., drug abuse education) (BOP, n.d.-b). Programs are also designed to meet the needs of specific offender population, such as the gender-responsive version of the Residential Drug Abuse Treatment Program, which caters to the treatment needs of women offenders. Additionally, the BOP offers a range of programs that address offenders' criminality and dynamic risk factors to reduce rates of federal recidivism (BOP, 2017).

During the Initial Classification of a newly admitted offender, a program plan is developed that contains the offenders' needs and the proposed correctional program to meet those needs (United States Department of Justice, 2014). Initial Classification occurs within 28 days of the offender's arrival at the institution. Every 180 days, a Program Review is held to assess the offender's progress in recommended programs and to recommend additional programs based on the offender's acquired skills while in custody. Nevertheless, each program has varied

³ Tribal offenders are individuals from Tribal Nations in the United States who have been sentenced in Tribal courts but are being held under the BOP's jurisdiction. For more information, see https://www.bop.gov/inmates/custody_and_care/tribal_offenders.jsp.

time frames in which offenders can participate, as highlighted in the examples below, and program offerings can vary based on resource availability and the needs of each institution's offender population (BOP, 2017).

The Bureau Rehabilitation and Values Enhancement Program (BRAVE). The BRAVE Program is a cognitive-behavioural treatment program for medium security men offenders aged 32 and younger who are serving their first federal sentence of 60 months or more (BOP, 2017). This program aims to reduce recidivism by confronting antisocial attitudes and criminality, as well as to encourage favourable institutional adjustment by focusing on building interpersonal skills and prosocial behaviours in prison. The BRAVE program is a six-month program that is assigned to offenders at the beginning of their sentence to help them adjust favourably to incarceration.

The Challenge Program. The Challenge Program is a cognitive-behavioural treatment program for high security men offenders that addresses offenders' substance use disorders, mental illnesses, and criminality (BOP, 2017). While offenders may participate in the program at any time throughout their sentence, they must have at least 18 months remaining. Furthermore, the length of the program will vary depending on the needs of the offender, with a minimum of nine months.

The Sex Offender Treatment Program – Nonresidential (SOTP-NR) and the Sex Offender Treatment Program – Residential (SOTP-R). The SOTP-NR is a moderate intensity cognitive-behavioural program for low to moderate risk sexual offenders, whereas the SOTP-R is a high intensity cognitive-behavioural program for high risk sexual offenders; yet both programs target dynamic risk factors associated with reoffence in sex offenders (BOP, 2017). While both the SOTP-NR and the SOTP-R are voluntary programs, offenders who participate in either program are placed during the last 36 months of their sentence and are prioritized by release date (i.e., those with earliest release dates are prioritized), taking into account the duration of the programs. The SOTP-NR has a duration of 9 to 12 months whereas the SOTP-R has a duration of 12 to 18 months.

Kentucky Department of Corrections. The Kentucky Department of Corrections provides correctional programs and services to adult offenders to facilitate their successful reintegration into the community (Kentucky Department of Corrections, 2021a). Offenders are assessed for risk and needs as soon as possible upon admission to identify program needs and the

risk of reoffending, as well as to establish a case plan that highlights the appropriate programs to address the offender's criminogenic needs (Kentucky Department of Corrections, 2020).

Programs at the Kentucky Department of Corrections are standardized across all institutions and can range from evidence-based programs to substance abuse programs, including the Sex Offender Treatment Program (SOTP) and the Division of Addiction Services Substance Abuse Program. While each program has different eligibility criteria (e.g., offender's needs, available resources, previous participation in program, offence history), the timing of program participation often takes the offender's parole eligibility date or minimum expiration date into account (Kentucky Department of Corrections, 2021b, 2021c). For instance, offenders must be within four years of their parole eligibility date and 24 months of parole eligibility or minimum expiration date to participate in the SOTP and the Substance Abuse Program, respectively.

Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections. The Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections (DPS&C) and its Correctional Services division oversee the custody and care of adult offenders who are in custody, on probation, and under community supervision (DPS&C, 2021a). To ensure public safety and offender rehabilitation, the DPS&C provides a range of evidence-based reintegration programs to offenders across a continuum of care from the institution to the community, addressing their criminogenic risks and needs (DPS&C, 2021b). This continuum, or reentry philosophy, is divided into three phases, with participation in rehabilitative and reintegration programs occurring in Phase I and Phase II.

Phase I (Getting Ready) is the institutional phase in which offenders are assessed for risk, needs, and responsivity to determine their rehabilitative needs in custody (DPS&C, 2021b). Once this is determined, an individualized Reentry Accountability Plan for the offender is created that specifies their program needs, such as cognitive-behavioural interventions, that they must attend. Periodically, the plan is updated to ensure that the offender is completing correctional programs and meeting their objectives. Phase II (Going Home) is the transitional phase before the offender's scheduled release date, during which they prepare for release by completing recommended programs by the Reentry Accountability Plan specific to reintegration. Lastly, in Phase III (Staying Home), offenders are released from the institution and continue their sentences under community supervision. Therefore, program timing varies depending on where the offender is in the continuum and the program's objectives.

Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services. Maryland

Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services' (DPSCS) Division of Correction manages 18 state prisons and pre-release centres with the goal of successfully reintegrating offenders into society by providing them with the tools they need to prevent criminal behaviour (DPSCS, n.d.). This is achieved through programs and services such as job skill opportunities, educational programs, psychological and health sessions, and drug treatment. Offenders are examined within 60 days of admission to determine their risk levels and criminogenic needs (DPSCS, 2016). If the offender is found to be at a high moderate or moderate risk of reoffending, they are referred to re-entry programs that address their criminogenic needs. Though timing of correctional programming is not specified, the DPSCS (2016) instructs that programs be delivered for a period of time and at a point in the offender's sentence that is considered the most effective for achieving case plan goals and objectives.

Michigan Department of Corrections. The Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) is responsible for the custodial care of all adults and juveniles sentenced as adults for offences with statutory maximum sentences of more than one year (MDOC, 2021a). Although most convicted offenders are supervised under probation or serving a sentence of up to one year in a county jail, some are sentenced to state prison. During incarceration, offenders are provided with treatment and correctional programs that employ cognitive behavioural techniques based on their assessed risk and need level, yet priority is given to offenders based on their Earliest Release Date (MDOC, 2021c). For instance, the Michigan Sex Offender Program provides treatment to men offenders with current sex offence convictions as well as histories of sexual offending; however, offenders are placed into the program based on their Earliest Release Date, with those with the earliest dates placed at the top of the placement list and given priority (MDOC, 2021b). This is related, in part, to the length of treatment. To illustrate, offenders classified as high risk must complete 250 to 300+ hours of program and at least 9 to 18 months of clinician-led Sex Offender Therapy.

Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS) operates correctional institutions in the State of Nebraska, with the statutory responsibility of keeping the public safe while also providing rehabilitative services to adult and juvenile offenders (NDCS, n.d.-a). These services include correctional programs such as Thinking for a Change, Sex Offender Treatment, Substance Abuse Treatment, and Anger Management (NDCS, 2018). An offender's placement in a correctional program is determined

by the results of their RNR assessment, which is administered upon admission. Once the offender's risk to reoffend, their criminogenic needs, and their level of responsivity to intervention are identified, an individualized case plan is created that includes the programs needed to achieve rehabilitation goals (NDCS, 2020). According to the NDCS (2020), case plan goals should include realistic schedules, identifying expected completion dates based on the offender's parole eligibility date, including for program participation.

Northern Territory Correctional Services. The Northern Territory Correctional Services offers a range of treatment and rehabilitative programs to men and women offenders with varying sentence lengths, though the Safe Sober Strong program is the only one indicated to be available to those on remand (Northern Territory Government, 2021). Programs also vary in terms of intensity (e.g., low or moderate intensity) and targeted risk levels (e.g., moderate-low or moderate risk offenders). Treatment and rehabilitative programs available at Northern Territory Correctional Services include sex offender treatment programs, alcohol and drug programs, violent offender programs, and maintenance programs (helping offenders transition back into the community), all with the purpose of addressing offending behaviour and reducing reoffending while in custody. Eligibility for programs is determined by offenders' clinical assessments and program requirements (i.e., whether offenders exhibited the targeted offending behaviour to attend the program; Northern Territory Government, 2021). While the timing of program is not specified, offenders are given priority to participate in a program based on their release dates; that is, those with the earliest possible release date must be prioritized as most programs require a specific period of time to be delivered. The Sex Offender Treatment Program, for instance, is structured around eight modules that are typically delivered over a six-month period, while the Violent Offender Treatment Program-Moderate is a three-month program.

Oklahoma Department of Corrections. The Oklahoma Department of Corrections (ODOC) provides a variety of evidence-based correctional treatment and rehabilitative programs to help offenders establish productive and law-abiding lifestyles (ODOC, 2019). Core correctional programs, such as education, substance abuse treatment, cognitive-behavioural programs, and re-entry programs, aim to minimize criminal risk and, as a result, the likelihood of recidivism (ODOC, 2021). Offenders are referred to treatment based on their assessed risk and needs, though placement and duration of treatment are dependent on available resources and sufficient time to complete the program, such as placement in cognitive-behavioural programs

that address criminogenic factors that increase the risk of recidivism (ODOC, 2021). Similarly, for offenders assessed as having moderate or high need for substance abuse treatment at reception, priority is given to those who have enough time to complete the program and are expected to be released upon program completion.

Oregon Department of Corrections. The Oregon Department of Corrections manages 14 state prisons throughout the state of Oregon and provides corrective services to adults sentenced to prison for more than 12 months (Oregon Department of Corrections, n.d.-a). The corrective services administered to offenders include programs, social activities, and training opportunities that assist offenders in preparing for release from custody by providing the cognitive, education, and job skills needed to reintegrate into society (Oregon Department of Corrections, n.d.-a, n.d.-b). As a result, program resources are limited to offenders preparing for release or in imminent need of services (Oregon Department of Corrections, 2011). The intake and assessment process is necessary to develop an offender's case plan that includes referrals to relevant programs based on assessed risk factors (Oregon Department of Corrections, n.d.-c).

Queensland Corrective Services. Queensland Corrective Services (QCS) delivers a variety of correctional programs to offenders that address criminal behaviour such as violent, sexual offending, and substance misuse-related offending. Programs vary in intensity and offenders are recommended for these programs based on their offending history, their risk of reoffending, and the level of harm associated with their offending (QCS, 2018b). When entering into prison, all offenders are assessed for their health, education and intervention needs, a process that can take up to three weeks (QCS, 2018a). Offenders are also assessed for their suitability to participate in programs. This assessment includes the consideration of a wide range of factors, including how much longer they have to stay in prison and the timing of the program (QCS, 2018b). Available information, however, does not specify how these factors are considered when determining offender suitability for programs.

Singapore Prison Service. The Singapore Prison Service (SPS) operates 15 institutions offering a range of rehabilitative programs to men and women offenders based on the RNR model, which addresses the specific risks and needs of offenders to facilitate successful reintegration into the community upon release (SPS, 2019, 2020a). Programs include psychology-based correctional programs, family programs (engaging or involving family in the rehabilitative process), religious programs and services, vocational programs, and academic

programs. The Enhanced Drug Rehabilitation Regime is an example of a rehabilitative program for drug offenders in which the range and intensity of rehabilitative interventions are tailored to the drug offenders' general risk of reoffending and their level of drug dependency (SPS, 2020b). The rehabilitation journey for offenders at SPS is structured into four phases, two of which take place in prison: the Incare and Pre-Release phases (SPS, 2019). Newly admitted offenders are assessed to determine their risks and needs, and based on this, a plan is devised with relevant programs for intervention and rehabilitation. While the timing of program delivery is not specified, SPS (2019) considers the pre-release phase as an important stage for offenders to participate in program in preparation for reintegration back into the community.

South Dakota Department of Corrections. The South Dakota Department of Corrections oversees the state's adult prison system, adult parole system, and juvenile corrections system (South Dakota Department of Corrections, 2021a). In the Adult Corrections System, adult offenders are offered programs that are based on evidence-based practices to provide opportunities for rehabilitation. Opportunities, however, differ based on various factors, including the offender's classification or risk level that determine the appropriate program, treatment, and care while in custody (South Dakota Department of Corrections, 2021b). Referrals to programs also depend on release dates and whether the offender can complete the program prior to release. In the Sex Offender Management Program's Sex Offender Treatment, for example, offenders must participate for roughly two hours per week for 9 to 12 months prior to release (South Dakota Department of Corrections, 2019). This also includes programs and services that help offenders transition and reintegrate into society, such as release planning, in which offenders must participate if they are within five years of their release date (South Dakota Department of Corrections, 2021b).

Texas Department of Criminal Justice. The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) provides a range of correctional services to offenders in state prisons, state jails, and private correctional facilities that contract with the TDCJ, as well as for offenders released from custody on parole or mandated supervision (TDCJ, n.d.-a). The TDCJ has numerous divisions and departments that oversee various areas of the correctional agency, including the Rehabilitation Programs Division, which provides evidence-based treatment and programs to offenders throughout their incarceration and supervision period (TDCJ, n.d.-b). Based on their needs, offenders' Individualized Treatment Plan (ITP) outlines the programs they are required to

attend (TDCJ, 2017). Program participation is prioritized based on the offenders' needs, as well as program availability and parole or discharge date. For instance, offenders enrolled in the Sex Offender Rehabilitation Programs (SOTP) must be within 15 to 24 months of release. However, an offender's program needs are ranked and prioritized for placement (TDCJ, 2017).

Utah Department of Corrections. The Programming Division of the Utah Department of Corrections (UDC) offers a wide range of services and interventions to both men and women offenders, some of which rely on evidence-based practices to assist offenders in successfully reintegrating into the community and to reduce recidivism (UDC, n.d.). The services and interventions being offered include substance use treatment, sex offense treatment, and educational programs. Because offenders are expected (in most cases) to complete their program before being evaluated for release by the Board of Pardons and Parole, they are prepared for release from the moment they enter corrections, beginning with assessments in Receiving and Orientation, when offenders' specific needs relating to education, treatment, and life skills are assessed (UDC, n.d.). Following the assessments, a Case Action Plan is created that outlines the offender's educational and program needs.

The Sex Offense Treatment Program (SOTP) is an example of a program, which is based on cognitive-behavioural therapy that focuses on addressing offenders' criminogenic risk factors, including risk factors specific to sexual offending (UDC, 2020). Offenders who are ordered to participate in a sex offence-specific treatment are initially placed on the SOTP's tracking list to await program participation, though their position on the list is determined by their willingness to participate and change. However, once the Board of Pardons and Parole sets a rehearing date, the offender must enroll in the program no sooner than 24 months before their projected rehearing date. This is to allow offenders enough time to enroll and complete the program given that the program is intended to run between 15 and 24 months, depending on the risk factors and overall risk level of the offender, unless there are extenuating reasons.

Virginia Department of Corrections. The Virginia Department of Corrections (VADOC) offers over 125 programs to men and women offenders in state custody to reduce recidivism (VADOC, n.d.-a). Programs offered to offenders include education, vocations, mental health, substance abuse, and core correctional programs, which are classified into three categories: academic, job training, and cognitive. Prior to program participation, offenders' criminal risks and treatment needs are identified, and then a provision of programs and services

is created to address criminogenic needs (VADOC, 2021). However, with so many programs, the timing of correctional program varies per program. For instance, Thinking for a Change is a mandated evidence-based practices program designed to teach social skills and develop problem-solving strategies to decrease criminal thinking and conduct for all offenders who score *probable* or *highly probable* on the Cognitive Behavioural scale of COMPAS, a tool used to assess the risk of recidivism (VADOC, 2021, n.d.-b). These offenders must be assigned to the program within 180 days of arrival at their first institution. The Cognitive Behavioural Interventions for Substance Abuse program, on the other hand, gives enrollment priority to offenders who are within two years of release who must begin program participation no less than 18 months before release (VADOC, 2021). Similarly, the Intensive Re-entry Program, which prepares offenders for release by offering cognitive and educational programs based on needs, must be enrolled in Phase 1 of the program no later than one year prior to release and Phase 2 within six months of their release dates (VADOC, 2021).