

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Quantitative Examination of Program Overrides and Community Outcomes for Women Offenders

2023 N° R-458

Cat. No.: PS83-5/R458E-PDF

ISBN: 978-0-660-44001-9

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.

**Quantitative Examination of Program Overrides and Community Outcomes for Women
Offenders**

Angela Smeth

&

Dena Derkzen

Correctional Service of Canada

2023

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to extend appreciation to everyone who were involved in the consultation process and provided report feedback from the Women Offender Sector (Karen Sorensen, Jennine Hamilton, Marie-Christine Pépin), Indigenous Initiatives Branch (Sandra Molyneux, Patricia Carvalho), and the Reintegration Programs Division (Emmanuel Rutsimbo, Mylène Duchemin, Thana Ridha, Veronique Dagenais). We would also like to thank Shanna Farrell MacDonald for her assistance in the data extraction process as well as Laura Hanby and Andrea Moser for their review and feedback on the draft report.

Executive Summary

Key words: *criminal risk index, program overrides, women offenders, community outcomes*

Effective February 5, 2018, the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) changed its policy for correctional program assignments, where program intensity levels are based on the Criminal Risk Index (CRI). The CRI is a tool used to assess static risk and guide offender intervention levels. A recent evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs prior to the implementation of the CRI (CSC, 2020) found that more than half of the women offenders who completed programming were overridden into a program as they did not initially meet the program selection criteria.

The purpose of this study was to conduct a quantitative examination of correctional program overrides and community outcomes for women offenders using the CRI as the primary program referral tool. Analyses were conducted with an admission dataset ($N = 709$; 34% Indigenous), which included all women offenders whom were admitted to federal custody between February 1, 2018 and December 31, 2019. Follow-up data was collected until December 31, 2021.

An examination of demographic characteristics indicated that the majority of women were serving shorter sentences and were convicted of drug-related offences. Based on the Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse, 82% of the women had an identified substance use issue. The majority of the study group scored low (45%) to moderate (43%) on the CRI.

Although a large proportion of program referrals aligned with CRI scores, 28% ($n = 90$) of women with a low CRI score were overridden from the engagement program to the moderate intensity program while 20% ($n = 16$) of women with a high CRI rating were overridden from the high intensity program to the moderate intensity program. Further analyses demonstrated that among women who completed the moderate intensity program ($n = 416$), 20% ($n = 81$) did not initially meet the program selection criteria for moderate intensity and received an override into the program. These results were consistent across Indigenous ancestry.

Comparisons on risk relevant indicators showed that women who received an override from no program need to moderate intensity generally scored lower on risk and need variables compared to women who initially met the program selection criteria for moderate intensity; however, both groups demonstrated elevated risk on key areas related to criminal behaviour relative to women who initially met the program selection criteria for engagement only. Women who received an override to moderate intensity had higher rates of suspensions than the engagement only group but they had lower rates of any revocations compared to women who met the criteria for moderate intensity. However, once time at risk in the community was controlled for, there were no significant differences in the likelihood of negative community outcomes between the groups.

Based on the risk relevant differences across program override status, these findings suggest that overrides to moderate intensity were warranted and appropriate. However, given the recent implementation of the CRI and limited follow-up period for the study sample, more research with expanded follow-up times is needed to replicate the findings of this study.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	vi
Introduction.....	1
Method	6
Participants.....	6
Measures	6
Analytical Approach	8
Results.....	10
Criminogenic Risk and Need Characteristics for Women Offenders	10
Program Overrides	11
Risk and Need Comparisons.....	15
Community Outcomes	19
Discussion.....	25
Limitations and Future Directions	29
Conclusions.....	30
References.....	31

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Proportion of Each Type of Program Override</i>	12
Table 2 <i>Distribution of Criminal Risk Index Scores across Override Status</i>	13
Table 3 <i>Correctional Programming Participation and Completion Information</i>	14
Table 4 <i>Risk and Need Comparisons at Intake across Override Status</i>	17
Table 5 <i>Release Characteristics and Post-Release Outcomes across Override Status</i>	22

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic, Sentence and Offence Information.....	34
Appendix B: Overview of Women Offender Correctional Programs	35
Appendix C: Program Override Criteria.....	36
Appendix D: Criminogenic Risk and Need Characteristics for Women Offenders	38
Appendix E: Risk and Need Comparisons across Program Override Status.....	40
Appendix F: Risk and Need Comparisons across Program Override Status for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Women.....	41
Appendix G: Release Characteristics and Post-Release Outcomes.....	45

Introduction

Effective February 5, 2018, the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) changed its policy for correctional program assignments, where program intensity levels are determined by the Criminal Risk Index (CRI).¹ The CRI is completed at intake in order to assess static risk and guide intervention levels (CSC, 2018; Motiuk & Vuong, 2018). Based on the Risk, Need, and Responsivity model (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990), higher risk offenders require higher intensity programming (risk principle), which should assess and target criminogenic needs linked to criminal behaviour (need principle), while maximizing the offender's ability to learn from the program (responsivity principle). CSC is mandated by the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* to address offenders' needs and assist in their successful reintegration through effective correctional programming (CCRA, c.20, 1992). Beginning in 2010, CSC initiated implementation of a comprehensive model of women offender correctional programming where women progress through a series of program components from admission (Engagement Program) through incarceration (Moderate and High Intensity Programs) to community release (Self-Management Programs;² CSC, 2018; Harris, Thompson & Derkzen, 2015; Wardrop & Pardoel, 2019).³

A recent evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs (CSC, 2020) found that more than half of the women offenders who completed programming were overridden into a program as they did not initially meet the program selection criteria.⁴ In addition, women who received an override from engagement to moderate intensity and women who initially met the program selection criteria for moderate intensity experienced comparable rates of any revocation when risk relevant differences were controlled. Based on these findings, this study aims to examine program overrides⁵ and community outcomes for women offenders using the CRI as the primary

¹ Prior to the policy change, the program selection criteria for women offenders were based on the Custody Rating Scale (CRS) and the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis, Revised (DFIA-R).

² Women offenders who complete high and/or moderate intensity correctional programs may participate in self-management programs in the institution and/or community (CSC, 2018).

³ There are two streams of correctional programs for women offenders—a general stream (WOCP) and an Indigenous stream (IWOCP). Correctional programming is offered through the Continuum of Care for non-Indigenous women and through the Circle of Care for Indigenous women (CSC, 2018).

⁴ It is important to highlight that this study used the previous program selection criteria for women (i.e., the CRS and DFIA-R).

⁵ Policy (CSC, 2018) uses the term *override* when referring to both overrides to a higher intensity program (i.e.,

program assignment tool.

Overview of the CRI

Upon intake to a federal institution, relevant criminal history factors are gathered and this information is entered into the CRI. The CRI is comprised of three sub-components, which include previous youth and adult offences as well as current offences. The items are summed to produce a total score that provides an overview of the offender's involvement with the criminal justice system (i.e., static risk), which determines program intensity levels for all offenders.

The CRI was developed from the Criminal History Record (CHR), which is a subcomponent of the Static Factor Assessment (SFA) data contained in CSC's Offender Management System. More specifically, the SFA includes a structured way to look at three areas of static risk: (a) The Criminal History Record (CHR), which examines current and previous criminal offences; (b) The Offence Severity Record (OSR), which examines the extent of harm from the offender's criminal activity; and (c) The Sex Offence History Checklist (SOHC), which evaluates the nature and extent of current and previous sex offending (if applicable). Based on previous research examining the predictive accuracy of the SFA risk rating as well as the CHR and the OSR subscales (Helmus & Forrester 2014a, 2014b), Motiuk and Vuong (2018) sought to transform the CHR into the CRI and examine the predictive validity of the tool on the entire federal population, as well as with major offence types (i.e., homicide, drug, sex and robbery offences). The sample was based on six complete fiscal years (2006/07 to 2011/12) of first releases (men = 24,978 and women = 1,497; Indigenous = 5,526) for a total of 26,475 federal cases. Post release outcome data included returns to federal custody for any offence within a 3-year follow-up period. The results of the study revealed that the CRI was predictive of release outcome across all offenders, including men, women, and Indigenous offenders, and major offence types. More specifically, among all offender sub-groups, higher CRI scores were positively associated with more re-offending.

Program Overrides

One of the primary elements within the Risk, Need, and Responsivity framework is the level and intensity of treatment services should match the risk level of the offender, where the

from moderate to high intensity) and overrides to a lower intensity (i.e., from high to moderate intensity). For the purpose of this research report, *underrides* to a lower intensity was used to ensure clarity when differentiating from overrides to a higher intensity.

most intensive intervention services should be reserved for the highest risk offenders (i.e., the risk principle; Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews et al., 1990).⁶ As such, ensuring that higher risk offenders receive the right “dosage” (i.e., longer program for higher risk offenders) is essential to see reductions in reoffending (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Bourgon & Armstrong, 2005). A fourth, but largely overlooked principle, is the professional discretion principle, which stipulates that correctional staff may override a classification level if it will not result in the most appropriate treatment (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews et al., 1990; Orton, Hogan, & Wormith, 2021); however, it should only be used sparingly and only with reasonable justifications (Andrews et al., 1990; Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2006; Orton et al., 2021). While the CRI provides a static risk rating that is used as a basis for program selection and intervention level, Parole Officers (POs) may use their professional judgment to ensure that all available information is applied in making case-specific recommendations (CSC, 2018). In these instances, the PO may use the override criteria for correctional program assignments set out in policy (CSC, 2018) and submit an override assessment that documents the rationale for an override. For example, they may request an override to a higher intensity program when there are aggravating factors that are not captured in the CRI (e.g., involvement in a security threat group). Conversely, an offender may be overridden into a lower intensity program if there are mitigating factors that warrant a reduction in program intensity level (e.g., previous participation in a main correctional program).

A recent evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs (CSC, 2020) compared women offenders who were overridden and completed a program to women who completed a program but were not overridden (i.e., they met the program selection criteria). The sample included women offenders admitted to federal custody between April 1, 2016 and March 31, 2018 when previous program selection criteria (based on CRS and DFIA-R results) were in use.⁷ Results demonstrated that of the 723 women who completed programming, 52% ($n = 373$) did

⁶ The need principle states that intervention and treatment programs should target dynamic factors linked to criminal behaviour. The responsivity principle states that services should employ cognitive behavioural therapies (general responsivity) and attend to those factors that influence their ability to successfully complete treatment (specific responsivity; Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews et al., 1990).

⁷ As noted, due to the timeframe of this study, the previous program selection criteria were used. Similarly, a formal override process (e.g., override requests reviewed by the Regional Program Manager) were introduced in the fall of 2016. As such, the previous override process, which involved recommendations to the Correctional Intervention Board, was used in the evaluation study (CSC, 2020).

not initially meet the program selection criteria and were overridden into the program.⁸ In addition, the study examined the relationship between having an override and the likelihood of a revocation for any reason, while controlling for risk relevant differences.⁹ While women who were overridden and completed programming had lower rates of any revocation compared to women who initially met the program selection criteria, when the risk relevant differences were controlled for, both groups experienced comparable rates of revocations for any reason. Based on these findings, it was recommended that CSC examine the reasons for the overrides and evaluate the community outcomes for women offenders who received an override relative to women who initially met program selection criteria.

To fulfill the first of two recommendations, a qualitative examination of the reasons of overrides for women offenders was conducted (Smeth, Derkzen, Cram & Ridha, 2021). Analyses were conducted with an admission dataset ($N = 709$; 34% Indigenous), which included all offenders whom were admitted to federal custody with a new warrant of committal during their first term between February 1, 2018 and December 31, 2019. Using the CRI as the basis of program intervention levels, results demonstrated that among women who completed moderate intensity programming ($n = 331$), 19% ($n = 64$) did not initially meet the program selection criteria for moderate intensity and were overridden into the program (i.e., from engagement only to moderate intensity). These results were fairly consistent across Indigenous ancestry. More specifically, among Indigenous women who completed moderate intensity ($n = 127$), 16% ($n = 20$) were overridden from engagement only to moderate intensity and among non-Indigenous women who completed moderate intensity ($n = 204$), 22% ($n = 44$) were overridden into the program.

File reviews of the reasons for overrides demonstrated that the rationale of program overrides was consistent with policy guidelines. For example, among women who were overridden from engagement only to moderate intensity, a large proportion were assessed as having a moderate to severe substance use problem and there was an established link between their substance use and their criminal behaviour. All women who were overridden from

⁸ This included women who completed either the Women's Offender Moderate Intensity Program (WO-MIP) or the Indigenous Women's Offender Moderate Intensity Program (IWO-MIP). This did not include women who were overridden to a lower intensity program (i.e., from high intensity to moderate intensity).

⁹ These included CRI level, motivation at intake, Indigenous ancestry, completion of a self-management program, age at release, and number of days between admission and release.

moderate to high intensity had exhibited a pattern of persistent violence. For example, they had a criminal history that included multiple instances of violence. The most frequently documented reason for an override to a lower intensity program¹⁰ was the presences of significant factors that would mitigate their risk (e.g., gaps in offending, limited history of violence). In addition, all Indigenous women who were overridden to a lower intensity program had Indigenous Social History (ISH) considerations that warranted a reduction in program intensity level. More specifically, there was a recognition that their criminal behaviour could be understood within the context of their ISH, where often times they were subjected to many levels of intergenerational trauma, loss of language, culture, and spiritual practices. Therefore, an override to a lower intensity program and the opportunity to follow a Traditional Healing path would allow them to examine their offence path in a cultural context and address their dynamic factors in a holistic manner.

Purpose of the Study

This study will involve a quantitative examination of community outcomes for women offenders who received an override relative to women who initially met program selection criteria based on the CRI. The research questions include:

1. What proportion of women received an override?
2. What proportion of women completed programming?
 - a) Among women who completed programming, what proportion were overridden compared to women who initially met the program selection criteria?
3. Are there risk relevant differences between women who received an override relative to women who initially met the program selection criteria?
4. Are there differences in release characteristics between women who received an override relative to women who initially met the program selection criteria?
5. Are there differences in community outcomes (suspensions and revocations) between women who received an override relative to women who initially met the program selection criteria?

¹⁰ This included either overrides from high intensity to moderate intensity or from moderate intensity to engagement only.

Method

Participants

The sample for this study included women offenders whom were admitted to federal custody with a new warrant of committal during their first term between February 1, 2018 and December 31, 2019 ($N = 709$; 34% Indigenous).¹¹ Follow-up data was collected until December 31, 2021. The mean age was approximately 36 years at admission ($SD = 11.1$), where non-Indigenous women were slightly older than Indigenous women (38 versus 32, respectively). The majority of the study group were admitted into the Prairie (42%, $n = 298$) or Ontario (28%, $n = 196$) regions during the study period, with Indigenous women comprising a higher proportion in the Prairie region (72%, $n = 172$) and non-Indigenous women in the Ontario region (35%, $n = 166$). More than half of the study group were serving a sentence of less than three years (55%, $n = 387$) with comparable rates between Indigenous (57%, $n = 137$) and non-Indigenous women (53%, $n = 250$). Almost half of the study group had drug related offences (42%, $n = 293$), where a greater percentage of non-Indigenous (48%, $n = 223$) women had drug related offences compared to Indigenous women (29%, $n = 70$). Refer to Table A1 in Appendix A for more detailed information regarding demographic, sentence and offence characteristics.

Measures

Data were extracted from CSC's Offender Management System (OMS), the automated system used by CSC to store decision-making and offender management data from the beginning of an offender's sentence until the sentence is complete. The CRI scores and levels were extracted, as were offender intake assessment, program assignment and completion information, and community outcomes.¹² The following sections provide more detailed descriptions of the variables included.

Risk and need variables. Criminogenic risk and need information is assessed during the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process. File information and interviews with offenders are compiled by CSC case management staff to profile their criminal risk and dynamic need areas in order to establish an individualized correctional plan (CSC, 2019). The criminogenic risk

¹¹ This is the same sample from the qualitative report examining the reasons for overrides (Smeth et al., 2021).

¹² The current study pulled updated intake information and program assignment and completion information.

information was based on the SFA, which examines criminal history and offence information. This measure yields an overall level of risk of low, medium or high static risk. Dynamic needs were measured by the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis-Revised (DFIA-R) tool, which is used for assessing dynamic factors upon admission (CSC, 2019). The purpose is to identify and prioritize criminogenic needs grouped into seven domains: employment and education, marital/family, associates, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional, and attitudes. The tool includes a rating on each of the domains (low, moderate, high, or asset/no need), as well as an overall criminogenic need rating of low, moderate, or high.

Other factors that were considered as part of the OIA process included: reintegration potential (how well the offender would be able to reintegrate to the community; low/moderate/high), presence of responsivity issues (factors that could impact participation in interventions; yes/no), engagement in the offender's Correctional Plan (offender actively working to address identified criminogenic need areas, participate in interventions, programming, etc.; yes/no), accountability (the level of involvement of the offender in their correctional plan in order to modify their problematic behaviour; low/moderate/high) and motivation (the desire or willingness to change; low/moderate/high). Lastly, the Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA) is a 261-item computerized assessment examining the scope and nature of women's substance use, with a focus on both lifetime substance use and use in the year preceding arrest. It is completed as part of women offenders' intake assessment process.

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

Program (IWO-MIP), and will subsequently be referred to the WSOP.

Women offenders whose level of risk, as measured by the CRI, did not fully reflect the correctional program need may be overridden to a higher or lower intensity program. Refer to Appendix B and C for a detailed description of Women Offender Correctional Programs and the program override criteria.

Program participation. Program completion and program non-completion were analyzed separately. Program completion indicators included successful completion (i.e., progress was made against program targets) and attended all sessions (i.e., completed the program but there was minimal or no evidence of progress against program targets). Program non-completion indicators were broken down into four categories: (a) offender related reasons (i.e., they were suspended or withdrew from the program); (b) the offender was released or transferred; (c) incomplete, where the offender was participating in a program but did not complete the assignment (e.g., physical health reasons, responsibility needs); and (d) program administrative reasons (e.g., the program was cancelled).

Release characteristics and post-release outcomes. Release characteristics and post-release outcomes for women released during the study period were examined. Release indicators included type of release (discretionary or non-discretionary release)¹³ and the security classification level of the offender at release (minimum/medium/maximum). Post-release outcomes included suspension warrants and revocation of release (i.e., offender's release is revoked and the offender returns to federal custody). The reasons for suspensions were also examined. A suspension may occur (a) when a breach of conditions has occurred, (b) to prevent a breach of conditions, or (c) to protect society (i.e., risk is considered unmanageable in the community). In addition, the specific reasons for a breach of conditions was also examined (e.g., do not consume drugs/alcohol, fail to report, increased risk of deteriorating behaviour and other reasons).

Analytical Approach

Descriptive analyses (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) were used to examine the distribution of risk and need variables, program completion, program overrides, release characteristics, and post release outcomes for the study cohort. Comparative analyses (chi-square

¹³ Discretionary release included day and full parole and non-discretionary release included statutory release.

and ANOVA) were used to examine group differences on risk and need variables, program completion, release characteristics, and community outcomes (suspensions and revocations) between: (a) Indigenous and non-Indigenous women, (b) women who met the program selection criteria for engagement only and women who received an override to moderate intensity, and (c) women who initially met the program selection criteria for moderate intensity and women who received an override to moderate intensity.¹⁴ Where analyses required the use of only one outcome measure, the first suspension or revocation of the offender's release was selected.

Cox Proportional Hazards regression analyses were performed to assess group differences in suspensions and revocation, while controlling for time at risk in the community. Survival analyses are statistical procedures used for measuring the length of time until an event occurs (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013); in this case, the time an offender remains in the community until first suspension or return to custody.¹⁵ Cox regression estimates hazard ratios, which provide an indication of the likelihood of an event.

¹⁴ As part of the WOCP continuum, women offenders must first complete lower intensity levels prior to participation in higher intensity levels. As such, the different intensity levels of programming are not mutually exclusive, which may potentially confound the results. A decision was made to exclude women who scored high on the CRI from the moderate intensity group when examining differences on risk relevant variables and community outcomes.

¹⁵ Cox regression has the advantage of incorporating variable follow-times and sample censoring. Participants are said to be censored if the study ends before an outcome of interest (e.g., suspension or revocation).

Results

The results section is divided into four parts. The first section provides an overview of the criminogenic risk and need information of the study cohort. Second, an examination of program overrides and program participation are presented. The third part examines the risk relevant differences between women who received an override relative to women who met the program selection criteria. The final section explores release characteristics and post-release outcomes for offenders under conditional release, including suspensions of release and returns to custody.

Criminogenic Risk and Need Characteristics for Women Offenders

Exploration of criminogenic risk and need information (see Table D1 in Appendix D) showed that overall, women had moderate static risk (47%) and high dynamic need (52%), with a moderate reintegration potential (56%) and moderate motivation for change (51%) at intake. At release, ratings on static, dynamic, reintegration potential and motivation were similar to those at intake. Over half (62%) were assessed as moderately accountable for their criminal actions. Almost one-quarter (24%) had identified responsivity issues and almost all of the study group (95%) were identified as engaged in their correctional plan. They were most likely to have a moderate to high need in the areas of personal/emotional orientation (78%), substance abuse (71%) and associates (68%). Based on the W-CASA results, 82% of the women had an identified substance use issue, with 62% assessed as having a moderate to severe problem. At admission, the majority of women were assessed at minimum (51%) or medium (46%) security. The majority of the study group scored low (45%) to moderate (43%) on the CRI.

Comparisons across Indigenous ancestry indicated significant differences between the two groups on risk and need factors (see Table D1 in Appendix D). For example, Indigenous women were more likely to have high static factor ratings both at intake and at release (28% for both intake and release) than non-Indigenous women (15% at intake; 16% at release).¹⁶ Indigenous women were also more likely to have higher dynamic need both at intake (76%) and release (64%) than non-Indigenous women (40% at intake; 36% for release).¹⁷ Indigenous

¹⁶ Static Factor-intake: $\chi^2(2, N = 703) = 50.62, p < .001$. Static Factor-release: $\chi^2(2, N = 703) = 45.97, p < .001$.

¹⁷ Dynamic Factor-intake: $\chi^2(2, N = 703) = 85.95, p < .001$. Dynamic Factor-release: $\chi^2(2, N = 703) = 61.57, p < .001$.

women were significantly more likely to score moderate to high need on all need domains compared to non-Indigenous women, particularly in the areas of substance abuse (92% versus 61%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 703) = 79.61, p < .001$), personal/emotional orientation (90% versus 72%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 702) = 32.68, p < .001$), and associates (85% versus 59%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 701) = 47.28, p < .001$). Lastly, Indigenous women ($M = 12.2, SD = 6.9$) had significantly higher mean CRI scores than non-Indigenous women ($M = 8.5, SD = 6.7$). However, Indigenous and non-Indigenous women were equally likely to be engaged in their correctional plan (94% versus 95%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 703) = 0.06, p = .81$, Cramer's $V = .01$).

Program Overrides

Table 1 displays the proportion of overrides between all women and Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. Among all women with a moderate CRI rating, 96% were referred to moderate intensity programming, which is consistent with program referral guidelines. Similarly, 72% with a low CRI rating were referred to the engagement program only. Among Indigenous and non-Indigenous women with a moderate CRI rating, the majority were referred to moderate intensity programming (95% vs. 96%, respectively). Although a large proportion of program referrals aligned with CRI scores, 28% of women with a low CRI score were overridden from engagement to moderate intensity while 20% of women with a high CRI rating were overridden from high to moderate intensity. Marked differences emerged when comparing Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. In particular, among Indigenous women with a low CRI rating, 38% were overridden to moderate intensity programming compared to 25% of non-Indigenous women. In contrast, 15% of Indigenous women with a high CRI rating were overridden to moderate intensity compared to 26% of non-Indigenous women.

Table 1

Proportion of Each Type of Program Override

CRI Levels ^a	Override Status	All women	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
		% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
		(n = 319)	(n = 74)	(n = 245)
<i>Low</i>	No Override	71.8 (229)	62.2 (46)	74.7 (183)
	Override to moderate	28.2 (90)	37.8 (28)	25.3 (62)
		(n = 304)	(n = 126)	(n = 178)
<i>Moderate</i>	Underride to engagement	0.7 (*)	0.8 (*)	0.6 (*)
	No override	95.7 (291)	95.2 (120)	96.1 (171)
	Override to high	3.6 (11)	4.0 (5)	3.4 (6)
		(n = 79)	(n = 40)	(n = 39)
<i>High</i>	Underride to moderate	20.3 (16)	15.0 (6)	25.6 (10)
	No override	79.7 (63)	85.0 (34)	74.4 (29)

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

Further examination of the distribution of mean CRI scores across override status (specifically among women who met the criteria for engagement only, women who received an override to moderate intensity, and women who initially met the program selection criteria for moderate intensity) showed some variability between the groups (see Table 2). For instance, the mean CRI scores for women who received an override to moderate intensity are slightly higher compared to women who met the criteria for engagement only and were not overridden but considerably lower than women who met the program selection criteria for moderate intensity. These results are consistent across Indigenous ancestry.

Table 2

Distribution of Criminal Risk Index Scores across Program Override Status

	All women	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
<i>Override Status</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Engagement only ^a	3.2 (1.8)	4.3 (1.9)	2.9 (1.6)
Override to moderate ^b	4.0 (1.9)	4.4 (2.2)	3.8 (1.8)
Moderate intensity ^c	12.9 (2.6)	12.8 (2.5)	13.0 (2.7)

Note. ^a Criminal Risk Index (CRI) scores ranged from 1-8 for each subgroup. ^b CRI scores ranged from 1-8 for all women and non-Indigenous women and from 2-8 for Indigenous women. ^c CRI scores ranged from 9-18 for each subgroup.

Program participation. Table 3 displays correctional program participation for the study cohort and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women.¹⁸ Almost all women were assigned to (97%) and completed an engagement program (98%). Among women who were assigned to moderate intensity, the vast majority completed the program (93%),¹⁹ and considerably more women successfully completed the program instead of simply attending all sessions (90% versus 3%, respectively). Indigenous and non-Indigenous women were equally likely to complete moderate intensity (94% versus 93%). Only a small proportion of the study cohort did not complete moderate intensity (7%), with comparable rates between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. The most common reason for program non-completion was that the offender was released or transferred. Among women assigned to high intensity,²⁰ a large proportion (85%) completed the program. Non-Indigenous women were more likely to complete high intensity compared to Indigenous women (92% versus 78%, respectively) and they were also more likely to successfully complete the program (76% versus 61%).

Further analyses demonstrated that among women who completed moderate intensity programming, 20% ($n = 81$) did not initially meet the program selection criteria for moderate intensity and were overridden into the program. These results were fairly consistent across Indigenous ancestry, where 16% ($n = 27$) of Indigenous and 22% ($n = 54$) of non-Indigenous women who completed moderate intensity programming were overridden into the program. In

¹⁸ Chi-square analyses were only conducted between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women; however, there were no significant differences in program participation information between the groups.

¹⁹ This included women who completed either WO-MIP/IWO-MIP.

²⁰ This included women who completed either WO-HIP/IWO-HIP.

terms of high intensity program completion, 17% ($n = 7$) of all women who did not initially meet the program selection criteria for high intensity were overridden into the program. The proportion of overrides to high intensity were the same between Indigenous and non-Indigenous (17%; less than 5 for each group).

Table 3

Correctional Programming Participation and Completion Information

Indicator	All Offenders ($N = 709$)	Indigenous ($N = 240$)	Non-Indigenous ($N = 469$)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Assigned to engagement	96.8 (686)	97.5 (234)	96.4 (452)
Completed engagement	98.3 (674)	98.3 (230)	98.2 (444)
Assigned to moderate intensity	62.9 (446)	77.1 (185)	55.7 (261)
Completed moderate intensity	93.3 (416)	93.5 (173)	93.1 (243)
<i>Successfully completed moderate</i>	89.9 (401)	90.3 (167)	89.7 (234)
<i>Attended all sessions</i>	3.4 (15)	3.2 (6)	3.4 (9)
Program non-completion - moderate	6.7 (30)	6.5 (12)	6.9 (18)
<i>Released or transferred</i>	2.9 (13)	2.7 (5)	3.1 (8)
<i>Incomplete</i>	2.0 (9)	2.2 (*)	1.9 (5)
<i>Offender related reasons</i>	1.1 (5)	1.6 (*)	1.1 (*)
<i>Administrative reasons</i>	0.4 (*)	0 (0)	0.8 (*)
Assigned to high intensity	6.8 (48)	9.6 (23)	5.3 (25)
Completed high intensity	85.4 (41)	78.3 (18)	92.0 (23)
<i>Successfully completed high</i>	68.8 (33)	60.9 (14)	76.0 (19)
<i>Attended all sessions</i>	16.7 (8)	17.4 (*)	16.0 (*)
Program non-completion - high	14.6 (7)	21.7 (5)	8.0 (*)
<i>Released or transferred</i>	4.2 (*)	8.7 (*)	0 (0)
<i>Incomplete</i>	4.2 (*)	8.7 (*)	0 (0)
<i>Offender related reasons</i>	4.2 (*)	0 (0)	8.0 (*)
<i>Administrative reasons</i>	2.1 (*)	4.3 (*)	0 (0)

Note. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

Risk and Need Comparisons

Comparisons on risk relevant variables were completed to assess differences between women who received an override relative to women who initially met the program selection criteria. More specifically, analyses were conducted between women who met the program criteria for engagement only and women who received an override from engagement to moderate intensity. Comparisons were also made between women who initially met the criteria for moderate intensity programming and women who received an override from engagement to moderate intensity. Comparisons on risk and need variables between the groups were conducted prior to and after program completion.²¹ It is important to highlight that no statistical comparisons were conducted for high intensity or for override to a lower intensity (i.e., from high to moderate intensity or from moderate to engagement only) due to low numbers.

Engagement assignments and override to moderate intensity. At intake, women who received an override to moderate intensity generally scored higher on risk and need variables compared to those women who were assigned to engagement only (refer to Table 4). For instance, a greater proportion of women who received an override to moderate intensity had high static risk compared to women who were assigned to engagement only (14% versus 3%, respectively; $\chi^2 (2, N = 319) = 54.06, p < .001$), and a greater proportion were considered to have high dynamic need at intake (50%) compared to women assigned to engagement only (14%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 319) = 47.33, p < .001$). Women who were assigned to engagement only were more likely to have a high reintegration potential (73%) and motivation (64%) than women who were overridden to moderate intensity (19% and 46%, respectively).²² Based on the W-CASA results, women who received an override to moderate intensity were more likely to be assessed as having a moderate (26%) to severe (40%) substance use issue than women who were assigned to engagement only (10% and 16%, respectively; $\chi^2 (3, N = 313) = 50.01, p < .001$). Similar pattern of results were also observed after both groups completed programming (see Appendix E, Table E1).²³

²¹ For analyses conducted prior to program completion, ratings on risk and need variables (i.e., static factor rating, dynamic factor rating, reintegration potential and motivation level) at intake were used. For analyses conducted after program completion, ratings on risk and need variables (i.e., static factor rating, dynamic factor rating, reintegration potential and motivation level) closest to release or end of the study period were used.

²² Reintegration potential-intake: $\chi^2 (1, N = 319) = 75.90, p < .001$. Motivation level-intake: $\chi^2 (1, N = 319) = 8.82, p < .01$.

²³ Women who were overridden to moderate intensity also completed the engagement program; however, they were removed from the engagement only group to ensure independence of observations.

Sub-analysis by Indigenous ancestry. Overall, the pattern and direction of results were consistent with the sample cohort when examining Indigenous and non-Indigenous women separately; however, not all differences were statistically significant. Non-Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity generally scored higher on risk and need variables at intake compared to those women who were assigned to engagement only (see Table F1 in Appendix F). For instance, a greater proportion of non-Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity had high static risk compared to non-Indigenous women who were assigned to engagement only (10% versus 3%, respectively; $\chi^2 (2, N = 245) = 35.53, p < .001$), and a greater proportion were considered to have high dynamic need at intake (36%) compared to non-Indigenous women assigned to engagement only (11%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 245) = 19.66, p < .001$). Women who were assigned to engagement only were more likely to have a high reintegration potential (80%) than women who were overridden to moderate intensity (24%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 245) = 63.51, p < .001$). Based on the W-CASA results, women who received an override to moderate intensity were more likely to be assessed as having a moderate (26%) to severe (34%) substance use issue than women who were assigned to engagement only (7% and 12%, respectively; $\chi^2 (3, N = 241) = 42.83, p < .001$). These results were in the same direction after program completion (refer to Table F2).

Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity also scored higher on risk and need variables at intake compared to Indigenous women who were assigned to engagement only; however, the majority of comparisons failed to reach statistical significance given low numbers (refer to Appendix F, Table F3). A greater proportion of Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity had high dynamic need at intake (82%) compared to women assigned to engagement only (24%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 74) = 23.76, p < .001$). Indigenous women who were assigned to engagement only were more likely to have high motivation levels (61%) than Indigenous women who were overridden to moderate intensity (29%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 74) = 7.27, p < .01$). These results were consistent after program completion (see Table F4 in Appendix F).

Table 4

Risk and Need Comparisons at Intake across Override Status

Indicator	Engagement Only (N = 229)	Override to Moderate (N = 90)	Cramer's V	Override to Moderate (N = 90)	Moderate Intensity (N = 291)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)		% (n)	% (n)	
Static Factor Rating – Intake			.41***			.31***
<i>Low</i>	76.4 (175)	33.3 (30)		33.3 (30)	8.3 (24)	
<i>Moderate</i>	20.5 (47)	52.2 (47)		52.2 (47)	73.8 (214)	
<i>High</i>	3.1 (7)	14.4 (13)		14.4 (13)	17.9 (52)	
Dynamic Factor Rating – Intake			.39***			.20***
<i>Low/moderate</i>	86.5 (198)	50.0 (45)		50.0 (45)	27.9 (81)	
<i>High</i>	13.5 (31)	50.0 (45)		50.0 (45)	72.1 (209)	
Reintegration Potential – Intake			.49***			.17**
<i>Low/moderate</i>	27.5 (63)	81.1 (73)		81.1 (73)	93.1 (270)	
<i>High</i>	72.5 (166)	18.9 (17)		18.9 (17)	6.9 (20)	
Motivation Level – Intake			.17**			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	36.2 (83)	54.4 (49)		54.4 (49)	63.8 (185)	
<i>High</i>	63.8 (146)	45.6 (41)		45.6 (41)	36.2 (105)	
Accountability Level			.13*			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	52.8 (121)	66.7 (60)		66.7 (60)	71.4 (207)	
<i>High</i>	47.2 (108)	33.3 (30)		33.3 (30)	28.6 (83)	
OSL at Admission ^a			-			-
<i>Minimum</i>	89.1 (204)	35.6 (32)		35.6 (32)	38.3 (111)	
<i>Medium</i>	10.9 (25)	61.1 (55)		61.1 (55)	58.6 (170)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	3.3 (*)		3.3 (*)	3.1 (9)	
W-CASA Severity			.40***			.19**
<i>None</i>	41.5 (93)	9.0 (8)		9.0 (8)	5.3 (15)	
<i>Low</i>	32.6 (73)	24.7 (22)		24.7 (22)	13.1 (37)	
<i>Moderate</i>	9.8 (22)	25.8 (23)		25.8 (23)	20.5 (58)	
<i>High</i>	16.1 (36)	40.4 (36)		40.4 (36)	61.1 (173)	

Note. OLS = Offender Security Level, W-CASA = Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. n.s. = not significant. ^aChi-square analyses were not conducted with expected cell counts less than five. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Moderate intensity assignments and override to moderate intensity. At intake, women who received an override to moderate intensity generally scored lower on risk and need variables compared to those women who met the selection criteria for moderate intensity (see Table 4). For instance, a greater proportion of women who were overridden to moderate intensity had lower static risk compared to women who initially met the criteria for moderate intensity (33% versus 8%, respectively; $\chi^2 (2, N = 380) = 35.49, p < .001$), and a greater proportion had lower dynamic need at intake (50%) compared to women who met the criteria for moderate intensity (28%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 380) = 15.09, p < .001$). In contrast, women who received an override to moderate intensity were more likely to have high reintegration potential (19%) than women who initially met the program selection criteria (7%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 290) = 11.24, p < .01$). Based on the W-CASA results, women who met the criteria for moderate intensity were more likely to be assessed as having a severe (61%) substance use issue than women who received an override (40%; $\chi^2 (3, N = 372) = 13.32, p < .01$). The pattern and direction of results were similar between the groups after program completion (see Appendix E, Table E1)

Sub-analysis by Indigenous ancestry. In general, the results were consistent with the overall sample for non-Indigenous women only. At intake, non-Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity generally scored lower on risk and need variables compared to non-Indigenous women who met the criteria for moderate intensity (see Appendix F, Table F1). For instance, a greater proportion of non-Indigenous women who were overridden to moderate intensity had low static risk compared to women who initially met the criteria for moderate intensity (40% versus 12%, respectively; $\chi^2 (2, N = 232) = 23.80, p < .001$), and a greater proportion were rated low/moderate dynamic need at intake (65%) compared to women who met the criteria for moderate intensity (39%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 232) = 11.52, p < .01$). Conversely, women who received an override to moderate intensity were more likely to have high reintegration potential (24%) than women who initially met the program selection criteria (9%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 232) = 8.58, p = .01$). Based on the W-CASA results, non-Indigenous women who met the criteria for moderate intensity were more likely to be assessed as having a severe (56%) substance use issue than women who received an override (34%; $\chi^2 (3, N = 231) = 10.06, p = .02$). Similar pattern of results were also observed after both groups completed programming (see Table F2 in Appendix F).

Comparisons on risk relevant variables at intake showed no significant differences

between Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity and Indigenous women who met the selection criteria for moderate (refer to Appendix F, Table F3). Overall, Indigenous women who initially met the selection criteria for moderate intensity and Indigenous women who received an override had moderate static risk (77% versus 57%, respectively) and high dynamic need (88% versus 82%), with lower motivation (71% versus 71%, respectively) and reintegration potential (97% versus 93%). The pattern and direction of results after program completion were the same for the two groups (see Table F4 in Appendix F).

Community Outcomes

Release characteristics and community outcomes for the study cohort. Release characteristics and community outcomes were first examined for the full sample and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women (see Appendix G, Table G1). In total, 90% ($n = 638$) of the study cohort were released into the community during the study period, with the majority of women released on day or full parole (82%). Non-Indigenous women were more likely to be released on day or full parole compared to Indigenous women (88% versus 69%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 638) = 33.92, p < .001$).

Results demonstrated that 29% of all women were suspended during the study period and were suspended within one year of their release. Sub-analysis by Indigenous ancestry indicated that Indigenous women were more likely to be suspended than non-Indigenous women (45% versus 21%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 638) = 38.76, p < .001$). Breaching conditions was the most common reason for suspensions (59%), with comparable rates between Indigenous (58%) and non-Indigenous women (59%; $\chi^2(1, N = 638) = 0.01, p = .91$, Cramer's $V = .01$). Although not statistically significant, a greater proportion of non-Indigenous women had a release suspension for alcohol/drug related reasons compared to Indigenous women (35% versus 24%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 181) = 2.92, p = .09$, Cramer's $V = .13$) and a greater proportion of Indigenous women had a release suspension due to a failure to report compared to non-Indigenous women (30% versus 24%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 181) = 0.89, p = .35$, Cramer's $V = .07$).

Overall, 26% of the study cohort returned to custody for any revocation (with or without a new offence) and only 3% returned because of a new offence. Indigenous women were more likely to return for any reason compared to non-Indigenous women (39% versus 21%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 638) = 23.41, p < .001$).

Release characteristics and community outcomes across program override status.

Table 5 displays the release characteristics and post-release outcomes across override status for those women who completed programming. Women who received an override to moderate intensity were less likely to be released on day or full parole compared to women who initially met the criteria for engagement only (85% versus 96%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 287) = 11.65, p < .001$). Further, women who received an override to moderate intensity were more likely to be suspended compared to women who met the criteria for engagement only (24% versus 12%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 287) = 6.20, p = .01$). Women who received an override were more likely to breach the terms of their release compared to women who met the criteria for engagement only (82% versus 52%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 42) = 4.06, p = .04$), and they were more likely to have a release suspension for alcohol/drug related reasons (63% versus 29%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 40) = 4.37, p = .04$). While a greater proportion of women who received an override returned to custody (18%) compared to women who met the criteria for engagement only (11%), this difference did not reach statistical significance; $\chi^2(1, N = 287) = 2.66, p = .10$, Cramer's $V = .10$. In order to control for time at risk, Cox Proportional Hazards regression analyses were conducted.²⁴ Results showed that once time at risk was controlled for, there was not a significant difference in the likelihood of suspensions between women who met the criteria for engagement only and women who received an override to moderate intensity, $B = 0.29, SE = 0.33$, Wald's $\chi^2(1) = .76, p = .38, e^B = 1.33$ (95% CI [0.67, 2.54]).²⁵

There were no significant differences in release type between women who met the criteria for moderate intensity and women who received an override to moderate intensity; however, slightly more women who met the criteria for moderate intensity received a statutory release (22% versus 15%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 314) = 1.33, p = .25$, Cramer's $V = .07$; see Table 5). Similarly, there were no statistically significant differences in the proportion of suspensions between the two groups, although more women who met the criteria for moderate intensity were suspended compared to women who received an override (36% versus 24%, respectively; $\chi^2(1, N = 314) = 3.81, p = .07$, Cramer's $V = .11$). Women who met the criteria for moderate intensity were more likely to return to custody (36%) compared to women who

²⁴ Analyses were restricted to suspensions as this was the only significant outcome.

²⁵ Because there were no significant differences in suspensions between the groups at the univariate level, no additional analyses were conducted (i.e., to control for the potential impact of other factors).

received an override (18%; $\chi^2(1, N = 314) = 7.86, p = .01$). In order to control for time at risk, Cox Proportional Hazards regression analyses were conducted.²⁶ Once time at risk was controlled for, there was not a significant difference in the likelihood of revocations (with or without an offence) between women who met the criteria for moderate intensity and women who received an override to moderate intensity, $B = 0.54, SE = 0.33, \text{Wald's } \chi^2(1) = 2.56, p = .11, e^B = 1.71$ (95% CI [0.89, 3.29]).²⁷

²⁶ Analyses were restricted to revocations as this was the only significant outcome.

²⁷ Because there were no significant differences in revocations across the groups at the univariate level, no additional analyses were conducted (i.e., to control for the potential impact of other factors).

Table 5

Release Characteristics and Post-Release Outcomes across Override Status

Indicator	Engagement Only (N = 215)	Override to Moderate (N = 72)	Cramer's V	Override to Moderate (N = 72)	Moderate Intensity (N = 242)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)		% (n)	% (n)	
Release type			.20**			n.s.
<i>Day/full parole</i>	96.3 (207)	84.7 (61)		84.7 (61)	78.5 (190)	
<i>Statutory release</i>	3.7 (8)	15.3 (11)		15.3 (11)	21.5 (52)	
OSL at release ^a			-			-
<i>Minimum</i>	89.8 (193)	66.7 (48)		66.7 (48)	63.2 (153)	
<i>Medium</i>	9.3 (20)	33.3 (24)		33.3 (24)	34.3 (83)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0.9 (*)	0 (0)		0 (0)	2.5 (6)	
Suspension of Release	11.6 (25)	23.6 (17)	.15*	23.6 (17)	36.0 (87)	n.s.
Days to First Suspension <i>M (SD)</i> ^{n.s}	82.1 (57.7)	97.1 (79.5)	-	97.1 (79.5)	82.3 (81.5)	-
General Reasons for Suspension						
<i>Breach Terms of Release</i>	52.0 (13)	82.4 (14)	.31*	82.4 (14)	57.5 (50)	n.s.
<i>Prevent Breach</i> ^a	16.0 (4)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)	16.1 (14)	-
<i>Protect Society</i> ^a	32.0 (8)	17.6 (*)	-	17.6 (*)	26.4 (23)	-
Specific Reasons for Suspension						
<i>Alcohol/drug Related</i>	29.2 (7)	62.5 (10)	.33*	62.5 (10)	24.1 (21)	.30**
<i>Fail to Report</i> ^a	16.7 (*)	18.8 (*)	-	18.8 (*)	32.2 (28)	-
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i> ^a	33.3 (8)	18.8 (*)	-	18.8 (*)	21.8 (19)	-
<i>Other Reasons</i> ^a	20.8 (5)	6.3 (*)	-	6.3 (*)	20.7 (18)	-
Any Return to Custody	10.7 (23)	18.1 (13)	n.s.	18.1 (13)	35.5 (86)	.16**
Any New Offence ^a	1.4 (*)	0 (0)		0 (0)	5.0 (12)	
Days to Return <i>M (SD)</i> ^{n.s}	322.9 (177.4)	324.4 (215.1)	-	324.4 (215.1)	276.0 (143.2)	-

Note. OLS= Offender Security Level. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. n.s. = not significant. ^aChi-square analyses were not conducted with expected cell counts less than five. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Sub-analysis by Indigenous ancestry. Overall, the pattern of results for non-Indigenous women were consistent with the study cohort; however, there were no significant differences in release types between non-Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity and non-Indigenous women who met the selection criteria for engagement only (see Table G2 in Appendix G). Similar to the full sample, non-Indigenous women who were overridden to moderate intensity were significantly more likely be suspended compared to women who met the criteria for engagement only (21% versus 6%, respectively; $\chi^2 (1, N = 220) = 9.06, p < .01$) and the reason for suspension was more likely a breach of the terms of their release (100% versus 55%, respectively; $\chi^2 (1, N = 21) = 6.00, p = .02$). Lastly, a greater proportion of women who received an override returned to custody (19%) compared to women who met the criteria for engagement only (8%), though this difference did not reach significance; $\chi^2 (1, N = 220) = 5.22, p = .02$.

There were no significant differences in release type between non-Indigenous women who met the criteria for moderate intensity and women who received an override (see Table G2); however, slightly more women who met the criteria for moderate intensity received a statutory release (14% versus 8%, respectively; $\chi^2 (1, N = 189) = 1.11, p = .29$, Cramer's $V = .08$). Both groups had comparable rates of suspensions (21% versus 29%, respectively; $\chi^2 (1, N = 189) = 1.24, p = .27$, Cramer's $V = .08$), although non-Indigenous women who received an override to moderate were more likely to breach the terms of their release compared to non-Indigenous women who met the selection criteria for moderate (100% versus 56%, respectively; $\chi^2 (1, N = 51) = 6.22, p = .01$) and they were more likely to have a release suspension for alcohol/drug related reasons (78% versus 37%, respectively; $\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 5.08, p = .02$). Although not statistically significant, non-Indigenous women who met the criteria for moderate intensity were more likely to return to custody (29%) compared to women who received an override (19%; $\chi^2 (1, N = 189) = 1.96, p = .16$, Cramer's $V = .10$). It is important to note that given the generally low numbers, results should be interpreted with caution.

Among Indigenous women, the results generally did not align with the full sample. For instance, there were no significant differences in release type and post release outcomes between Indigenous women who met the criteria for engagement only and Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity (refer to Table G3 in Appendix G). For instance, both

groups were equally likely to be suspended and return to custody. Again, given the low numbers, these results should be interpreted with caution.

Similarly, comparisons among Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity and Indigenous women who met the selection criteria for moderate intensity, showed no significant differences in release type and post-release outcomes (see Table G3). In particular, Indigenous women who received an override to moderate intensity were equally likely to receive a statutory release compared to women who met the selection criteria for moderate intensity (29% versus 32%, respectively). While Indigenous women who met the selection criteria for moderate intensity had a higher proportion of suspensions (46%) and returns to custody (45%) than Indigenous women who received an override (29% and 17%, respectively), these differences were not statistically significant.

Discussion

The focus of this report was to provide a quantitative examination of program overrides and community outcomes for women offenders based on recommendations put forward in the recent evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs (CSC, 2020). More specifically, program overrides and program participation were examined as were differences on risk relevant variables and community outcomes between women who received an override relative to women who initially met the program selection criteria.

Using an admission cohort, women offenders were on average thirty-six years of age and tended to be single, to be serving shorter sentences, and to have been convicted of drug-related offences. Overall, women had moderate static risk and high dynamic need both at intake and release. Comparisons across Indigenous ancestry indicated that Indigenous women had a higher proportion of moderate to high need in all dynamic need domains. These results reflect previous research that has consistently shown that compared to their non-Indigenous counterparts, Indigenous women have higher criminogenic needs assessed at intake, particularly in the areas of substance abuse and personal/emotional orientation (Farrell MacDonald, Gobeil, Biro, Ritchie, & Curno, 2015; Stewart et al., 2017; Wanamaker, 2018; Wardrop, Thompson, & Derkzen, 2018).

In general, the results demonstrated that a large proportion of correctional program referrals aligned with CRI scores. For instance, among women who scored moderate on the CRI, the vast majority (96%) were referred to moderate intensity, which is consistent with the program selection criteria. Similarly, almost three-quarters of women who scored low on the CRI were referred to engagement only. These results were comparable across Indigenous ancestry. In terms of overrides, approximately one-quarter of the study cohort who scored low on the CRI were overridden from engagement only to moderate intensity, where slightly more Indigenous women received an override compared to non-Indigenous women. In contrast, a greater proportion of non-Indigenous women were overridden from high intensity to moderate intensity compared to Indigenous women. Based on the qualitative study (Smeth et al., 2021), the most frequently documented reason for an override to a lower intensity program among Indigenous women were ISH considerations that warranted a reduction in program intensity level (e.g., loss of language, culture and spiritual practices). Among non-Indigenous women, the main reason was the presence of significant factors that would mitigate their risk (e.g., significant gaps in

reoffending).

Overall, there were more overrides to a higher intensity program than underrides to a lower intensity program. While the research base on overrides remains relatively small, these results are consistent with estimates provided in the literature, where there tends to be more overrides than underrides (Cohen, Pendergast, & VanBenschoten, 2016; Orton et al., 2021; Wormith, Hogg, & Guzzo, 2012). However, the extant literature examining overrides has primarily focused on examining overrides in the context of risk prediction and predictive accuracy rather than in the context of program intensity (i.e., the use of overrides to increase or decrease program intensity levels). Therefore, there remains a significant gap in our understanding regarding the impact of program overrides, especially among women offenders.

The majority of women completed the requisite engagement program, while over half of the study cohort completed moderate intensity programming. Importantly, among women who completed moderate intensity, a considerable proportion successfully completed the program (90%) as opposed to simply attending all session (3%). Indigenous and non-Indigenous women were equally likely to complete moderate intensity. Even though program assignment for high intensity was substantially lower than in other programs within the WOCP continuum, this is expected as women need to complete engagement and moderate intensity programming prior to participation in a high intensity program. Regardless, a large proportion of women assigned to high intensity completed the program (85%). Further, among women who completed the high intensity program, over three-quarters successfully completed the program. Encouragingly, program non-completion rates for both moderate intensity and high intensity and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women were very low. Offender related reasons (e.g., offender suspended or withdrew from the program) was one of the least common reasons for program incompleteness. Taken together, these results suggest that women were actively engaged in addressing their criminogenic needs, with a demonstrated commitment and understanding of the skills required to manage their risk factors and problematic behaviour.

While CSC's evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs (CSC, 2020) found that half of the women who completed moderate intensity programming were overridden into the program, this study showed that a smaller proportion (20%) of women who completed moderate intensity programming were overridden, with comparable rates across Indigenous ancestry. These differences are unsurprising as they are based on the previous program selection criteria

(i.e., CRS and DFIA-R). Although there is additional information clearly not captured in the CRI (demonstrated by the variability in mean scores across program override status), the use of the CRI as the primary program selection tool in conjunction with the more formal and structured program override criteria, changes to correctional program referrals (i.e., intensity levels) are being done on a more limited basis. Moreover, based on CSC's recent qualitative study examining the reasons for overrides (Smeth et al., 2021), the use of overrides were used with reasonable justification, which is in line with the professional discretion principle (e.g., Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews et al., 1990).

Exploration of risk relevant differences between women who initially met the program selection criteria (for either engagement only or moderate intensity) and women who received an override to moderate intensity illustrated some important findings. At intake, women who received an override to moderate intensity generally scored higher on risk and need variables compared to those women who were assigned to engagement only. For example, women who received an override were more likely to be assessed as having a moderate to severe substance use issue (based on the W-CASA) than women who were assigned to engagement only. Importantly, these results are consistent with the program override criteria set out in policy (CSC, 2018) and the results from the qualitative study examining the reasons for overrides (Smeth et al., 2021). Further, women who initially met the program selection criteria for moderate intensity were more likely to be assessed as having a severe substance use issue than women who received an override to moderate intensity. The direction and pattern of results were similar among Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. Substance abuse is a prevalent problem among offender populations and is a strong predictor of women's reoffending (Farrell MacDonald et al., 2015, Andrews et al., 2012; Olver, Stockdale, & Wormith, 2014). It is often interrelated with other criminogenic needs as it may draw one to antisocial individuals and exposure to antisocial attitudes (Andrews & Bonta, 2010), signalling more entrenched criminal careers and higher levels of risk. These results underscore the importance of providing interventions for women with substance use needs. Correctional programs for women address problematic behaviour linked to crime and help in targeting risk factors, such as substance use. They are designed to help participants develop prosocial skills, abilities and attitudes, which may in turn assist women to reduce the personal and interpersonal supports for substance-oriented behaviour (Andrews et al., 2006; Farrell MacDonald et al., 2015). Although women who

received an override to moderate intensity tended to score lower on risk and need indicators compared to women who met the criteria for moderate intensity, overall, they still demonstrated elevated risk on key areas related to criminal behaviour relative to the engagement only group.

The majority of the study cohort were released, with over three-quarters released on day or full parole. Non-Indigenous women were more likely to receive a discretionary release than Indigenous women. Comparisons across override status showed that women who received an override to moderate intensity and completed the program were less likely to be released on day or full parole compared to women who completed engagement only; however, the proportions for non-discretionary release (i.e., statutory release) were relatively small compared to discretionary release. On the other hand, the proportions across release types between women who received an override to moderate intensity and women who met the criteria for moderate intensity were similar. Generally, these findings indicate that women who received an override to moderate intensity have distinct release characteristics from women who completed engagement only but are more comparable with women who met the criteria for moderate intensity.

Just over one-quarter of the study cohort were suspended during the study period, with Indigenous women having higher rates of suspensions than non-Indigenous women. Alcohol/drug related suspensions were the most common reasons for suspensions for all women and for non-Indigenous women in particular. Approximately one-quarter of all women returned to custody (with or without an offence), where Indigenous women were more likely to return to custody for any reason compared to non-Indigenous women.

Women who received an override to moderate intensity were more likely to be suspended compared to women who met the criteria for engagement only and they were more likely to have a release suspension for alcohol/drug related reasons. Given that women who received an override were more likely to have an identified substance use issue and were generally a higher risk group, these results were in the expected direction. Although differences in revocations between the two groups did not reach statistical significance, the direction and pattern of the results suggest that women who received an override were more likely to return to custody than women who completed engagement only. In contrast, there were no significant differences in suspension rates between women who met the criteria for moderate intensity and women who were overridden; however, women who met the criteria for moderate intensity were significantly more likely to return to custody for any reason. It is important to highlight that once time at risk

was controlled for, there were no significant differences in the likelihood of suspensions or revocations across program override status.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study should be considered in light of some limitations. Given that programming was suspended for a period of time due the COVID-19 pandemic and more than half of all women were serving sentences of less than three years, higher risk women may not have received the programming needed prior to release. More research is needed to evaluate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on program participation and ultimately community outcomes. It is important to note that other services and interventions that women may have received (e.g., employment and education programs, social programs, visitations) were not accounted for in this study. In particular, previous research at CSC has shown that, in addition to correctional programs, participation in educational courses, community maintenance/booster sessions, and prison visitations significantly reduced rates of revocation among women offenders (Wilton & Stewart, 2015). Another limitation was the short follow-up period for the study sample. Therefore, results related to community outcomes should be interpreted with caution. Lastly, examining changes on risk relevant variables after program completion and across program override status was not the focus of this study; this study lacked the methodological rigor needed to do just that.

Based on CSC's recent qualitative report examining the reasons for overrides (Smeth et al., 2021), one of the most frequently documented reasons for an underride to a lower intensity program was the presence of significant factors that would mitigate their risk,²⁸ such as considerable gaps in reoffending. Currently, the CRI places equal weight on youth convictions and even if an offender has had an extended crime free period as an adult, they may still score higher on the CRI. Consequently, there is the potential of inflating risk levels beyond the offender's actual criminogenic risk. This may disproportionately affect Indigenous offenders as they have more extensive youth and adult criminal histories (Keown, Gobeil, Biro, & Beaudette, 2015; Farrell MacDonald, 2014). Therefore, further research and refinement of the psychometric properties of the CRI (e.g., weighting items) may be warranted.

²⁸ The overall override criteria was recently changed (November 2021; CSC, 2021) and this specific criteria was removed.

Conclusions

This study fulfills the second of two recommendations put forward in CSC's evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs (CSC, 2020). The results of this report demonstrated that once time at risk in the community was controlled for, there were no significant differences in the likelihood of negative community outcomes across program override status. Nevertheless, comparisons on risk relevant indicators showed that women who received an override to moderate intensity generally scored lower on risk and need variables compared to women who initially met the program selection criteria for moderate intensity; however, both groups demonstrated elevated risk on key areas related to criminal behaviour relative to women who initially met the program selection criteria for engagement only. This further reinforces the importance of the program override criteria and the professional discretionary principle, which ensures that all available information is applied in making case-specific recommendations. Based on the risk relevant differences across program override status, these findings suggest that overrides to moderate intensity were warranted and appropriate. However, given the recent implementation of the CRI and limited follow-up period for the study sample, more research with expanded follow-up times is needed to replicate the findings of this study.

References

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct (5th ed.)*. Cincinnati, OH, US: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Andrews, D., Bonta, J., Hoge, R., & Andrews, D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *17*(Mar 90), 19–52. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/57694140/>
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J. L., & Wormith, J. S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, *52*, 7–27. doi:10.1177/0011128705281756
- Andrews, D. A., Guzzo, L., Raynor, P., Rowe, R. C., Rettinger, L. J., Brews, A., & Wormith, J. S. (2012). Are the major risk/need factors predictive of both female and male reoffending? A test with the eight domains of the Level of Service / Case Management Inventory. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *56*, 113-133. doi. 10.1177/0306624X10395716
- Bourgon, G., & Armstrong, B. (2005). Transferring the principles of effective treatment into a “real world” prison setting. *Criminal justice and Behavior*, *32*(1), 3-25. doi. 10.1177/0093854804270618
- Cohen, T. H., Pendergast, B., & VanBenschoten, S. W. (2016). Examining overrides of risk classifications for offenders on federal supervision. *Federal Probation*, *80*(1), 12–21.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2020). *Evaluation report: Evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs*. Ottawa, ON: CSC.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2019). *Commissioner’s Directive 705-6: Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2018). *Guidelines 726-2: National Correctional Program Selection Guidelines*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2021). *Guidelines 726-3: National Correctional Program Management Guidelines*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act [CCRA]*. (1992). Retrieved from <https://laws.lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/>
- Derkzen, D., Harris, A., & Wardrop, K. (2017). *Assessment of Aboriginal Women Offender Correctional Program (AWOCP) outcomes*. (Research Report R-391. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

- Farrell MacDonald, S. (2014). *Profile of Aboriginal male federal offenders: Custody and supervision snapshots*. (Research Report R-321). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Farrell MacDonald, S., Gobeil, R., Biro, S. M., Ritchie, M. B., & Curno, J. (2015). *Women offenders, substance use, and behaviour* (Research Report R-358). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Harris, A., Thompson, J., & Derkzen D. (2015). *Assessment of Women Offender Correctional Program (WOCP) outcomes*. (Research Report R-374). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Helmus, L. and Forrester, T. (2014a). *Construct validity of the Static Factor Assessment in the Offender Intake Assessment process*. (Research Report R-309). Ottawa, Canada: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Helmus, L. and Forrester, T. (2014b). *Static Factor Assessment (SFA) in the Offender Intake Assessment process: Relationship to release and community outcomes*. (Research Report R-339). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Keown, L., Gobeil, R., Biro, S., & Beaudette, J. (2015). *Aboriginal Social History Factors in Case Management*. Research Report R-356). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Motiuk, L. L., & Vuong, B. (2018). *The Development and Validation of a Criminal Risk Index (CRI) for Federally Sentenced Offenders in Canada*. (Research Report R-403). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Olver, M. E., Stockdale, K. C., & Wormith, J. S. (2014). Thirty years of research on the Level of Service scales: A meta-analytic examination of predictive accuracy and sources of variability. *Psychological Assessment*, 26, 156-176. doi. 10.1037/a0035080
- Orton, L. C., Hogan, N. R., & Wormith, J. S. (2021). An examination of the professional override of the level of service inventory—Ontario revision. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 48(4), 421-441. doi. 10.1177/0093854820942270
- Smeth, A., Derkzen, D., Cram, S., & Ridha, T. (2021). *Qualitative Examination of Overrides for Correctional Programming for Women Offenders*. (Research Report R-440). Ottawa, ON: Correction Service of Canada.
- Stewart, L. A., Wardrop, K., Wilton, G., Thompson, J., Derkzen, D., & Motiuk, L. (2017). *Reliability and validity of the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised* (Research Report R-395). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Wanamaker, K.A. (2018). *Risk Factors Related to the Initial Classification of Women Offenders: A Literature Review*. (Research Report R-418). Ottawa, ON: Correction Service of Canada.
- Wardrop, K., & Pardoel, K. (2019). *Examining Change in Criminogenic Need Level Associated with Correctional Program Participation among Federally Sentenced Women*. (Research Report R-422). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Wardrop, K., Thompson, J., & Derkzen, D. (2018). *Minimum Security Women: A Profile*. (Research Report R-394). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Wilton, G., & Stewart, L. (2015). *The Additive effects of Women Offenders' Participation in Multiple Correctional Interventions*. (Research Report R-422). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Wormith, J.S., Hogg, S., and Guzzo, L. (2012). The predictive validity of a general risk/needs assessment inventory on sexual offender recidivism and an exploration of the professional override. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 39: 1511–1538. doi. 10.1177/0093854812455741

Appendix A: Demographic, Sentence and Offence Information

Table A1
Demographic, Sentence and Offence Information

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

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

Appendix B: Overview of Women Offender Correctional Programs

CSC is mandated by the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* to address offenders' needs and assist in their successful reintegration through effective correctional programming (CCRA, c.20, 1992). Participants must complete the lower intensity levels of programming prior to being referred to the higher intensity programs.

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

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

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

Appendix C: Program Override Criteria

The following information is pulled directly from Guidelines 726-2 (CSC, 2018) and outlines the override criteria.²⁹

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

1. The offender's affiliation with a security threat group (STG) increases the likelihood of violence;³⁰
2. The offender scores moderate to high need on the Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (W-CASA) and there is an established link between the current offence and substance abuse;
3. There is corroborated information demonstrating a pattern of violent behaviour not reflected in convictions and/or the CRI;³¹
4. The current offence caused death or serious harm to another person and/or there are risk factors present to believe, on reasonable grounds, the offender is likely to commit an offence causing death or serious harm to another person; and
5. The offender acted alone and/or the psychological risk assessment corroborates a level of risk which should be addressed through participation in a correctional program.³²

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

1. The current offence(s) included elements of gratuitous violence;³³ and

²⁹ The override criteria was recently updated in November 2021; however, the change in Guidelines 726-2 came into effect outside the study period of this report.

³⁰ This criteria is adapted for women sex offenders where it specifies that the offender's affiliation with a security threat group, particularly that involved the exploitation of minors or vulnerable persons, increases the likelihood of violence.

³¹ This criteria is adapted for women sex offenders where it specifies that there is corroborated information demonstrating a pattern of violent and/or sexual offending behaviour not reflected in convictions and/or the CRI.

³² This criteria applies to women sex offenders only.

³³ Gratuitous violence is defined as excessive violence beyond that which is "required" to meet an end; or evidence of sadistic behaviour, torture (CSC, 2018).

2. The offender has exhibited a pattern of persistent violence.³⁴

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

1. Indigenous social history (ISH) considerations, contextualizing risk, that warrants a reduction in program intensity level;³⁵
2. Poor physical health that is determined to be sufficient to significantly reduce the offender's risk of reoffending or precludes program participation at a higher intensity level (e.g., significant physical disability);
3. Previous participation in a main correctional program; and
4. The presence of significant factors, mitigating risk, that warrant a reduction in program intensity level.

³⁴ Persistent violence is defined as three or more offences listed in Schedule I, irrespective of their mode of prosecution, where each conviction leads to a custodial sentence of at least six months duration and where the offences occurred on different days (CSC, 2018). Schedule 1 offences are generally violent and/or sexual in nature and include offences such as sexual interference or robbery. Offences designated as Schedule 1 offences are subject to changes in legislation. First degree and Second degree murder or other offences carrying an automatic life sentence are not Schedule 1 offences because life sentences and eligibility for parole are handled directly in the legislation for those offences.

³⁵ ISH considerations are only applicable to Indigenous offenders.

Appendix D: Criminogenic Risk and Need Characteristics for Women Offenders³⁶

Table D1

Criminogenic Risk and Need Characteristics

Indicator	All women (<i>N</i> = 709)	Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 240)	Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 469)	Cramer's <i>V</i>
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	
Static Factor Rating – Intake				.27***
<i>Low</i>	33.1 (233)	16.3 (39)	41.9 (194)	
<i>Moderate</i>	47.2 (332)	55.4 (133)	43.0 (199)	
<i>High</i>	19.6 (138)	28.3 (68)	15.1 (70)	
Static Factor Rating – Release				.26***
<i>Low</i>	32.9 (231)	16.7 (40)	41.3 (191)	
<i>Moderate</i>	47.2 (332)	55.4 (133)	43.0 (199)	
<i>High</i>	19.9 (140)	27.9 (67)	15.8 (73)	
Dynamic Factor Rating – Intake				.35***
<i>Low</i>	15.1 (106)	3.8 (9)	21.0 (97)	
<i>Moderate</i>	32.6 (229)	20.4 (49)	38.9 (180)	
<i>High</i>	52.3 (368)	75.8 (182)	40.2 (186)	
Dynamic Factor Rating – Release				.30***
<i>Low</i>	15.9 (112)	4.2 (10)	22.0 (102)	
<i>Moderate</i>	38.4 (270)	32.1 (77)	41.7 (193)	
<i>High</i>	45.7 (321)	63.7 (153)	36.3 (168)	
Reintegration Potential – Intake				.30***
<i>Low</i>	14.5 (102)	22.1 (53)	10.6 (49)	
<i>Moderate</i>	56.2 (395)	66.7 (160)	50.8 (235)	
<i>High</i>	29.3 (206)	11.3 (27)	38.7 (179)	
Reintegration Potential – Release				.30***
<i>Low</i>	10.8 (76)	15.4 (37)	8.4 (39)	
<i>Moderate</i>	58.2 (409)	72.5 (174)	50.8 (235)	
<i>High</i>	31.0 (218)	12.1 (29)	40.8 (189)	
Motivation Level – Intake				.17***
<i>Low</i>	3.6 (25)	4.6 (11)	3.0 (14)	
<i>Moderate</i>	51.4 (361)	61.7 (148)	46.0 (213)	
<i>High</i>	45.1 (317)	33.8 (81)	51.0 (236)	
Motivation Level – Release				n.s.
<i>Low</i>	4.0 (28)	4.6 (11)	3.7 (17)	

³⁶ Chi-square analyses were only conducted between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women. The distribution of the risk and need indicators for the full sample were included in the table for descriptive purposes only.

Table D1 (continued)

Indicator	All women (<i>N</i> = 709)	Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 240)	Non-Indigenous (<i>N</i> = 469)	Cramer's <i>V</i>
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	
<i>Moderate</i>	39.1 (275)	40.4 (97)	38.4 (178)	
<i>High</i>	56.9 (400)	55.0 (132)	57.9 (268)	
Accountability Level				.12**
<i>Low</i>	4.0 (28)	3.3 (8)	4.3 (20)	
<i>Moderate</i>	62.2 (437)	70.0 (168)	58.1 (269)	
<i>High</i>	33.9 (238)	26.7 (64)	37.6 (174)	
Responsivity Issues	24.2 (170)	29.2 (70)	21.6 (100)	.08*
Engaged in Correctional Plan	94.5 (664)	94.4 (226)	94.6 (438)	n.s.
DFIA-R Need Domains – Moderate to High Need				
<i>Associates</i>	67.8 (475)	84.6 (203)	59.0 (272)	.26***
<i>Attitudes</i>	49.1 (344)	55.8 (134)	45.6 (210)	.10*
<i>Community Functioning</i>	44.1 (309)	66.9 (160)	32.3 (149)	.33***
<i>Employment/Education</i>	52.5 (368)	72.0 (172)	42.4 (196)	.28***
<i>Marital/Family Relations</i>	56.7 (397)	82.0 (196)	43.6 (201)	.37***
<i>Personal/Emotional</i>	77.9 (547)	90.4 (216)	71.5 (331)	.22***
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	70.8 (498)	91.9 (205)	60.5 (254)	.34***
OSL at Admission				.29***
<i>Minimum</i>	50.8 (357)	30.8 (74)	61.1 (283)	
<i>Medium</i>	45.5 (320)	62.5 (150)	36.7 (170)	
<i>Maximum</i>	3.7 (26)	6.7 (16)	2.2 (10)	
W-CASA Severity				.32***
<i>None</i>	17.6 (121)	3.9 (9)	24.5 (112)	
<i>Low</i>	20.7 (142)	13.6 (31)	24.2 (111)	
<i>Moderate</i>	17.6 (121)	21.9 (50)	15.5 (71)	
<i>High</i>	44.0 (302)	60.5 (138)	35.8 (164)	
Criminal Risk Index (CRI) Level				.23***
<i>Low</i>	45.0 (319)	30.8 (74)	52.2 (245)	
<i>Moderate</i>	42.9 (304)	52.5 (126)	38.0 (178)	
<i>High</i>	11.1 (79)	16.7 (40)	8.3 (39)	
<i>No Rating</i>	1.0 (7)	0 (0)	1.5 (7)	
Average CRI score <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) ^a	9.8 (7.0)	12.2 (6.9)	8.5 (6.7)	

Note. OSL = Offender Security Level. W-CASA = Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse. M = mean. SD = standard deviation. n.s. = not significant. Cell counts may not add up to column totals due to missing values.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. ^a $F(1,700) = 45.9$

Appendix E: Risk and Need Comparisons across Program Override Status

Table E1

Risk and Need Comparisons at Release across Program Override Status

Indicator	Engagement Only (<i>N</i> = 222)	Override to Moderate (<i>N</i> = 81)	Cramer's <i>V</i>	Override to Moderate (<i>N</i> = 81)	Moderate Intensity (<i>N</i> = 262)	Cramer's <i>V</i>
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)		% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	
Static Factor Rating –Release			.41***			.31***
<i>Low</i>	76.6 (170)	32.1 (26)		32.1 (26)	7.6 (20)	
<i>Moderate</i>	20.3 (45)	55.6 (45)		55.6 (45)	74.4 (195)	
<i>High</i>	3.2 (7)	12.3 (10)		12.3 (10)	17.9 (47)	
Dynamic Factor Rating – Release			.31***			.19***
<i>Low/moderate</i>	88.3 (196)	60.5 (49)		60.5 (49)	38.2 (100)	
<i>High</i>	11.7 (26)	39.5 (32)		39.5 (32)	61.8 (162)	
Reintegration Potential – Release			.44***			.21***
<i>Low/moderate</i>	26.6 (59)	75.3 (61)		75.3 (61)	91.6 (240)	
<i>High</i>	73.4 (163)	24.7 (20)		24.7 (20)	8.4 (22)	
Motivation Level – Release			n.s.			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	31.1 (69)	38.3 (31)		38.3 (31)	42.4 (111)	
<i>High</i>	68.9 (153)	61.7 (50)		61.7 (50)	57.6 (151)	

Note. n.s. = not significant. ****p* < .001.

Appendix F: Risk and Need Comparisons across Program Override Status for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Women

Table F1

Risk and Need Comparisons at Intake across Program Override Status for Non-Indigenous Women

Indicator	Engagement Only (N = 183)	Override to Moderate (N = 62)	Cramer's V	Override to Moderate (N = 62)	Moderate Intensity (N = 170)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)		% (n)	% (n)	
Static Factor Rating – Intake			.38***			.32***
<i>Low</i>	80.3 (147)	40.3 (25)		40.3 (25)	11.8 (20)	
<i>Moderate</i>	16.9 (31)	50.0 (31)		50.0 (31)	71.8 (122)	
<i>High</i>	2.7 (5)	9.7 (50)		9.7 (50)	16.5 (28)	
Dynamic Factor Rating – Intake			.28***			.22**
<i>Low/moderate</i>	89.1 (163)	64.5 (40)		64.5 (40)	39.4 (67)	
<i>High</i>	10.9 (20)	35.5 (22)		35.5 (22)	60.6 (103)	
Reintegration Potential – Intake			.51***			.17**
<i>Low/moderate</i>	20.2 (37)	75.8 (47)		75.8 (47)	90.6 (154)	
<i>High</i>	79.8 (146)	24.2 (15)		24.2 (15)	9.4 (16)	
Motivation Level – Intake			n.s.			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	35.5 (65)	46.8 (29)		46.8 (29)	58.8 (100)	
<i>High</i>	64.5 (118)	53.2 (33)		53.2 (33)	41.2 (70)	
Accountability Level			n.s.			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	54.1 (99)	64.5 (40)		64.5 (40)	65.9 (112)	
<i>High</i>	45.9 (84)	35.5 (22)		35.5 (22)	34.1 (58)	
OSL at Admission ^a			-			-
<i>Minimum</i>	90.7 (166)	41.9 (26)		41.9 (26)	50.6 (86)	
<i>Medium</i>	9.3 (17)	54.8 (34)		54.8 (34)	47.6 (81)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	3.2 (*)		3.2 (*)	1.8 (3)	
W-CASA Severity			.42***			.21*
<i>None</i>	48.0 (86)	11.3 (7)		11.3 (7)	8.9 (15)	
<i>Low</i>	33.0 (59)	29.0 (18)		29.0 (18)	14.8 (25)	
<i>Moderate</i>	6.7 (12)	25.8 (16)		25.8 (16)	20.7 (35)	
<i>High</i>	12.3 (22)	33.9 (21)		33.9 (21)	55.6 (94)	

Note. OLS = Offender Security Level. W-CASA = Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. n.s. = not significant. ^aChi-square analyses were not conducted with expected cell counts less than five. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table F2

Risk and Need Comparisons at Release across Program Override Status for Non-Indigenous Women

Indicator	Engagement Only (N = 178)	Override to Moderate (N = 54)	Cramer's V	Override to Moderate (N = 54)	Moderate Intensity (N = 150)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)		% (n)	% (n)	
Static Factor Rating –Release			.41***			.31***
<i>Low</i>	80.3 (143)	37.0 (20)		37.0 (20)	11.3 (17)	
<i>Moderate</i>	16.9 (30)	53.7 (29)		53.7 (29)	72.7 (109)	
<i>High</i>	2.8 (5)	9.3 (5)		9.3 (5)	16.0 (24)	
Dynamic Factor Rating – Release			.31***			.19***
<i>Low/moderate</i>	90.4 (161)	68.5 (37)		68.5 (37)	46.7 (70)	
<i>High</i>	9.6 (17)	31.5 (17)		31.5 (17)	53.3 (162)	
Reintegration Potential – Release			.44***			.21***
<i>Low/moderate</i>	19.1 (34)	66.7 (36)		66.7 (36)	88.0 (132)	
<i>High</i>	80.9 (144)	33.3 (18)		33.3 (18)	12.0 (18)	
Motivation Level – Release			n.s.			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	30.3 (54)	35.2 (19)		35.2 (19)	42.7 (64)	
<i>High</i>	69.7 (124)	64.8 (35)		64.8 (35)	57.3 (86)	

Note. n.s. = not significant. *** $p < .001$.

Table F3

Risk and Need Comparisons at Intake across Program Override Status for Indigenous Women

Indicator	Engagement Only (N = 46)	Override to Moderate (N = 28)	Cramer's V	Override to Moderate (N = 28)	Moderate Intensity (N = 120)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)		% (n)	% (n)	
Static Factor Rating – Intake			-			-
<i>Low</i>	60.9 (28)	17.9 (5)		17.9 (5)	3.3 (*)	
<i>Moderate</i>	34.8 (16)	57.1 (16)		57.1 (16)	76.7 (92)	
<i>High</i>	4.3 (*)	25.0 (7)		25.0 (7)	20.0 (24)	
Dynamic Factor Rating – Intake			.57***			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	76.1 (35)	17.9 (5)		17.9 (5)	11.7 (14)	
<i>High</i>	23.9 (11)	82.1 (23)		82.1 (23)	88.3 (106)	
Reintegration Potential – Intake						
<i>Low/moderate</i>	56.5 (26)	92.9 (26)		92.9 (26)	96.7 (116)	
<i>High</i>	43.5 (20)	7.1 (*)		7.1 (*)	3.3 (*)	
Motivation Level – Intake			.31**			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	39.1 (18)	71.4 (20)		71.4 (20)	70.8 (85)	
<i>High</i>	60.9 (28)	28.6 (8)		28.6 (8)	29.2 (35)	
Accountability Level			n.s.			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	47.8 (22)	71.4 (20)		71.4 (20)	79.2 (95)	
<i>High</i>	52.2 (24)	28.6 (8)		28.6 (8)	20.8 (25)	
OSL at Admission ^a			-			-
<i>Minimum</i>	82.6 (38)	21.4 (6)		21.4 (6)	20.8 (25)	
<i>Medium</i>	17.4 (8)	75.0 (21)		75.0 (21)	74.2 (89)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0 (0)	3.6 (*)		3.6 (*)	5.0 (6)	
W-CASA Severity			-			-
<i>None</i>	48.0 (86)	11.3 (7)		3.7 (1)	0 (0)	
<i>Low</i>	33.0 (59)	29.0 (18)		14.8 (*)	10.5 (12)	
<i>Moderate</i>	6.7 (12)	25.8 (16)		25.9 (7)	20.2 (23)	
<i>High</i>	12.3 (22)	33.9 (21)		55.6 (15)	69.3 (79)	

Note. OLS = Offender Security Level. W-CASA = Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. n.s. = not significant. ^aChi-square analyses were not conducted with expected cell counts less than five. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table F4

Risk and Need Comparisons at Release across Program Override Status for Indigenous Women

Indicator	Engagement Only (N = 44)	Override to Moderate (N = 27)	Cramer's V	Override to Moderate (N = 27	Moderate Intensity (N = 112)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)		% (n)	% (n)	
Static Factor Rating –Release ^a			-			-
<i>Low</i>	61.4 (27)	22.2 (6)		22.2 (6)	2.7 (*)	
<i>Moderate</i>	34.1 (15)	59.3 (16)		59.3 (16)	76.8 (86)	
<i>High</i>	4.5 (*)	18.5 (5)		18.5 (5)	20.5 (23)	
Dynamic Factor Rating – Release			.36**			.n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	79.5 (35)	44.4 (12)		44.4 (12)	26.8 (30)	
<i>High</i>	20.5 (9)	55.6 (15)		55.6 (15)	73.2 (82)	
Reintegration Potential – Release ^a			-			-
<i>Low/moderate</i>	56.8 (25)	92.6 (25)		92.6 (25)	96.4 (108)	
<i>High</i>	43.2 (19)	7.4 (*)		7.4 (*)	3.6 (*)	
Motivation Level – Release			n.s.			n.s.
<i>Low/moderate</i>	34.1 (15)	44.4 (12)		44.4 (12)	42.0 (47)	
<i>High</i>	65.9 (29)	55.6 (15)		55.6 (15)	58.0 (65)	

Note. n.s. = not significant. ^aChi-square analyses were not conducted with cell counts less than five. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed. ** $p < .01$.

Appendix G: Release Characteristics and Post-Release Outcomes

Table G1

Release Characteristics and Post-Release Outcomes

Indicators	All Women (N = 638)	Indigenous (N = 208)	Non-Indigenous (N = 430)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
Release type				.23***
<i>Day/full parole</i>	82.0 (523)	69.2 (144)	88.1 (379)	
<i>Statutory release</i>	18.0 (115)	30.8 (64)	11.9 (51)	
OSL at release				.12*
<i>Minimum</i>	69.1 (441)	61.5 (128)	72.8 (313)	
<i>Medium</i>	27.9 (178)	34.1 (71)	24.9 (107)	
<i>Maximum</i>	3.0 (19)	4.3 (9)	2.3 (10)	
Suspension of Release	28.7 (183)	44.7 (93)	20.9 (90)	.25***
Days to First Suspension <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) ^{n.s.}	80.9 (71.6)	72. (65.6)	89.2 (76.8)	
General Reasons for Suspension				
<i>Breach Terms of Release</i>	58.5 (107)	58.1 (54)	58.9 (53)	n.s.
<i>Prevent Breach</i>	11.5 (21)	15.1 (14)	7.8 (7)	n.s.
<i>Protect Society</i>	30.1 (55)	26.9 (25)	33.3 (30)	n.s.
Specific Reasons for Suspension				
<i>Alcohol/drug Related</i>	29.3 (53)	23.7 (22)	35.2 (31)	n.s.
<i>Fail to Report</i>	27.1 (49)	30.1 (28)	23.9 (21)	n.s.
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i>	25.4 (46)	25.8 (24)	25.0 (22)	n.s.
<i>Other Reasons</i>	17.7 (32)	19.4 (18)	15.9 (14)	n.s.
Any Return to Custody	26.3 (168)	38.5 (80)	20.5 (88)	.19***
Any New Offence	3.3 (21)	5.3 (11)	2.3 (10)	n.s.
Days to Return <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) ^{n.s.}	273.9 (71.6)	256.5 (149.2)	289.7 (160.6)	

Note. OLS= Offender Security Level. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. n.s. = not significant.

* $p < .05$ *** $p < .001$.

Table G2

Release Characteristics and Post-Release Outcomes across Program Override Status for non-Indigenous Women

Indicator	Engagement Only (N = 172)	Override to Moderate (N = 48)	Cramer's V	Override to Moderate (N = 48)	Moderate Intensity (N = 141)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)		% (n)	% (n)	
Release type ^a			-			-
<i>Day/full parole</i>	97.1 (167)	91.7 (44)		91.7 (44)	85.8 (121)	
<i>Statutory release</i>	2.9 (5)	8.3 (*)		8.3 (*)	14.2 (20)	
OSL at release ^a			-			-
<i>Minimum</i>	90.7 (156)	66.7 (32)		66.7 (32)	68.8 (97)	
<i>Medium</i>	8.7 (15)	33.3 (16)		33.3 (16)	19.1 (41)	
<i>Maximum</i>	0.6 (*)	0 (0)		0 (0)	2.1 (*)	
Suspension of Release	6.4 (11)	20.8 (10)	.20*	20.8 (10)	29.1 (41)	n.s.
Days to First Suspension <i>M (SD)</i> ^{n.s}	76.8 (58.1)	112.5 (89.6)	-	112.5 (89.6)	89.6 (89.5)	-
General Reasons for Suspension						
<i>Breach Terms of Release</i>	54.5 (6)	100 (10)	.53*	100 (10)	58.5 (24)	.35*
<i>Prevent Breach</i> ^a	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)	14.6 (6)	-
<i>Protect Society</i> ^a	45.5 (5)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)	26.8 (11)	-
Specific Reasons for Suspension						
<i>Alcohol/drug Related</i>	30.0 (*)	77.8 (7)	-	77.8 (7)	36.6 (15)	.32*
<i>Fail to Report</i> ^a	20.0 (*)	11.1 (*)	-	11.1 (*)	24.4 (10)	-
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i> ^a	30.0 (*)	11.1 (*)	-	11.1 (*)	19.5 (8)	-
<i>Other Reasons</i> ^a	20.0 (*)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)	19.5 (8)	-
Any Return to Custody	7.6 (13)	18.8 (9)	.15*	18.8 (9)	29.1 (41)	n.s.
Any New Offence ^a	1.2 (*)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)	5.0 (7)	-
Days to Return <i>M (SD)</i> ^{n.s}	352.2 (197.9)	334.8 (217.4)	-	334.8 (217.4)	296.6 (142.4)	-

Note. OLS= Offender Security Level. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. n.s. = not significant. ^aChi-square analyses were not conducted with expected cell counts less than five. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

**p* < .05

Table G3

Release Characteristics and Post-Release Outcomes across Program Override Status for Indigenous Women

Indicator	Engagement Only (N = 43)	Override to Moderate (N = 24)	Cramer's V	Override to Moderate (N = 24)	Moderate Intensity (N = 101)	Cramer's V
	% (n)	% (n)		% (n)	% (n)	
Release type ^a			-			n.s.
<i>Day/full parole</i>	93.0 (40)	70.8 (17)		70.8 (17)	68.3 (69)	
<i>Statutory release</i>	31.7 (*)	29.2 (7)		29.2 (7)	31.7 (32)	
OSL at release ^a			-			-
<i>Minimum</i>	86.0 (37)	66.7 (16)		66.7 (16)	55.4 (56)	
<i>Medium</i>	11.6 (5)	33.3 (8)		33.3 (8)	41.6 (42)	
<i>Maximum</i>	2.3 (*)	0 (0)		0 (0)	3.0 (*)	
Suspension of Release	32.6 (14)	29.2 (7)	n.s.	29.2 (7)	45.5 (46)	n.s.
Days to First Suspension <i>M (SD)</i> ^{n.s}	86.3 (59.3)	75.0 (61.9)	-	75.0 (61.9)	75.7 (74.1)	-
General Reasons for Suspension						
<i>Breach Terms of Release</i>	50.0 (7)	57.1 (*)	-	57.1 (*)	56.5 (26)	-
<i>Prevent Breach</i> ^a	28.6 (*)	0 (0)	-	0 (0)	17.4 (8)	-
<i>Protect Society</i> ^a	21.4 (*)	42.9 (*)	-	42.9 (*)	26.1 (12)	-
Specific Reasons for Suspension						
<i>Alcohol/drug Related</i>	28.6 (*)	42.9 (*)	-	42.9 (*)	13.0 (6)	-
<i>Fail to Report</i> ^a	14.3 (*)	28.6 (*)	-	28.6 (*)	39.1 (18)	-
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i> ^a	35.7 (*)	28.6 (*)	-	28.6 (*)	23.9 (11)	-
<i>Other Reasons</i> ^a	21.4 (*)	14.3 (*)	-	14.3 (*)	19.6 (9)	-
Any Return to Custody	23.3 (10)	16.7 (*)	-	16.7 (*)	44.6 (45)	-
Any New Offence ^a	2.3 (*)	0 (0)		0 (0)	5.0 (5)	
Days to Return <i>M (SD)</i> ^{n.s}	284.8 (147.9)	301.0 (240.8)	-	301.0 (240.8)	257.2 (143.0)	-

Note. OLS= Offender Security Level. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. n.s. = not significant. ^aChi-square analyses were not conducted with expected cell counts less than five. *Cell counts with less than five were suppressed.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.