

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Escapes from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021

2023 N° R-455

ISBN: 978-0-660-47610-0

Cat. No.: PS83-3/455E-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.

Escapes from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021

Laura McKendy
Stephanie Biro
Josée Taylor
Leslie Anne Keown
Magda Miron
&
Daina Stanley

Correctional Service of Canada

2023

Executive Summary

The current report builds on previous research examining the nature and circumstances surrounding escapes from federal institutions (McKendy & Keown, 2017; Johnson & Motiuk, 1992a, 1992b). The present analysis examined all escapes (i.e., unlawful departures from institutional boundaries) occurring at federal institutions between the 2017-2018 and 2020-2021 fiscal years. During this time period, there was a total of 56 individuals who escaped from a federal institution, with the number of incidents declining from a high of 17 in 2017-2018 to a low of 11 in 2020-2021. As in previous years, a majority of incidents occurred in the Prairie region. This regional trend was particularly pronounced in 2020-2021, when nine out of 11 incidents occurred in the Prairie region.

Consistent with prior research, escapes were mostly non-violent, often unplanned, and typically motivated by an immediate stressor. Time spent at large was generally three days or less, concluding with police apprehension. Most incidents occurred in minimum security environments, although a small number occurred at higher security institutions (i.e., medium or maximum settings). Exceptions to general trends in the nature and circumstances of escapes are notable. In some cases, signs of more advanced planning were identified, contrary to incidents that appeared to be an immediate reaction to a stressful event or situation. In addition, in a small number of cases, violence was used during the escape or while at large.

Analysis of profile information of escapees revealed several prominent themes. Most notably, the percentage of escape incidents involving Indigenous persons and women was considerably higher in the present study compared to prior analysis (i.e., McKendy & Keown, 2017). Indigenous persons accounted for 70% of escapes in the current analysis, compared to 43% previously, while escapes from women's institutions accounted for 20% of incidents, compared to 3% previously. A majority of incidents involving Indigenous persons occurred at Healing Lodge facilities, which are environments that incorporate Indigenous values, traditions and beliefs (Correctional Service Canada, 2021). In cases involving women, 64% of incidents occurred at Healing Lodges.

Other key profile findings were tied to institutional trajectories and escape histories. In just under half (45%) of cases, the individual's security level represented an override from risk assessment results. Specifically, the recommended security level was higher than the level determined by final decision-makers. It was also observed that escapes often occurred in close proximity to arrival at the institution of escape, suggesting the transition period may be a time of enhanced escape risk. Finally, individuals involved in escapes were found to often have histories of escape and/or going unlawfully at large, suggesting a connection between prior escape-related behaviours and current escape risk.

While escapes from custody are uncommon and generally do not involve violence, such incidents raise key implications for public safety and confidence. Comprehensive understandings of escape incidents are integral to identifying pre-incident and proximal risk factors, as well as possible operational vulnerabilities, with the underlying aim of maintaining accountability and transparency as a public organization.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
List of Tables	v
Introduction.....	1
Method	1
Results.....	2
Overview of Escape Incidents by Fiscal Year and Region, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021	2
Institutions of Escape	3
Temporal Elements of Escape Incidents.....	6
Escape Incident Details.....	6
Method	6
Motivations, Planning, and Possible Contributing Factors.....	7
Days at Large and Recapture Details.....	7
Post-Incident Management	7
Profile of Escapees.....	8
Conclusion	12
References.....	13

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Recorded Escapes From Federal Custody by Region, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.</i>	3
Table 2. <i>Institution of Escapes from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.</i>	5
Table 3. <i>Temporal Information for Escapes from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.</i> ..	14
Table 4. <i>Basic Profile Information of Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.</i>	15
Table 5. <i>Sentence Information of Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.</i> ..	16
Table 6. <i>Sentence History and Security Placement Information of Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.</i>	17
Table 7. <i>Dynamic Need Information at Intake for Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.</i>	18
Table 8. <i>Additional Intake Measures Information of Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.</i>	20

Introduction

Escapes from federal institutions are relatively uncommon events, yet generate considerable public attention, particularly when public safety risk is perceived to be a concern. The analysis of escape incidents can shed light on the circumstances surrounding such incidents; moreover, underlying gaps and broader issues within correctional operations can be revealed through systematic examination of this topic.

Previous research conducted on escapes from federal institutions found that incidents typically occur at minimum security institutions, are non-violent, are not pre-planned, and are often in response to stressful events or situations (McKendy & Keown, 2017; Johnson & Motiuk, 1992a, 1992b). The current research builds on prior studies by examining escape incidents that occurred between fiscal years 2017-2018 and 2020-2021 at a Correctional Service Canada (CSC) federal institution.

Method

Cases for analysis were drawn from an escape incident tracking list maintained by the Special Projects and Data Management (SPDM) team. Incidents included were those in which an individual housed in a federal institution unlawfully departed institutional boundaries. Incidents in which escape efforts were not successful (i.e., there was no breach of institutional boundaries) were excluded.

In total, there were 56 cases that met inclusion criteria. Cases are analyzed at the individual level (i.e., for each individual who escaped) rather than at the incident level (there were nine incidents involving more than one escapee). The analysis examines three main elements: (1) The circumstances and details of the escape (e.g., date, time, location, method, motivation); (2); Basic case management responses following the incident; and (3) Profile characteristics of the individuals involved. Data sources for the analysis included: Incident Reports, Warden Situation Reports, and individual case documents located in the Offender Management System (OMS). Comparative analysis is presented across fiscal year periods; however, given relatively low

numbers, it is difficult to discern whether yearly variations are the result of genuine trends or random fluctuations.

Results

Overview of Escape Incidents by Fiscal Year and Region, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021

Between 2017/2018 and 2020/2021, there was a total of 56 escapes from federal custody. The number of incidents declined over this period, from a high of 17 in 2017-2018 to a low of 11 in 2020-2021. It is possible that the lower number of incidents in 2020-2021 was tied to restrictions and measures in place to reduce the spread of Covid-19; however, this relationship was not examined empirically.

Consistent with previous analysis (McKendy & Keown, 2017), a majority of incidents occurred in the Prairie region; this trend was evident across fiscal year periods, but was particularly pronounced in 2020-2021 (See

Table 1). By fiscal year, the percentage of incidents occurring in the Prairie region was 59% in 2017-2018, 69% in 2018-2019, 67% in 2019-2020, and 82% in 2020-2021. The actual number of escape incidents varied minimally within the Prairie region during the four-year period, however. Percentage shifts appear to be tied to declining numbers in other regions rather than an increase in incidents. Further, given low numbers, relatively small changes can result in large changes in percentages.

The Pacific region had the second highest number of incidents (though far less than in the Prairie region), with 18% of incidents overall, declining across the four years (i.e., from 24% in 2017-2018 to 9% in 2020-2021). There was only one escape incident in the Atlantic region during the four year period (i.e., in 2017-2018) and only two incidents in Ontario (i.e., one in 2018-2019 and one in 2019-2020). There were five incidents in Quebec, with at least one incident per year.

Table 1.

Recorded Escapes From Federal Custody by Region, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.

Region	Fiscal Year				<i>Total</i> (<i>n</i> = 56)
	2017-2018 (<i>n</i> = 17)	2018-2019 (<i>n</i> = 16)	2019-2020 (<i>n</i> = 12)	2020-2021 (<i>n</i> = 11)	
Atlantic	1 5.9%	- -	- -	- -	1 1.8%
Quebec	2 11.8%	1 6.3%	1 8.3%	1 9.1%	5 8.9%
Ontario	- -	1 6.3%	1 8.3%	- -	2 3.6%
Prairie	10 58.8%	11 68.8%	8 66.7%	9 81.8%	38 67.9%
Pacific	4 23.5%	3 18.8%	2 16.7%	1 9.1%	10 17.9%
<i>Total</i>	17 100.0%	16 100.0%	12 100.0%	11 100.0%	56 100.0%

Institutions of Escape

Escapes occurred at 18 different federal institutions (See

Table 2

Table 1 **Error! Reference source not found.**). The vast majority of incidents (i.e., 89%) involved individuals housed in minimum security; such incidents are often referred to as “walkways” given there are limited perimeter barricades within minimum security environments. The remaining 11% of incidents occurred in medium and maximum security settings (i.e., three incidents in both medium and maximum institutions across the four years).

During the four-year period, 43% of escapes occurred at Healing Lodges (including both CSC and community run Healing Lodges; Correctional Service Canada, 2021). The percentage of incidents occurring at Healing Lodges was relatively consistent across all fiscal years except for 2019-2020; during this fiscal year, only one incident occurred at a Healing Lodge. During the other three fiscal year periods, the percentage of incidents occurring at Healing Lodges was 50% or greater.

Non-Healing Lodge institutions with the greatest number of incidents during the period under analysis included Saskatchewan Penitentiary ($n = 6$), Mission Institution ($n = 5$), and Stony Mountain Institution ($n = 5$). Healing Lodges with the greatest number of escape incidents during this period were Willow Cree Healing Centre ($n = 6$) and Buffalo Sage Wellness Centre ($n = 5$).

Across the four year period, 20% of escape incidents occurred at women’s institutions, representing an increase from prior years (i.e., 2011-2012 to 2016-2017; McKendy & Keown, 2017). There was variation, however, across the years examined. The percentage of incidents occurring at women’s institutions was 24%, 31%, 0% and 18% in 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021 respectively. Escapes from women’s institutions often occurred at Healing Lodges (i.e., 64% during the period under analysis), compared to 38% for men’s institutions.

Table 2.

Institution of Escapes from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.

Institution	Fiscal Year				Total (n = 56)
	2017- 2018 (n = 17)	2018- 2019 (n = 16)	2019- 2020 (n = 12)	2020- 2021 (n = 11)	
Non-Healing Lodges					
Beaver Creek	-	1	1	-	2
Dorchester Penitentiary	1	-	-	-	1
Drumheller Annex	-	-	1	-	1
Edmonton Inst. for Women	2	1	-	1	4
Federal Training Centre	2	1	1	-	4
Mission Institution	1	3	-	1	5
Regional Psychiatric Centre	-	-	2	-	2
Stony Mountain Institution	2	-	1	2	5
William Head	-	-	2	-	2
Saskatchewan Penitentiary	-	2	3	1	6
<i>Total</i>	8	8	11	5	32 (57%)
Healing Lodges					
Okimaw	-	1	-	-	1
Pê Sâkâstêw Centre	1	-	-	2	3
Willow Cree Healing Centre	3	1	-	2	6
Kwikwexwelhp	3	-	1	-	4
Buffalo Sage Wellness House	2	3	-	-	5
Stan Daniels Healing Centre	-	3	-	-	3
Waseskun Healing Centre	-	-	-	1	1
Eagle Women's Lodge	-	-	-	1	1
<i>Total</i>	9	8	1	6	24 (43%)
<i>Overall Total</i>	17	16	12	11	56 (100%)

Temporal Elements of Escape Incidents

Different temporal elements were considered to explore when escapes were most likely to occur. When it came to month and season, incidents were uncommon in December and January, and slightly more common in the fall (between September and November; i.e., 34%). However, given relatively low numbers within a given fiscal year, the ability to discern seasonal/monthly trends is limited. In terms of day of the week, escape incidents occurred disproportionately on Sunday (27%) and Wednesday (27%). It is not clear based on currently available information why escape incidents are more common on these days. In regards to time of day, a majority (55%) of incidents occurred in the evening period (i.e., between 6:00 PM and 11:59 PM). One-quarter (25%) of incidents occurred in the midday/afternoon period (i.e., noon to 5:59 PM). Incidents were less common overnight (7%) and in the morning period (i.e., between 6:00 AM to 11:59 AM; 13%).

Escape Incident Details

Method

In most cases, the escape method did not involve violence or property destruction. It was most common for individuals to unlawfully walk away from the site, which in some cases, included scaling the perimeter fence. Most often, the individual acted alone, although a notable subset of cases (38%) involved another individual incarcerated at the institution, most often in the form of an escape accomplice. Specifically, there were nine unique incidents, corresponding with 18 individuals, or 32% of cases, that involved more than one escapee (all such incidents involved two escapees). Of note, there appeared to be no cases in the most recent fiscal year (2020-2021) that involved more than one escapee, which represents a change from previous years. It is possible that the absence of multi-instigator escapes in 2020-2021 was tied to the restrictions and measures in place to reduce the spread of Covid-19, which could inhibit activities such as planning and coordination.

In a small number of cases, signs of more advanced planning were evident; this included accomplices on the outside (e.g., a driver of a getaway car), strategies to avoid detection (e.g., use of a staged dummy), and use of tools or other items to assist in the escape. In five cases, a vehicle was stolen to facilitate the escape. In a small number of cases, property destruction was noted, and in one case, violence against a staff member occurred.

Motivations, Planning, and Possible Contributing Factors

Reasons or motivating factors for escapes were often unknown or not recorded in documentation. Specifically, there was no known motivation in 41% of cases. In some cases, the escape appeared to be an unplanned immediate response to bad news or an upsetting situation. This could include circumstances related to one's case, such as an involuntary transfer, being found in contravention of institutional rules (e.g., discovery of contraband, substance use), negative decisions (or fear of) regarding transfers, temporary absences or release, or difficulties within the institutional population (e.g., interpersonal conflict). In other cases, family-related matters or concerns appeared to prompt the individual's decision to escape. This could include concern about a loved one, a desire to see family, or emotional turmoil caused by upsetting personal news (e.g., loss of a loved one). Escalating mental health issues and/or proximal substance use were also noted in a small number of cases.

Incidents tied to the collection of contraband appear to have become less common. In 2017-2018, 35% of cases involved a motivation tied to contraband collection. This was consistent with findings from previous years (2011-2012 to 2016-2017; McKendy & Keown, 2018), in which contraband collection was the most commonly identified motivating factor, noted in roughly one-quarter of cases. However, few incidents in subsequent years were noted to involve contraband collection (including no such incidents in 2018-2019 and 2020-2021). In the current analysis, contraband-related incidents mostly occurred at Healing Lodges, and all occurred at men's institutions.

Days at Large and Recapture Details

The median number of days at large was 2.5; less than one-third of cases exceeded three days. Individuals were most often apprehended by police (i.e., in 71% of cases). In the remaining cases (for which information was available), the apprehension was carried out by CSC staff or involved the individual turning themselves in. In two cases, the individuals who escaped remained unlawfully at large at the time of writing. Apprehension of escapees was generally non-violent (force was deemed to be used in only one incident).

Post-Incident Management

An increase in security level was prompted by the escape in all cases involving individuals

classified as minimum or medium at the time of the incident.¹ Many federal institutions are clustered sites (i.e., include minimum, medium and maximum security sections), thus some individuals remained at the same institution of escape following the incident, but were transferred to a higher security section. In 66% of cases, the individual was transferred to a different institution.

In nearly three-quarters of cases, it was noted that criminal charges had been laid in relation to the escape and/or behaviours that occurred in the context of the escape.² Most often, escapees were charged with escape or going unlawfully at large (i.e., in 70% of cases). Other charges associated with escape incidents, and behaviours while unlawfully at large, included property offences (9%), drug offences (5%), other non-violent offences (5%), and homicide³ (4%). Charges for robbery, assault, and other violent offences were noted in one case each.

Profile of Escapees

Of the 56 escapes that occurred during the four year period under analysis, 70% involved Indigenous persons, representing an increase from previous years (i.e., 2011-2012 to 2016-2017; McKendy & Keown, 2017). The percentage fluctuated during the period under analysis, with the lowest percentage in 2018-2019 (i.e., 56%) and highest percentage in 2020-2021 (82%). When it came to escapes from women's institutions, 82% of escapees were Indigenous. Overall, Indigenous persons involved in escapes were younger (mean age = 33.69, median = 30.00) compared to White individuals (mean age = 42.27, median = 45.00). Just over half (54%) of incidents involving Indigenous persons occurred at a Healing Lodge.

In terms of sentence and criminal profile information, a majority (61%) of individuals involved in escapes were serving their first federal sentence. Most commonly, individuals were serving short (i.e., less than four year) sentences (i.e., 43%), although one-quarter were serving indeterminate sentences. Individuals were typically serving time for violent offences, such as homicide related offences (36%), robbery (14%), and other violent offences (14%). Most individuals involved in

¹ This excludes two individuals who remained UAL at the time of writing and two individuals who did not return to federal custody.

² Data pertaining to criminal charges laid was limited to information available in OMS sources and Warden Situation Reports; therefore prevalence of criminal charges may be under-estimated.

³ The two individuals who were charged with a homicide-related offence were involved in the same escape incident.

escapes (88%) did not have a listed affiliation with a Security Threat Group (STG). Over half (i.e., 55%) had high static risk, a measure related to criminal history (Correctional Service Canada, 2019a).

Over three-quarters (79%) of escapees had high overall dynamic need, referring to need level in regards to correctional interventions (Correctional Service Canada, 2019a). For particular need areas, the percentage of individuals with a rating of high was 66% for substance abuse, 61% for personal emotional, 34% for attitude, 29% for associates, 21% for education/employment, 13% for marital/family, and 11% for community functioning. A majority (52%) of individuals were deemed at intake to have low reintegration potential, with 27% being rated medium. In 59% of cases, the individual involved in the escape was identified as having a mental health condition or need.

At the time of the incident, the average time served on the current sentence was 5.6 years (median = 2.2 years); however, there was considerable variation. In 20% of cases, the individual was newly admitted to federal custody, having served only six months or less. The average time served as a percentage of sentence length (for determinately-sentenced individuals only) was 41% (median = 38%); 36% had served one-quarter or less, 24% had served over one-quarter to half of their sentence, 29% had served between over a half to three-quarters, and 12% had served over three-quarters.

Many individuals were newly admitted to the institution of escape. Specifically, 61% were admitted to the institution of escape within six months of the incident; the percentage was higher for Healing Lodge escapes compared to non-Healing Lodge escapes (i.e., 75% versus 50%). This proximity may speak to certain risk and case management information not being fully incorporated into the decision process; however, it is also possible that the period of transition represents a time of increased escape risk.

Analysis of institutional histories revealed that the vast majority of individuals involved in escapes had previously held institutional employment (88%) and had completed correctional programming (86%). Individuals had, on average, 13 prior institutional charges (median = 9). A history of

escapes and escape-related behaviour was evident in many cases, consistent with findings in previous years (i.e., 2011-2012 to 2016-2017; McKendy & Keown, 2017). In over half of cases (57%), individuals had a history of escape or going unlawfully at large. A history of escape from a closed institution (e.g., federal or provincial custody) was noted in 38% of cases. In 73% of cases, the individual had a history of conditional release breaches and/or administration of justice charges.

At the time of the escape incident, the vast majority (i.e., 89%) of individuals were classified as minimum security. However, in almost half of cases (45%), the individual's security level represented an override from risk assessment results, namely the most recent Security Reclassification Scale/Security Reclassification Scale for Women (SRS or SRS-W) score, or, in the case of newly admitted or re-admitted individuals, the Custody Rating Scale (CRS). Specifically, the recommended security level in these cases was higher than the level determined by final decision-makers. The percentage of escape incidents where an override was evident increased during the period under examination, from 29% in 2017-2018, to 55% in 2020-2021.

Discussion

Analysis of escape incidents between 2017-2018 and 2020-2021 demonstrates similarities and variation in relation to prior analysis. Certain qualities of escapes were generally consistent with those identified in prior CSC research (McKendy & Keown, 2017; Johnson & Motiuk, 1992a, 1992b), namely that escape incidents are mostly non-violent, often unplanned, and motivated by an immediate stressor. Also consistent with previous findings, most incidents occurred in minimum security environments. Relative to the previous CSC study on escapes (McKendy & Keown, 2017), a somewhat higher percentage of incidents occurred in higher security settings in the present analysis, although the difference was not stark.

Some findings regarding the profiles and institutional trajectories of escapees stand out. First, many escape incidents occurred soon after the instigator arrived at the institution of escape. The occurrence of escapes in close proximity to arrival at the institution may reflect information gaps

in decision-making (i.e., failure to incorporate all relevant risk based information). This proximity may also suggest that the transition period represents a time of enhanced escape risk, calling for interventions that respond to the adjustment difficulties that may accompany changes in one's social environment (e.g., enhanced staff alertness to institutional adjustment concerns).

Second, security level overrides appear to be an increasingly common theme in cases of individuals who escape. As noted, overrides occurred when the security level determined by decision-makers was lower than that recommended by security assessment tools. Such tools are intended to inform but not dictate security level decisions, as professional judgement is an integral component of all case management decisions, including institutional placement. During the period under analysis, policy changes occurred that mandated an additional layer of approval for minimum security placements in cases where public safety risk may be higher (Correctional Service Canada, 2019b). Continued monitoring of override trends and their potential influence on escapes is warranted.

Third, consistent with prior findings (McKendy & Keown, 2017), many individuals involved in escapes had histories of escape-related behaviours, including being unlawfully at large and escapes from closed institutions. This suggests that prior escape-related behaviours, not surprisingly, may be associated with subsequent escapes from custody, although the larger association was not explored here.

Other key findings were related to the demographic profiles of escapees. Most notably, Indigenous representation in escape incidents was 70% in the current analysis, compared to 43% in the previous study (McKendy & Keown, 2017). Higher representation of escapes from women's institutions was also identified in the current analysis, i.e., 20% compared to 3% in the prior analysis. A majority of escapes involving Indigenous persons and women occurred at Healing Lodges.

Escapes from Healing Lodges represent a challenge for residents, staff, and community alike, and highlight the tensions that can emerge between institutional and public safety goals and rehabilitative and reintegration objectives, including the availability of environments that are more responsive to the needs of Indigenous persons, or those otherwise following an Indigenous Healing

Path (Correctional Service Canada, 2021). It is important to note, however, that the vast majority of Healing Lodge residents, like those in minimum security environments, do not engage in escape-related behaviours.

Conclusion

Minimum security environments serve a valuable purpose in the structured reintegration process. Such environments are used to house individuals who are deemed to present a low risk to public safety, a low escape risk, and low institutional adjustment concerns (Correctional Service of Canada, 2018). Often, cascading from a higher security level to minimum security is an important stage towards eventual release, as minimum security environments allow for conditions and opportunities marked by closer connections to the outside world, thus offering preparation for release (Correctional Service Canada, 2019b). While the vast majority of individuals in minimum security environments will not engage in escape-related behaviours, escapes from institutions can have negative repercussions not only for institutional and public safety, but confidence and trust in correctional organizations. Developing thorough understandings of escape incidents so as to identify possible pre-incident and proximal risk factors, as well as potential weak points or gaps in operations, is an integral component to maintaining accountability and transparency as a public organization.

References

- Correctional Service of Canada. (2019a). *Commissioner's Directive 705-6 Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile*. <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/705-6-cd-en.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2019b). *Security classifications*. <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/security/001003-1000-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2021). *Indigenous healing lodges*. <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/aboriginal/002003-2000-en.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2018). *Security classification and penitentiary placement*. <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/705-7-cd-eng.shtml>
- Johnston, J. C., & Motiuk, L. (1992a). *Factors related to unlawful walkaways from minimum security institutions*. Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service Canada.
- Johnston, J. C., & Motiuk, L. (1992b). *Unlawful departures from minimum security institutions: A comparative investigation*. Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service Canada.
- McKendy, L. & Keown, L.A. (2017). *Profiling escapes from federal custody 2011/2012 – 2016/2017*. Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service Canada.

Appendix A: Additional Tables

Table 3.

Temporal Information for Escapes from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.

Time Element	Fiscal Year				Total (n = 56)
	2017-2018 (n = 17)	2018-2019 (n = 16)	2019-2020 (n = 12)	2020-2021 (n = 11)	
Season					
Winter (Dec.-Feb.)	5 29.4%	2 12.5%	- -	2 18.2%	9 16.1%
Spring (March-May)	5 29.4%	6 37.5%	1 8.3%	3 27.3%	15 26.8%
Summer (June-Aug.)	2 11.8%	4 25.0%	4 33.3%	3 27.3%	13 23.2%
Fall (Sept.-Nov.)	5 29.4%	4 25.0%	7 58.3%	3 27.3%	19 33.9%
Day of Week					
Sunday	4 23.5%	3 18.8%	4 33.3%	4 36.4%	15 26.8%
Monday	3 17.6%	2 12.5%	- -	- -	5 8.9%
Tuesday	- -	1 6.3%	1 8.3%	1 9.1%	3 5.4%
Wednesday	2 11.8%	5 31.3%	4 33.3%	4 36.4%	15 26.8%
Thursday	3 17.6%	- -	- -	1 9.1%	4 7.1%
Friday	2 11.8%	2 12.5%	3 25.0%	1 9.1%	8 14.3%
Saturday	3 17.6%	3 18.8%	- -	- -	6 10.7%
Time of Day					
12:00 AM – 5:59 AM	2 11.8%	- -	- -	2 18.2%	4 7.1%
6:00 AM – 11:59 AM	2 11.8%	3 18.8%	1 8.3%	1 9.1%	7 12.5%
12:00 PM – 5:59 PM	5 29.4%	4 25.0%	3 25.0%	2 18.2%	14 25.0%
6:00 PM – 11:59 PM	8 47.1%	9 56.3%	8 66.7%	6 54.5%	31 55.4%

Table 4.

Basic Profile Information of Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.

Characteristic	Fiscal Year				Total (n = 56)
	2017-2018 (n = 17)	2018-2019 (n = 16)	2019-2020 (n = 12)	2020-2021 (n = 11)	
Gender					
Male	13 76.5%	11 68.8%	12 100.0%	9 81.8%	45 80.4%
Female	4 23.5%	5 31.3%	-	2 18.2%	11 19.6%
Ethnicity					
White	5 29.4%	7 43.8%	2 16.7%	1 9.1%	15 26.8%
Indigenous	12 70.6%	9 56.3%	9 75.0%	9 81.8%	39 69.6%
Black	-	-	1 8.3%	1 9.1%	2 3.6%
Age					
18-24	4 23.5%	2 12.5%	3 25.0%	1 9.1%	10 17.9%
25-34	8 47.1%	7 43.8%	4 33.3%	4 36.4%	23 41.1%
35-44	2 11.8%	-	2 16.7%	3 27.3%	7 12.5%
45-54	3 17.6%	4 25.0%	-	3 27.3%	10 17.9%
55+	-	3 18.8%	3 25.0%	-	6 10.7%

Table 5.

Sentence Information of Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.

Characteristic	Fiscal Year				Total (n = 56)
	2017-2018 (n = 17)	2018-2019 (n = 16)	2019-2020 (n = 12)	2020-2021 (n = 11)	
First Federal Sentence	11 64.7%	9 56.3%	8 66.7%	6 54.5%	34 60.7%
Sentence length					
4 years or less	8 47.1%	6 37.5%	4 33.3%	6 54.5%	24 42.9%
>4 years to 10 years	5 29.4%	4 25.0%	4 33.3%	2 18.2%	15 26.8%
>10 years	1 5.9%	1 6.3%	1 8.3%	-	3 5.4%
Indeterminate	3 17.6%	5 31.3%	3 25.0%	3 27.3%	14 25.0%
Index Offence (Most Serious)					
Homicide related	7 41.2%	7 43.8%	3 25.0%	3 27.3%	20 35.7%
Sexual	-	-	1 8.3%	-	1 1.8%
Assault	1 5.9%	2 12.5%	1 8.3%	2 18.2%	6 10.7%
Robbery	3 17.6%	2 12.5%	3 25.0%	-	8 14.3%
Other violent	1 5.9%	2 12.5%	1 8.3%	4 36.4%	8 14.3%
Property	2 11.8%	2 12.5%	1 8.3%	-	5 8.9%
Drug	1 5.9%	-	1 8.3%	-	2 3.6%
Other non-violent	2 11.8%	1 6.3%	1 8.3%	2 18.2%	6 10.7%

Table 6.

Sentence History and Security Placement Information of Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.

Characteristic	Fiscal Year				Total (n = 56)
	2017-2018 (n = 17)	2018-2019 (n = 16)	2019-2020 (n = 12)	2020-2021 (n = 11)	
Time Served					
6 months or less	4 23.5%	1 6.3%	3 25.0%	3 27.3%	11 19.6%
>6 months to 1 year	1 5.9%	3 18.8%	1 8.3%	- -	5 8.9%
>1 year to 2 years	3 17.6%	2 12.5%	1 8.3%	4 36.4%	10 17.9%
>2 years to 5 years	4 23.5%	5 31.3%	3 25.0%	1 9.1%	13 23.2%
>5 years	5 29.4%	5 31.3%	4 33.3%	3 27.3%	17 30.4%
Time at Institution of Escape					
6 months or less	12 70.6%	6 37.5%	7 58.3%	9 81.8%	34 60.7%
>6 months to 1 year	1 5.9%	7 43.8%	2 16.7%	- -	10 17.9%
> 1 year to 2 years	1 5.9%	1 6.3%	3 25.0%	2 18.2%	7 12.5%
>2 years to 5 years	2 11.8%	1 6.3%	- -	- -	3 5.4%
>5 years	1 5.9%	1 6.3%	- -	- -	2 3.6%
Security Level					
Minimum	15 88.2%	15 93.8%	10 83.3%	10 90.9%	50 89.3%
Medium	2 11.8%	- -	- -	1 9.1%	3 5.4%
Maximum	- -	1 6.3%	2 16.7%	- -	3 5.4%

Table 7.

Dynamic Need Information at Intake for Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.

Domain	Fiscal Year				Total (n = 56)
	2017-2018 (n = 17)	2018-2019 (n = 16)	2019-2020 (n = 12)	2020-2021 (n = 11)	
Dynamic Need Domain ^a					
Education/Employment					
High/Considerable	5 29.4%	4 25.0%	3 25.0%	- -	12 21.4%
Moderate/Some	6 35.3%	7 43.8%	6 50.0%	9 81.8%	28 50.0%
No/Low Need or Asset	6 35.3%	4 25.0%	3 25.0%	2 18.2%	15 26.8%
Not Indicated	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%
Personal/Emotional					
High/Considerable	11 64.7%	9 56.3%	9 75.0%	5 45.5%	34 60.7%
Moderate/Some	5 29.4%	4 25.0%	1 8.3%	6 54.5%	16 28.6%
No/Low Need	1 5.9%	2 12.5%	2 16.7%	- -	5 8.9%
Not Indicated	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%
Substance Abuse					
High/Considerable	13 76.5%	10 62.5%	6 50.0%	8 72.7%	37 66.1%
Moderate/Some	3 17.6%	2 12.5%	4 33.3%	1 9.1%	10 17.9%
No/Low Need	1 5.9%	3 18.8%	2 16.7%	2 18.2%	8 14.3%
Not Indicated	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%
Marital/Family					
High/Considerable	4 23.5%	2 12.5%	- -	1 9.1%	7 12.5%
Moderate/Some	4 23.5%	5 31.3%	4 33.3%	4 36.4%	17 30.4%
No/Low Need or Asset	9 52.9%	8 50.0%	8 66.7%	6 54.5%	31 55.4%
Not Indicated	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%

Domain	Fiscal Year				Total (n = 56)
	2017-2018 (n = 17)	2018-2019 (n = 16)	2019-2020 (n = 12)	2020-2021 (n = 11)	
Attitude					
High/Considerable	6 35.3%	5 31.3%	6 50.0%	2 18.2%	19 33.9%
Moderate/Some	6 35.3%	6 37.5%	1 8.3%	4 36.4%	17 30.4%
No/Low Need or Asset	5 29.4%	4 25.0%	5 41.7%	5 45.5%	19 33.9%
Not Indicated	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%
Associates					
High/Considerable	5 29.4%	6 37.5%	3 25.0%	2 18.2%	16 28.6%
Moderate/Some	8 47.1%	8 50.0%	7 58.3%	8 72.7%	31 55.4%
No/Low Need or Asset	4 23.5%	1 6.3%	2 16.7%	1 9.1%	8 14.3%
Not Indicated	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%
Community Functioning					
High/Considerable	3 17.6%	1 6.3%	- -	2 18.2%	6 10.7%
Moderate/Some	5 29.4%	9 56.3%	6 50.0%	4 36.4%	24 42.9%
No/Low Need or Asset	9 52.9%	5 31.3%	6 50.0%	5 45.5%	25 44.6%
Not Indicated	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%
Overall Level of Need					
High	15 88.2%	12 75.0%	9 75.0%	8 72.7%	44 78.6%
Medium	2 11.8%	2 12.5%	3 25.0%	3 27.3%	10 17.9%
Low	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%
Not Indicated	- -	1 6.3%	- -	- -	1 1.8%

^aRefers to the dynamic need domain level ratings at intake based on results from the Dynamic Factors Identification Analysis (DFIA) or Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis-Revised (DFIA-R).

Table 8.

Additional Intake Measures Information of Escapees from Federal Custody, 2017-2018 to 2020-2021.

Intake Measure	Fiscal Year				Total (n = 56)
	2017-2018 (n = 17)	2018-2019 (n = 16)	2019-2020 (n = 12)	2020-2021 (n = 11)	
Static Risk Level					
High	9 52.9%	8 50.0%	8 66.7%	6 54.5%	31 55.4%
Medium	5 29.4%	6 37.5%	4 33.3%	5 45.5%	20 35.7%
Low	2 11.8%	1 6.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 5.4%
Not Indicated	1 5.9%	1 6.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.6%
Accountability					
High	4 23.5%	1 6.3%	2 16.7%	2 18.2%	9 16.1%
Medium	8 47.1%	10 62.5%	4 33.3%	6 54.5%	28 50.0%
Low	2 11.8%	0 0.0%	4 33.3%	0 0.0%	6 10.7%
Not Indicated	3 17.6%	5 31.3%	2 16.7%	3 27.3%	13 23.2%
Motivation					
High	3 17.6%	4 25.0%	3 25.0%	2 18.2%	12 21.4%
Medium	13 76.5%	10 62.5%	3 25.0%	7 63.6%	33 58.9%
Low	1 5.9%	0 0.0%	4 33.3%	1 9.1%	6 10.7%
Not Indicated	0 0.0%	2 12.5%	2 16.7%	1 9.1%	5 8.9%
Reintegration Potential					
High	3 17.6%	1 6.3%	1 8.3%	2 18.2%	7 12.5%
Medium	4 23.5%	5 31.3%	3 25.0%	3 27.3%	15 26.8%
Low	10 58.8%	8 50.0%	6 50.0%	5 45.5%	29 51.8%
Not Indicated	0 0.0%	2 12.5%	2 16.7%	1 9.1%	5 8.9%