

# CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



## RESEARCH REPORT

### Revocations Related to Substance Use among Federally Sentenced Men with Substance Use Needs: Comparing Correctional Program Participants and Eligible non-Participants

**2023 N° R-466**

ISBN: 978-0-660-67735-4

Cat. No.: PS83-3/466E-PDF

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

**Revocations Related to Substance Use among Federally Sentenced Men with Substance Use  
Needs: Comparing Correctional Program Participants and Eligible non-Participants**

Geoff Wilton

Kayla Wanamaker

Sara Johnson

Daniella Filoso

&

Wardah Mahboob

Correctional Service of Canada

2023



## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to Andrea Moser and LA Keown for your input into the methods of this study and helpful reviews of early drafts of the report. Thanks also to all the personnel who participated in consultations on the methods of this report – Jason Dunn and Krishna Tiwari from the Evaluation Division, Emmanuel Rutsimbo, Katherine Belhumeur, Mylene Duchemin, Meagan Smith, Jessica Kamps, Thana Ridha, Julie Desjardins, Michel Woodworth, Téa Kulenovic, Marci Beitner, and Veronique Dagenais from Offender Programs and Reintegration, and Marty Maltby from Indigenous Initiatives.



## Executive Summary

**Key words:** *revocation, unlawfully at large, conditional release, substance use, drug use, community supervision.*

This research project examined how substance use was related to post-release revocations with and without an offence among participants in Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) Integrated Correctional Program Model (ICPM) and eligible non-participants. A random sample of men offenders with a substance use need whose community supervision was revoked were selected for file coding, wherein the role of substance use in these revocations was examined. For the current study, outcomes related to substance use include: (1) revocations where substance use related conditions were breached, (2) revocations where substance use related factors – other than the specific substance use related breached conditions – were considered in the decision, and (3) revocations with an offence that related to substance use.

File coding was completed for 485 cases – 428 revocation without an offence and 57 revocation with an offence cases. Intake assessments for these offenders indicated substantial drug and alcohol use needs related to their criminal behavior. This level of substance abuse was reflected in the conditions of their community supervision. Conditions to not consume drugs and not to consume alcohol were applied in 97% and 93% of cases, respectively.

Among the 428 cases of revocations without an offence that were coded, 89% had a breach of one or more conditions and the majority of these cases (86%) were due to a breached substance use condition. Revocations due to breaches of non-substance use conditions were less common (45%). Among offenders with a condition to not consume drugs, 66% breached the condition. Non-Indigenous program participants were significantly more likely to breach the condition than non-Indigenous eligible non-participants. Offenders with the condition to not consume alcohol breached this condition in nearly 22% of cases. Breaches of applied conditions of respect curfew (32%) and reside at place (31%) were the next most likely to be breached. In addition to breaches of conditions, substance use was often recorded as a concern contributing to the decision to revoke (22%).

Among 57 coded cases with a revocation with one or more offences, 25% had substance use related offence, most frequently for drug possession. Additionally, in 23% of cases, the offence was committed while intoxicated, and in 11% of cases, substance use appeared to be a motivation for the offence, such as going UAL to avoid a positive urinalysis test result and robbery to acquire drugs. In almost half (46%) of cases of revocations with an offence, substance use was raised as a concern.

Substance use was an important contributing factor to offenders' revocations with or without offence in a sample of offenders with moderate or high substance use needs. A variety of case management tools may help offenders comply with their special conditions. Community-based correctional intervention, electronic monitoring, opioid agonist treatment, community residential facilities and resources that offer substance use counselling may assist offenders in preventing substance use and the potential resulting harmful effects while under community supervision.



## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary .....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables .....	v
List of Appendices .....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Method .....	9
Participants.....	9
Procedure .....	10
Measures/Material .....	10
Results.....	12
Profile of Coded Cases .....	12
Coding Results of Revocation without an Offence Cases .....	13
Coding Results of Revocation with an Offence Cases .....	29
Discussion.....	31
Limitations .....	34
Conclusions.....	36
References.....	37





## List of Tables

Table 1	<i>Release Conditions Imposed upon Offenders with Revocations without an Offence</i> .....	15
Table 2	<i>Proportions of offenders with revocations without an offence who breached the condition among those with the condition assigned</i> .....	20
Table 3	<i>Associations between Community Maintenance Program Participation and Breaches of Conditions</i> .....	26
Table 4	<i>Associations between Community Program Participation and Breaches of Conditions</i>	28



## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A: Cohort of Offenders Eligible for inclusion in the study.....	40
Appendix B: Coding Manual of Substance-Use Related Outcomes on Community Supervision	45
Appendix C: Profile of Coded Cases .....	50



## Introduction

Offenders arrive at Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) correctional institutions with a variety of factors that contribute to their criminal behaviour. CSC aims to prepare these individuals for release into the community by providing correctional interventions that address their criminogenic needs. Criminogenic needs are defined as dynamic risk factors that are associated with an offender's criminal behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 2006). Unlike static risk factors, dynamic risk factors can change through time, which is why they are the primary focus of attention in an offender's correctional programming. Static risk, dynamic risk (also referred to as criminogenic need) and responsivity<sup>1</sup> are components of the Risk-Need-Responsivity principles first described in 1990 by Andrews, Bonta and Hoge. Since then, research has established that one of the "Central Eight" risk/need factors of criminal behaviour is a history of substance use (CSC, 2021a; Andrews & Bonta, 2006; Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2006). Accordingly, substance use is often a priority for treatment among offenders who have been identified as having a substance use need. The link between substance use and criminal behaviour was also demonstrated in a recent study, which found that over 40% of crimes committed by offenders admitted to Canadian federal institutions (excluding impaired driving or violations of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act) are associated with substance use (Canadian Substance Use Costs and Harms Scientific Working Group, 2018).

The CSC prepares offenders for release into the community by assessing their risk and criminogenic needs and developing an individualized Correctional Plan<sup>2</sup>. (See CSC, 2019.) If an offender's risk is high enough (a Criminal Risk Index (CRI)) score of 8 or greater, or a rating of Low Moderate or greater) they will be referred to participate in the appropriate intensity of correctional interventions (moderate or high intensity) to address their criminogenic need areas (CSC, 2021b)<sup>3</sup>. To assess criminogenic needs, CSC uses the Dynamic Factors Identification

---

<sup>1</sup> Responsivity principle indicates that the style and mode of intervention should be matched to the offender's learning style and abilities (Andrews, Bonta & Hoge, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> See Commissioner's Directive 705-6: Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile (CSC, 2019) for more information.

<sup>3</sup> See the National Program Referral Guidelines (Guidelines 726-2; CSC, 2021b) for more information.

Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R), a structured professional judgement measure completed as part of the Offender Intake Assessment which is completed upon offenders’ arrival at a CSC institution. (See Commissioner’s Directive 705-6; CSC, 2019). The DFIA-R includes seven domains – Employment and Education, Marital and Family, Associates, Substance Abuse, Community Functioning, Personal and Emotional, and Attitude. Whether an offender has a criminogenic need for substance use is determined by their rating on the Substance Use Domain.

When offenders are conditionally released from federal institutions, they must follow certain conditions and are supervised by Parole Officers. If an offender breaches the conditions of their release, CSC takes action to assess the offender and normally this would result in a suspension. Suspension means that an offender is temporarily removed from the community until a decision is made to revoke release or cancel the suspension. Reasons for suspensions include: breach of condition, to prevent a breach of conditions, to protect society, the offender receives another sentence, an offender’s risk is assessed as unmanageable in the community. Following a suspension, a post-suspension interview will occur between the Parole Officer and the offender during which alternatives to a return to custody, such as changes to the offender’s correctional plan, may be discussed. A decision is made to either cancel the suspension within thirty days before referral to the Parole Board of Canada (PBC; i.e., local cancellation) or submit the case to the PBC. If the case is referred to the PBC, Board members will decide whether to cancel the suspension (i.e., Board cancellation) or revoke conditional release (Corrections and Conditional Release Act, 1992).

With the exception of cases involving automatic suspensions or suspensions issued by the PBC or where the case has already been referred to the PBC, the most common circumstances for cancelling a warrant of suspension include the following:

- new information modifies the risk assessment;
- new information modifies the reasons for suspension;
- a new release plan or new conditions, that are consistent with the offender’s correctional plan, reduce the risk to the community to an acceptable level
- loss of referral to late referral

In other circumstances, the conditional release may be revoked. Approximately 48% of

suspension warrants result in a revocation (Farrell MacDonald, Curno, Biro & Gobeil, 2015).

Previous research has demonstrated that ratings on the DFIA-R, and in particular the substance use domain, are related to post-release outcomes. Stewart et al. (2017) found that substance use is a common area of need for most offenders. The majority of federally sentenced men (62%) and women (75%) have either a moderate or high need in the substance abuse domain. Indeed, the majority of Indigenous men (61%), non-Indigenous women (50%), and Indigenous women (62%) were rated as having a high need in the substance abuse domain. The majority of offenders also reported early ages of drug and alcohol use, combining the use of alcohol and drugs, regular drug use is part of their lifestyle, alcohol or drug use has resulted in law violations, and is part of the offence cycle. Higher ratings on the substance abuse domain of the DFIA-R were associated with increased rates of revocations in general and revocations with an offence more specifically, and every indicator was associated with increased rates of revocations. Indicators of early age of drug use, drug use interfering with employment, becoming violent when drinking or using drugs, and alcohol or drug use resulting in law violations had particularly strong correlations with revocations and revocations with an offence. These findings serve two important purposes: (1) they provide an approximate prevalence of offenders who have a criminogenic need for substance use treatment, and (2) they highlight the importance of conducting research on offenders who have a criminogenic need for substance use treatment in order to facilitate their safe and successful re-integration into the community.

One of CSC's goals is to deliver effective correctional programming that directly addresses offenders' criminal behaviour (CSC, 2009; CSC, 2021c). Within the context of these correctional programs, criminogenic needs are targeted to help offenders safely and successfully reintegrate into the community (Corrections and Conditional Release Act, 1992) and enhance public safety as a direct result (CSC, 2009). Historically, CSC's programming model emphasized a *multi-program* model, whereby offenders participated in individualized programs that focused on their offence history and specific criminogenic needs (CSC, 2020). For example, if an offender had been convicted of a violent drug offence and had an identified programming need for violence and substance use, they would likely partake in two programs: one focused on violence prevention and one focused on substance use. A 2009 Evaluation Report by the CSC



determined that the multi-program model of offender rehabilitation was indeed effective at improving outcomes relating to criminogenic needs (CSC, 2009). With regards to substance use needs specifically, the Evaluation found that program completers were (1) more likely to be granted discretionary release, (2) less likely to have institutional substance use related incidents, and (3) were less likely to be readmitted into custody for any reason when compared to eligible non-participants. These findings were validated for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous men.

Although the previous multi-program model of offender treatment was based in Cognitive Behavioural Therapy, the Risk-Need-Responsivity principles, and produced overall positive post-release outcomes (CSC, 2009), CSC began shifting towards a *multi-target*/holistic program in 2010. The purpose of changing the approach of treatment was to maintain the positive outcomes that were observed in the multi-program model (CSC, 2009) while continuing to meet the needs of offenders who have multiple criminogenic needs in a more effective and efficient way. As a result, the present-day approach is an Integrated Correctional Program Model Multi-Target (ICPM-MT), which targets multiple criminogenic need areas in one correctional program (CSC, 2020). The ICPM continuum includes primer (readiness), main and maintenance components. The ICPM for men includes four different main program streams<sup>4</sup>:

- Integrated Correctional Program Model Multi-Target (ICPM-MT);
- Indigenous Integrated Correctional Program Model (IICPM);
- Integrated Correctional Program Model Sex Offender (ICPM-SO); and
- Indigenous Integrated Correctional Program Model Sex Offender (IICPM-SO).

The ICPM-MT stream provides mainstream programming that does not include culture- or sex offender-specific components while the IICPM stream offers culture-specific programming that addresses both the Indigenous offender's criminogenic factors and issues

---

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that the multi-target and sex offender programs have been adapted for offenders who have unique responsivity needs that may impact both functioning (i.e., cognitive impairments, mental health issues and/or learning disabilities) and their ability to participate successfully in correctional programming – these are referred to as Adapted programs. In addition, hybrid versions of the men's moderate intensity programs are offered. The hybrid programs combine the primer and main programs so that there is no break between the two program components.

related to Indigenous social history. It includes the assistance of Elders in a minimum of 50% of the sessions (CSC, 2020). The ICPM-SO stream addresses all components in the multi-target (MT) stream as well as risk factors associated with sexual offending. The IICPM-SO stream addresses the same components as the ICPM-SO stream, but it does so by offering culture-specific programming that addresses the Indigenous offender's criminogenic factors and issues related to Indigenous social history. Each of the four program streams has a moderate and a high intensity version.

With regards to substance use specifically, the multi-target program considers harm reduction over abstinence, focuses on enhancing one's awareness regarding their substance use by using goal setting, and incorporates the use of support services and strategies such as Opioid Agonist Treatment and the Prison Needle Exchange Program (CSC, 2020). Participants explore the impact of substance use on their goals during program sessions as well as on the crime process, while identifying risk factors related to their crime and personal targets. Depending on which ICPM stream is most suitable for the offender based on risk, substance use is targeted in the ICPM if it is an identified need for the offender.

To assess the effectiveness of the ICPM for men offenders, CSC conducted a second evaluation of correctional reintegration programs in 2020. Cox regression survival analyses were conducted to compare all identified program completers with eligible non-participants and with non-participants with no-intent-to-treat. These analyses included several variables in the model as covariates in order to control for any impact that they had as explanatory variables. Specifically, CRI at intake, Indigenous ancestry, age of offender at release, number of days from admission to release, motivation level at intake, a flag for any maintenance program completion, and a flag for any community program completion were included as covariates. Similar to the 2009 evaluation, the 2020 evaluation revealed several key findings regarding men offenders. First, across all ICPM streams (including those that target substance use needs) program completers had significantly fewer revocations for any reason when compared to eligible non-participants. This finding was consistent for Indigenous men. Second, when examining revocations with a new offence, the findings trended in the same direction, although the difference between program completers and eligible non-participants were not significant. This

pattern of results were also consistent for Indigenous men.

A more unexpected pattern of results emerged with regards to substance use outcomes (e.g., suspension due to a breach of a substance use related release condition, positive urinalysis test in the community, etc.). The findings for all ICPM programs revealed that program completers had a substance use outcome more often when compared to eligible non-participants, although this difference was not statistically significant. When the analyses were further broken down by Indigenous ancestry, it was revealed that, for Indigenous men, program completers had a substance use outcome significantly more often in comparison to eligible non-participants when relevant factors were controlled. Although the evaluation advised that this result should be interpreted with caution due to the smaller subsample of Indigenous men, the overall findings regarding substance use outcomes suggested that “among men with a program need for substance use, correctional programming appears to be effective at reducing revocations, but does not impact the likelihood of a substance use outcome in the same way” (CSC 2020, p. xviii). It is important to note, however, that the operationalization of substance use outcome in the evaluation relates to suspensions due to breaches of substance use related conditions and/or positive urinalysis results while under community supervision and, as noted earlier, research has demonstrated that approximately half of suspensions result in revocations while the bulk of the remainder are cancelled.

Previous meta-analytic research and comprehensive reviews have established a connection between substance use program completion and post-release outcomes (for example, Aos, Miller, and Drake, 2006; McMurrin, 2007; Pearson and Lipton, 1999) such as lower recidivism rates, fewer re-conviction rates, and fewer re-admissions back to prison when compared to other groups. Further, a more recent meta-analysis by de Andrade, Ritchie, Rowlands, Mann, and Hides (2018) examined 62 articles (49 different studies) where (1) the study sample was composed of substance users, (2) said substance users participated in a psychological, pharmacological, mixed, or “other” treatment program, and (3) recidivism after prison release was reported. Overall, recidivism rates were reduced among substance use program participants, suggesting that substance use treatments in prison are effective for

program-completers.

Although the above studies highlight a clear association between substance use program completion and reduced recidivism, there are a few caveats that need to be mentioned. First, the participants in these studies did not necessarily have an identified criminogenic need for substance use treatment; most of them simply had a diagnosed substance use disorder. Second, these studies did not compare program completers to eligible non-participants; the researchers primarily drew their comparisons between program completers and other types of treatment-as-usual groups (e.g., boot camps and purely behavioural therapies). Third, these studies examined general recidivism as a measure of post-release success rather than revocations with and without new offences. While some previous studies have examined revocations, new charges, and new offences as they relate to substance use and substance use treatment, the literature in this area is limited. For example, a study by Seal, Parisot, and DiFranceisco (2012) examined male offenders' substance use during a 3-month period prior to their parole revocation. Among the 126 participants who were recruited for the study, approximately two-thirds (63.5%) reported alcohol use and just over half (53.2%) reported drug use in the 3 months prior to their parole revocation; however, it was not specified whether substance use was a cause for the parole revocation. In the most up-to-date study on offenders with an identified substance use need, Ternes, Farrell MacDonald, and Cheverie (2019) examined 4,082 men who had been released from custody. Among the men who were released, 1,667 (40.8%) returned to custody due to any revocation of their release. Revocations were further broken down into revocations with an offence, of which 264 (6.5%) of the men had identified in their records. A study examining the predictors of federal offenders going Unlawfully at Large (UAL) while under community supervision demonstrated that a history of alcohol use and a history of drug use were among the variables predictive of offenders going UAL even when other factors are taken into account (Dunbar & Helmus, 2014).

While the Ternes et al. (2019) study provides the most comprehensive information on returns to custody for general revocations and for revocations with an offence in the literature, the current study will examine reasons for revocations. More specifically, the purpose of the current study is to build upon the findings of the 2020 Evaluation report by examining if

revocations with or without an offence are related to offenders' substance use. The 2020 Evaluation found that program completers were revoked less frequently for any reason in comparison to eligible non-participants. However, whether the revocations were a result of a substance use related incident was not specified. Additionally, program completers were more likely than eligible non-participants to have a substance use outcome (e.g., suspension due to a breach of a substance use related release condition, positive urinalysis test in the community) while on release in the community, although this difference was not statistically significant among non-Indigenous men. Nonetheless, these findings suggest that, among men with an identified criminogenic need for substance use, correctional programming is effective at reducing revocations but may not be as effective at reducing the likelihood of a substance use outcome. As such, additional research was recommended to determine the association between the current programming model and substance use outcomes among those who were revoked. Therefore, this research aims to address the following research questions:

1. Among a cohort of offenders with moderate to high substance use need levels at intake who were revoked without an offence after first release, what proportion of revocations without an offence are related to substance use?
2. Among a cohort of offenders with moderate to high substance use need levels at intake who were revoked with an offence after first release, what proportion of revocations with an offence involve substance use?
3. Do the above outcomes differ between correctional reintegration program (ICPM, IICPM) participants and eligible non-participants?

## Method

### Participants

A pool of federally sentenced men eligible for file coding was identified by applying a number of criteria. Offenders must have been admitted on a new federal sentence after February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018<sup>5</sup>. Their first releases were identified, and the release types must have been day parole, full parole, or statutory release to ensure that they had a supervision period in the community. Additional selection criteria included a) return to custody on a revocation with or without an offence prior to data collection in December 2022, b) eligible for participation in the ICPM, c) criminogenic need in the area of substance use, and d) absence of participation in nationally recognized correctional programs on a prior sentence. According to Guidelines 726-2 (CSC, 2021b), program eligibility depends on offenders' general criminal history risk as assessed by the CRI<sup>6</sup>, and sex offender risk as assessed by either the Static-99R<sup>7</sup> or the STABLE-2007<sup>8</sup>. Substance use need was defined as a moderate or high rating on the DFIA-R Substance Abuse domain. Applying these criteria yielded a cohort of 1,311 offenders eligible for file coding. Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders who had participated in a multi-target ICPM or IICPM program and those who did not participate in a program during their period of incarceration formed four potential study groups. Characteristics of this cohort are displayed in Appendix A.

Records for 485 randomly selected offenders were coded for information on the role substance use played in decisions to revoke. These cases included 122 Indigenous and 122 non-Indigenous program participant cases, and 120 Indigenous and 121 non-Indigenous eligible non-participant cases. Program participants included those who met program referral criteria outlined

---

<sup>5</sup> The CRI was adopted as the main correctional program referral criterion in January 2018.

<sup>6</sup> The CRI consists of 17 indicators of previous adult court criminal history, 15 indicators of previous youth court criminal history, and 6 indicators of current offences. All indicators are scored as yes or no. The number of indicators endorsed as present are summed with greater values indicating greater criminal history risk (Motiuk & Vuong, 2018).

<sup>7</sup> The Static-99R is an assessment tool designed to estimate the likelihood of sexual recidivism among offenders with a sex offence history (CSC, 2021b).

<sup>8</sup> The STABLE-2007 assessment identifies stable dynamic risk factors for sexual offending (CSC, 2021b).

above and who had been assigned to a main program<sup>9</sup> with an assignment start date while incarcerated. This date indicates that the offender started the assigned program and attended at least one session. They did not necessarily complete the program.<sup>10</sup> Eligible non-participants met the same program referral criteria (from the CRI and Static-99R and STABLE-2007), but did not have a main program assignment with a start date.

## **Procedure**

Indigenous and non-Indigenous federally sentenced men who met the risk criteria for participation in correctional programs were randomly selected for file coding. A spreadsheet was prepared for the coders containing offender identifiers, sentence and release information, and supervision conditions. The coding process began by identifying the Assessment for Decision document associated with the offender's revocation without an offence or revocation with an offence. If additional information was required to complete the coding, coders referred to Parole Board Decision sheets, Criminal Profile Reports, Correctional Plan Update, and Memo to File documents in addition to the Assessment for Decision. The coding manual found in Appendix B guided the coders in recording information, and the data were entered into a spreadsheet as they were collected. Coders maintained communication with one another and consulted one another on any questionable cases. A decision log was updated as items in the coding manual were refined to help ensure consistency across the three coders. Coding was completed for approximately equal numbers of cases of Indigenous and non-Indigenous identities and of those who had participated in the ICPM or IICPM and those who were eligible to participate but did not.

## **Measures/Material**

The coding manual prompted review the offender's identifier, supervision type,

---

<sup>9</sup> Main correctional programs include general and Indigenous-specific multi-target and sex offender streams of the Integrated Correctional Program Model, and exclude primer and maintenance programs.

<sup>10</sup> Program participants were selected as a study group rather than program completers as was the case in the evaluation. This method combines all offenders who participated in at least a portion of the program, including those who drop out of a program and may be higher risk than those who complete the program. While this increases the variability within the group regarding risk, it ensures that results are not skewed in favor of a program by selecting only those who are able to successfully complete the program.

supervision conditions, and revocation type. In cases of revocations without an offence, coders examined a) whether one or more breached conditions led to the revocation, b) what those breached conditions were, c) what substance use related conditions were breached, d) what non-substance use related conditions were breached, e) what substance use related factors other than breached conditions influenced the decision to revoke the offender's community supervision, and f) what other factors contributed to the decision to revoke. Finally, coders examined and recorded whether a primary reason for the revocation without an offence was recorded, and whether this was related to substance use, a breached condition, a breached condition related to substance use, and to specify the breached condition identified as the primary reason for the revocation without an offence.

In cases of revocations with an offence, coders examined a) whether at least one of the offences was a substance use offence and what the offences were, b) whether at least one of the offences was a non-substance use offence and what the offences were, c) whether at least one of the offences were motivated by substance use and how so, d) whether at least one of the offences was committed while intoxicated, and e) whether the document raised concerns about the offender's substance use while under supervision.

In addition to the questions specifically regarding the circumstances for revocations without an offence and revocations with an offence, coders could record any additional substance use related information, any non-substance use related information, and any general comments.



## Results

### Profile of Coded Cases

The sample does not reflect the population of federal offenders since only those who were eligible for programs, had an assessed substance use need at intake, and had their community supervision revoked were examined in this study. Appendix C describes differences across these groups, and also includes a brief comparison of the profiles of the coded cases and the cohort from which they were drawn. Detailed profile results of the coded cases of program participant and eligible non-participant groups of Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders are presented in the tables in Appendix C. Some notable differences include longer sentence lengths for program participants in comparison to eligible non-participants for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups of coded cases (Table C2), and lower risk ratings of program participant groups compared to eligible non-participants for Indigenous and non-Indigenous men. While non-Indigenous program participants and eligible non-participants had similar levels of need across the DFIA-R domain ratings, Indigenous program participants were less likely to be rated as having moderate or high need on the Community Functioning and Attitude domains than Indigenous eligible non-participants. (See Table C3.)

The degree of substance use need of the coded cases indicates that both the program participants and eligible non-participants have long-standing substance use concerns and similar levels of need. Results presented in Appendix C show that the mean number of indicators endorsed were similar between program participants and eligible non-participants for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders. There were some observed differences in the frequencies of endorsement of specific indicators. Table C5 displays the prevalence of the DFIA-R Substance Abuse domain indicators. Over 90% of offenders in each of the four groups had the substance use indicators, “Alcohol or drug use has resulted in law violations,” and “Alcohol and/or drug use is part of the offence cycle” endorsed. “Regular drug use is part of the offender's lifestyle” was also commonly endorsed. Together these indicators suggest that alcohol or drug use has been problematic and has been related to the offences of all four groups of the sample. The frequency that “Early age drug use” and “Early age of alcohol use” were endorsed for the two groups of Indigenous men is of concern since it suggests a long-standing role of substances

in the men's lives.

The profile results of the entire cohort are presented in the corresponding tables A2 and A3 in Appendix A. Given that the sample of coded cases differed from the cohort from which they were drawn in specific areas such as region, release type and selected index offence types, there may be limitations to the generalizability to the population. That being said, the coded cases were similar to the cohort in a number of other variables such as race, age at admission, sentence length, time incarcerated until release, days spent in the community until revocation, most of the DFIA-R need domains, number of substance use domain indicators endorsed, and CRI ratings.

### **Coding Results of Revocation without an Offence Cases**

When offenders appear before the PBC, the circumstances surrounding their criminal histories are examined. Much of the information in the profile results would be taken into consideration, and appropriate conditions for their periods of community supervision would be applied. The main focus of this study is based on examining these conditions and breaches of the conditions which led to revocations. Although it would have been ideal to be able to take the variables in the profile section into account in conducting this research, it was not possible to do so due to methodological and sample size limitations.

### **Types of Release Conditions Applied in Revocations without an Offence Cases**

The cases that were coded were released under a number of conditions. Table 1 below displays the frequencies of these conditions among the 428 offenders with revocations without an offence. Most frequently, offenders were released with around 7 different conditions. The condition not to consume drugs was the most common with over 97% of offenders having this condition. Over 90% of offenders also had the conditions not to consume alcohol and to avoid certain persons. These high rates of substance use related conditions are not surprising since the sample for this study only included offenders who had moderate or high need levels on the DFIA-R substance abuse domain.

A few of statistically significant differences were observed between the program participants and eligible non-participant groups in the conditions that were applied. Offenders in

the non-Indigenous eligible non-participant group were more likely to have the condition of follow treatment plan than non-Indigenous program participants. Residency conditions were more often applied to offenders in the eligible non-participant groups for both non-Indigenous and Indigenous offenders. This may be related to their higher rates of statutory releases. Other comparisons which approached significance included conditions to report relationships, financial disclosure and psychological treatment or assessment conditions for non-Indigenous offenders, and seek employment for Indigenous offenders.

Table 1

*Release Conditions Imposed upon Offenders with Revocations without an Offence*

Condition Type	All Offenders		Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
	Not to Consume Drugs	416	97.2	112	98.3	108			96.4	0.72	.396	97		
Not to Consume Alcohol	397	92.8	103	90.4	100	89.3	0.07	.791	96	96.0	98	96.1	< 0.01	.977
Avoid Certain Persons <sup>a</sup>	394	92.1	105	92.1	102	91.1	0.08	.780	94	94.0	93	91.2	0.59	.444
Follow Treatment Plan	305	71.3	68	59.6	87	77.7	8.52	.004	72	72.0	78	76.5	0.53	.468
Report Relationships	196	45.8	56	49.1	41	36.6	3.61	.057	50	50.0	49	48.0	0.08	.781
Seek Employment	176	41.1	47	41.2	49	43.8	0.15	.701	33	33.0	47	46.1	3.61	.057
Reside at Place	159	37.2	24	21.1	47	42.0	11.47	< .001	26	26.0	62	60.8	24.85	< .001
Avoid Victims <sup>b</sup>	152	35.5	38	33.3	39	34.8	0.06	.813	41	41.0	34	33.3	1.27	.260
Avoid Drinking Establishments <sup>c</sup>	101	23.6	29	25.4	35	31.3	0.94	.332	20	20.0	17	16.7	0.38	.540
Financial Disclosure	92	21.5	28	24.6	40	35.7	3.34	.068	10	10.0	14	13.7	0.67	.413
Respect Curfew	79	18.5	21	18.4	25	22.3	0.53	.467	17	17.0	16	15.7	0.06	.801
Psychological <sup>d</sup>	47	11.0	12	10.5	22	19.6	3.67	.055	7	7.0	6	5.9	0.10	.746

Table 1 *cont.*

Condition Type	All Offenders		Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
Take Medication as Prescribed	44	10.3	10	8.8	14	12.5	0.83	.363	9	9.0	11	10.8	0.18	.671
Telecommunications Restrictions <sup>e</sup>	38	8.9	14	12.3	11	9.8	0.35	.556	7	7.0	6	5.9	0.10	.746
Motor Vehicle Restrictions	20	4.7	4	3.5	3	2.7	0.13	.719	8	8.0	5	4.9	0.80	.370
Avoid Children <sup>f</sup>	20	4.7	4	3.5	2	1.8	0.65	.421	5	5.0	9	8.8	1.14	.285
Not to Gamble <sup>g</sup>	13	3.0	4	3.5	1	0.9	1.79	.181	5	5.0	3	2.9	0.56	.453
Other <sup>h</sup>	60	14.0	20	17.5	19	17.0	0.01	.908	11	11.0	10	9.8	0.08	.781

<sup>a</sup> Includes No Contact Certain Persons.

<sup>b</sup> Includes No Contact Victims.

<sup>c</sup> Includes Do Not Enter Drinking Establishments.

<sup>d</sup> Includes Psychological Counselling, Psychiatric Treatment, and Psychological Assessment.

<sup>e</sup> Includes Internet Restrictions.

<sup>f</sup> Includes No Contact Children and No Child Areas.

<sup>g</sup> Includes Avoid Gambling Establishments and Do Not Enter Gambling Establishments.

<sup>h</sup> Includes Avoid Sex Work, Avoid Cannabis Establishments, Provide Compensation/Restitution, Pornography Restrictions, and “Other” conditions.

## **Frequencies of Breaches of Release Conditions in Revocations without an Offence Cases**

Of the 428 coded cases with revocations without an offence, 88.8% ( $n = 380$ ) had breached one or more of their release conditions. The remaining 11.2% ( $n = 48$ ) would have had their community supervision revoked due to perceived increases in risk. The decision to revoke the conditional release may have been made to prevent a breach of conditions or due to judgements that the offender could no longer be safely supervised in the community. Additionally, some cases may have breached a condition, but were not identified as such due to missing or ambiguous information in the files that were coded.

Offenders commonly breached more than one condition; 184 offenders (48%) had two or more breached conditions contributing to their revocations, and 196 (52%) had only one. Forty-eight percent of non-Indigenous program participants ( $n = 49$ ) and 45% of non-Indigenous eligible non-participants ( $n = 43$ ) had multiple breached conditions ( $\chi^2 (1) = 0.15, p = .694$ ). Indigenous eligible non-participants tended to be more likely to have multiple breached conditions (58%,  $n = 52$ ) than Indigenous program participants (44%,  $n = 40$ ) although this difference only approached statistical significance ( $\chi^2 (1) = 3.46, p = .063$ ).

Among the cohort of offenders with substance use needs whose community supervision was revoked, the majority breached a substance use condition. A general examination revealed that substance use conditions and those that were determined to be related to substance use<sup>11</sup> were the most commonly breached conditions. The majority of coded cases with a breach of conditions leading to the decision to revoke had one or more breached condition related to substance use (86%, 325 of 380), while 45% (172 of 380) had one or more non-substance use related breached condition. The proportions of program participants and eligible non-participants with substance use related breaches were not significantly different for either non-Indigenous men (88% and 82%, respectively;  $\chi^2 (1) = 1.46, p = .226$ ) or Indigenous men (90% and 81%,

---

<sup>11</sup> Coders were asked to record yes or no to the question, “Was a substance use-related breached condition recorded as a reason for the revocation without an offence?” If yes, they were asked to specify which conditions were breached. This could have included the obvious ones (e.g. not to consume drugs) or the ones which may or may not have been directly related to substance use (e.g. take meds as prescribed, psychological counselling).

respectively;  $\chi^2 (1) = 2.98, p = .084$ ). For non-Indigenous men, the proportions of program participants with one or more non-substance use related breached conditions (43%) was not statistically significantly different from the eligible non-participants (48%;  $\chi^2 (1) = 0.46, p = .500$ ). Indigenous eligible non-participants had statistically significantly more cases with one or more non-substance use related breached condition (57%) than Indigenous program participants (34%;  $\chi^2 (1) = 9.33, p = .002$ ).

A more specific analysis was also conducted. Table 2 displays the frequencies of breaches of each condition among the offenders with the respective types of conditions applied during their supervision periods. Breaches of the condition not to consume drugs stood out as the most likely condition to be breached. Across all groups, 66% of the offenders with this condition breached it. Offenders with the condition to not consume alcohol breached this condition in nearly 22% of cases. Other commonly breached conditions included respect curfew, residency conditions, take medication as prescribed, avoid children, avoid certain persons, motor vehicle conditions, and report relationships.

Interestingly, Non-Indigenous program participants statistically significantly breached the condition to not consume drugs more often than eligible non-participants. They were also more likely to breach the condition to follow their treatment plan, and less likely to breach the condition to take medication as prescribed compared to non-Indigenous eligible non-participants. Among Indigenous offenders, eligible non-participants were more likely to breach their residency condition. The reasons for these differences may be numerous. For example, they could relate to other differences between the groups. As displayed in Appendix C, non-Indigenous program participants were more likely to be released on parole than non-Indigenous eligible non-participants (Table C1), and had longer periods between release and revocation (Table C2). Sentence lengths were longer for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous program participants compared to their eligible non-participant counterparts (Table C2). Non-Indigenous eligible non-participants had more frequent indications of alcohol use and similar indicators of drug use on the DFIA-R compared to non-Indigenous program participants, and Indigenous eligible non-participants were more likely than Indigenous program participants to be rated as violent when drinking or using drugs (Table C5). Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous eligible

non-participants had higher criminal history risk scores on the CRI than their respective program participant groups (Table C6).

A logistic regression was run in an attempt to determine factors that may explain the results that non-Indigenous program participants may have differed from the eligible non-participants on the rates of revocation of the condition to not consume drugs. A model predicting breaches of the condition not to consume drugs by number of substance use indicators endorsed, CRI Index score, and study group – program participants versus eligible non-participants – approached significance ( $\chi^2(3) = 7.25, p = .064$ ). However, only the study group appeared to contribute meaningfully to the model ( $\chi^2(1) = 4.09, p = .043$ ), and neither substance use need ( $\chi^2(1) = 2.49, p = .115$ ) nor CRI score ( $\chi^2(1) = 0.267, p = .605$ ) was a reliable variable in the model. The non-significant result of this analysis may have been due to low statistical power. Both substance use need and criminal history had limited variability since they were included in the selection criteria. There were also a limited number of cases included in the analysis ( $n = 237$  cases with 146 breaches of not to consume drugs conditions). Correlations may also be expected to be low since a variety of other factors may be related to breaches of not to consume drug conditions.

As mentioned above, offenders often had multiple breached conditions in addition to the individual breached conditions described above. When more than one condition was breached, the condition to not consume drugs was usually one of the breached conditions. The most common breached conditions in addition to not to consume drugs included avoid certain persons ( $n = 76, 8\%$ ), not to consume alcohol ( $n = 47, 12.4\%$ ), and reside at place ( $n = 23, 6.1\%$ )<sup>12</sup>. There were 17 offenders (5%) who had breached conditions of not to consume alcohol and avoid certain persons, but who did not breach the condition not to consume drugs.

---

<sup>12</sup> While pairs of breached conditions are listed, other conditions may also have been included. For example, the offenders with breaches of both not to consume drugs and avoid certain persons may also have breached a residency condition.



Table 2

*Proportions of offenders with revocations without an offence who breached the condition among those with the condition assigned*

Breached Condition Type	All Offenders		Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
Not to Consume Drugs	274	65.9	82	73.2	64	59.3	4.80	.029	64	66.0	64	64.6	0.04	.845
Not to Consume Alcohol	86	21.7	16	15.5	21	21.0	1.02	.313	27	28.1	22	22.4	0.83	.363
Avoid Certain Persons <sup>a</sup>	90	22.8	22	21.0	29	28.4	1.56	.212	22	23.4	17	18.3	0.74	.388
Follow Treatment Plan	12	3.9	5	7.4	1	1.1	3.95	.047	4	5.6	2	2.6	0.87	.350
Report Relationships	38	19.4	14	25.0	5	12.2	2.46	.117	6	12.0	13	26.5	3.37	.066
Seek Employment	4	2.3	2	4.3	2	4.1	0.00	.966	0	0	0	0	-	-
Reside at Place	50	31.4	9	37.5	14	29.8	0.43	.511	4	15.4	23	37.1	4.06	.044
Avoid Victims <sup>b</sup>	9	5.9	5	13.2	1	2.6	3.01	.083	2	4.9	1	2.9	0.18	.670
Avoid Drinking Establishments <sup>c</sup>	3	3.0	1	3.4	1	2.9	0.02	.892	0	0	1	5.9	1.21	.272
Financial Disclosure	8	8.7	1	3.6	2	5	0.08	.778	1	10.0	4	28.6	1.22	.269
Respect Curfew	25	31.6	6	28.6	4	16	1.06	.303	9	52.9	6	37.5	0.79	.373

Table 2 *cont.*

Breached Condition Type	All Offenders		Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
Psychological <sup>d</sup>	1	2.1	0	0	1	4.5	-	-	0	0.0	0	0	-	-
Take Medication as Prescribed	12	27.3	0	0	7	50.0	7.06	.008	3	33.3	2	18.2	0.61	.436
Telecommunications Restrictions <sup>e</sup>	6	15.8	2	14.3	0	0	-	-	1	14.3	3	50.0	7.38	.390
Motor Vehicle Restrictions	4	20.0	0	0	0	0	-	-	2	25.0	2	40.0	3.13	.873
Avoid Children <sup>f</sup>	5	25.0	0	0	0	0	-	-	1	20.0	4	44.4	0.84	.360
Not to Gamble <sup>g</sup>	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	1	33.3	-	-
Other <sup>h</sup>	2	3.3	1	5.0	0	0	-	-	1	9.0	0	0	-	-

Note. Since the results indicate the percentage of offenders who breached a given condition among those with the condition assigned, and since offenders may have had more than one breached condition, percentages will not sum to 100 within a group.

<sup>a</sup> The condition Avoid Certain Persons also includes No Contact Certain Persons.

<sup>b</sup> The condition Avoid Victims also includes No Contact Victims.

<sup>c</sup> The condition Avoid Drinking Establishment also includes Do Not Enter Drinking Establishment.

<sup>d</sup> Psychological conditions include psychological counselling, psychiatric treatment, and psychological assessment.

<sup>e</sup> The condition Telecommunications Restrictions also includes Internet Restrictions.

<sup>f</sup> The condition Avoid Children also includes No Contact Children and No Child Areas.

<sup>g</sup> The condition Not to Gamble also includes Avoid Gambling Establishments and Do Not Enter Gambling Establishments.

<sup>h</sup> Other conditions included avoiding cannabis establishments, geographic restrictions, pornography restrictions, avoid sex work, and conditions labeled "Other." Additional information on these "Other" conditions revealed that they included conditions which could have been included in the above types such as avoid children, avoid drinking establishments, financial disclosure, among others.

## **Revocations without an Offence where Substance use was a concern, but not a breach of conditions**

As mentioned previously, some offenders had revocations despite not having any breached conditions. Additionally, offenders with breaches of conditions may have had other factors contributing to their risk and the decision to revoke, and these may have been related to substance use. In 22% ( $n = 93$ ) of cases with revocations without an offence, substance use was of concern, but did not result in a breach of substance use conditions. These circumstances were quite varied but often fell into one of four themes.

The first theme involved urinalysis testing. The offenders often missed or tampered with their urinalysis testing. For example, one offender had, “several missed samples due to forgetting or sleeping through urinalysis.” Another offender “was found to be in possession of a device and “fake urine” to circumvent his urinalysis test.”

Secondly, offenders were often suspected of breaching a substance use condition, but there was a lack of evidence to substantiate the suspicion. One parole officer stated, “While the offender was UAL in the community, he was believed to have been using substances; however, the writer of the [assessment for decision] cannot confirm this.”

The third theme involved discovery of drug paraphernalia and possibly drugs. In one case, community residential facility “staff found drug paraphernalia that was consistent with chemical drug use on his night stand at the centre. Upon further investigation, it was noted that the plastic baggie had powder residue while the tin foil had three distinct lines heated from the bottom consistent with drug use not related to marijuana.” In another case, “Following his arrest, a room search was completed and staff found a pipe used to smoke substances, a small clear bag with white powder.”

The fourth theme involves misuse of prescription medication. Some offenders overconsumed their prescription medication while others abused their prescription medication by consuming it in an unintended way. For example, one offender, “admitted to crushing up his Suboxone and snorting it.”

## **Factors contributing to revocations without an offence other than those related to**

## **substance use**

While the focus of this study is on the role of substance use in revocation decisions, offenders often return to custody for a variety of reasons. To ensure the above examination of substance use related factors are put into context, an examination of non-substance use related factors were also examined. Non-substance use risk factors contributed to the decision to revoke without an offence in 76% ( $n = 326$ ) of cases. These contributing factors generally fell into four themes.

The first theme included offenders going UAL or their whereabouts were unknown. This included not returning to a community correctional centre or community residential facility. File coders often observed statements similar to one offender who “failed to return to the [community residential facility] and went unlawfully at large until he was arrested.”

The second theme involved alleged criminal offences. While the return to CSC custody was recorded as a revocation without an offence, the circumstances leading to this sometimes involved apparent offences. For example, one offender was apprehended “following a call from a citizen advising he was performing an indecent act and exposure.... The police located him... completely naked.” Another offender, “threatened violence against staff and began damaging property at his shelter. This property damage continued and included punching and kicking a food buffet being used for breakfast service. This punch caused the glass guards to break over the food, spoiling the food for the rest of the residents at the shelter.”

The third theme involved previously cancelled suspensions. Often offenders had several previous suspensions, some involving breached conditions. One offender “breached for a second time within just under two weeks of his release.” In another case, the offender “had previously had his release maintained two times due to using drugs and that his placement at SDHC [Stan Daniels Healing Centre] was an alternative to his previous suspension.” In this latter case, the previous canceled suspensions were counted as non-substance use related factors in addition to recording that the offender had breached his condition to not consume drugs.

The fourth theme involved a perception of increasing risk to the public. Typically, an offender’s non-compliance under community supervision would lead to the conclusion that, “risk to public is deemed unmanageable at present and revocation is recommended.” This could have

involved specific problematic behaviour such as missing parole meetings, “defiant attitude,” or “hostile, dishonest and verbally confrontational” behaviour. It could also have been stated more generally, such as, the offender’s behaviour “declined precipitously immediately prior to his suspension.”

Some factors contributing to revocation without an offence decisions did not fit within the four themes. These included breaches of standard release conditions such as missing parole meetings, violating rules of the correctional residential facility, withdrawal of support from the correctional residential facility, having social media accounts under a false name, and failure to follow COVID-19 restrictions after explicit warning from the parole officer.

### **Primary reason for revocation without an offence**

Coders were asked to record if a single breached condition or factor was identified as the primary reason for the decision to revoke the offenders’ community supervision. This step of the coding process required a greater degree of judgement, and results may be less reliable than the previously reported results. The following should be interpreted with caution.

In 56% of cases ( $n = 240$ ), a primary reason for the decision to revoke was identified. For cases with a primary reason, coders then responded to a number of non-mutually exclusive items regarding the primary reason. The primary reason was related to substance use in 57% ( $n = 138$ ) of these 240 cases. Sixty-nine percent ( $n = 167$ ) were due to a breached condition, usually a breach of a substance use condition ( $n = 130$ ). The primary reason was often related specifically to breaches of conditions to not consume drugs ( $n = 109$ ).

### **Cancelled Suspensions**

Previous cancelled suspensions were identified as a theme of non-substance use related factors contributing to revocation without an offence decisions. An examination of administrative data of cancelled suspensions among the 428 coded cases revealed that 130 (30.4%) of them had at least one cancelled suspension between supervision start date and readmission date, and 24 (5.6%) had more than one cancelled suspension. Among the study groups, 36 (31.6%) non-Indigenous participants and 31 (27.7%) non-Indigenous eligible non-participants had one or more cancelled suspensions ( $\chi^2 (1) = 0.41, p = .521$ ). Thirty-one (31.0%)

Indigenous participants and 32 (31.4%) Indigenous eligible non-participants had one or more cancelled suspensions ( $\chi^2 (1) < 0.01, p = .954$ ). Table D1 in Appendix D displays the types of activities that led to the cancelled suspensions across study groups of offenders with revocations without an offence. Breaches of the conditions – specifically breaches of conditions to not consume drugs – and increasing risk or deteriorating behaviour were the most common activities that led to cancelled suspensions. The Participant and Eligible non-Participant groups did not statistically significantly differ in the frequencies of suspension activities associated with these cancelled suspensions, for both Indigenous or non-Indigenous groups.

### **The Role of Community Maintenance Programs and Community Programs**

Once offenders have completed a multi-target correctional program while incarcerated, the non-Indigenous and Indigenous program participants may have also enrolled in institutional and community maintenance programs. Offenders who do not complete programs while incarcerated may participate in the Community Program while on release. Examining the breached conditions contributing to decisions to revoke offenders' community supervision among participants in these programs compared to non-participants may help identify strategies to mitigate certain risks including those related to substance use. A minority of offenders – 10 (8.2%) non-Indigenous program participants and 11 (9.0%) Indigenous program participants enrolled in institutional maintenance programs. Further analyses were not conducted for those who participated in institutional maintenance due to the small numbers.

Sixty (49.2%) offenders in the non-Indigenous program participants group and 54 (44.3%) offenders in the Indigenous program participants group enrolled in community maintenance programs.

Table 3 displays results examining which conditions were breached among those with and without enrollment in community maintenance programs for the participants. Generally, the rates of breaches of the most commonly applied conditions did not significantly differ between community maintenance participants and non-participants. Breaches of conditions to not consume drugs were most common for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders.

Table 3

*Associations between Community Maintenance Program Participation and Breaches of Conditions*

Breached Condition	Non-Indigenous Program participants with Community Maintenance		Non-Indigenous Program participants without Community Maintenance		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%		
Not to consume drugs	37	62.7	45	73.8	1.70	.193
Not to consume alcohol	7	12.5	9	16.4	0.34	.562
Avoid Certain Persons	12	21.8	10	17.5	0.32	.569
Reside at Place	2	28.6	7	38.9	0.23	.629
Report Relationships	10	29.4	4	16.7	1.25	.264
	Indigenous Program participants with Community Maintenance		Indigenous Program participants without Community Maintenance			
	n	%	n	%		
Not to consume drugs	32	60.4	32	48.5	1.67	.196
Not to consume alcohol	16	31.4	11	16.4	3.67	.055
Avoid Certain Persons	12	22.6	10	15.9	0.86	.354
Reside at Place	-	-	4	20.0	-	-
Report Relationships	4	14.3	2	7.1	0.75	.388

Similarly, the eligible non-participant study groups may have participated in the Community Program – a correctional intervention that is delivered after release for those who had not participated in programs while incarcerated. Sixty-four (52.9%) of non-Indigenous eligible non-participants and 47 (39.2%) of Indigenous eligible non-participants participated in the Community Program. Table 4 displays results examining what conditions were breached among those with and without enrollment in the Community Program. Again, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders were most likely to breach their conditions to not consume drugs.

A few statistically significant differences between offenders who participated in the Community Program and those who did not emerged. Non-Indigenous Community Program participants were more likely to breach their conditions to avoid certain persons than those who did not participate. Indigenous Community Program participants were more likely to breach their conditions to not consume drugs than those who did not participate.



Table 4

*Associations between Community Program Participation and Breaches of Conditions*

Breached Condition	Non-Indigenous Eligible non-participants with Community Program		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-participants without Community Program		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%		
Not to consume drugs	36	57.1	28	51.9	0.33	.567
Not to consume alcohol	12	21.4	9	17.3	0.29	.589
Avoid Certain Persons	22	36.1	7	14.0	6.93	.009
Reside at Place	6	23.1	8	27.6	0.15	.702
Report Relationships	4	16.0	1	5.3	1.24	.266
	Indigenous Eligible non-participants with Community Program		Indigenous Eligible non-participants without Community Program		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%		
Not to consume drugs	33	70.2	31	44.3	7.63	.006
Not to consume alcohol	10	21.3	12	17.7	0.24	.627
Avoid Certain Persons	10	22.2	7	10.8	2.67	.102
Reside at Place	10	34.5	13	32.5	0.03	.863
Report Relationships	4	15.4	9	30.0	1.67	.196

## **Coding Results of Revocation with an Offence Cases**

Files for 57 offenders with revocations with an offence were coded. The coding process examined the circumstances around the offence with particular attention to the involvement of substance use. The offences could have been substance use offences such as possession. They could have been motivated by substance use such as acquiring money to buy drugs, and they could have been committed while intoxicated. In addition to the offences, substance use and non-substance use conditions may have been breached, and may have otherwise contributed to a concern regarding the offender's risk.

Of these cases of revocation with an offence among federally sentenced men with a substance use need, 25% ( $n = 14$ ) were coded as having a substance use related offence. Given the small sample size, comparisons were not made between groups, but rather, overall findings are reported. Twelve of these 14 cases had drug possession charges, and three of these cases had enough drugs to warrant a charge of possession for the purpose of trafficking. Non-substance use offences were more common, with 54 of the 57 (95%) offenders having at least one non-substance use offence.

For the following examination of the most frequent offences, some offenders had multiple different offences, and some had multiple similar offences. Different offences were counted separately, but similar offences were not counted separately. For example, one offender had multiple firearms offences as well as dangerous driving and flight from police offences. He therefore, contributed once to the frequency of firearms offences, and once each to dangerous driving and flight from police.

Unlawfully at large was the most common offence with 25 of the 57 (44%) offenders incurring this charge. These charges often occurred on their own without other offences. It should also be noted that these UAL cases are in addition to those offenders who had revocations without an offence with UAL as a contributing factor in those decisions<sup>13</sup>. Firearms and weapons

---

<sup>13</sup> Offenders going UAL does not necessarily lead to a criminal change. For example, in a previous study, among the approximately 80% of UAL offenders who eventually had their releases revoked, most of those were recorded as revocations without an offence (Dunbar & Helmus, 2014).

offences such as various possession of a weapon charges and violations of a prohibition order, and traffic violations such as dangerous driving and driving while suspended charges were the next most common with 10 offenders (18%) with each of these charges. Eight offenders (14%) incurred obstruction charges. Eight offenders (14%) also incurred a range of assault charges – assault peace officer, use of force, causing bodily harm, aggravated assault. There were no indications that any of the assault charges were of a sexual nature. Flight from police ( $n = 7$ , 12%), theft ( $n = 6$ , 11%), threats or harassment ( $n = 5$ , 9%), possession of stolen property ( $n = 5$ , 9%), and mischief ( $n = 5$ , 9%) were also common offences. Less common offences included break and enter and attempted break and enter, robbery, forcible confinement, extortion, cause disturbance, and failure to comply with a release order.

In addition to substance use offences, substance use may have been a motivation for the offence, the offence may have been committed while intoxicated, and the parole officer may have recorded concerns regarding increased risk related substance use and possible breaches of substance use conditions unrelated to the offence. In 11% (6 of 57) of cases, substance use was a motivation for one or more of the offences leading to the revocation. In four of these cases, the offender tried to avoid a positive urinalysis test and went UAL or went UAL because they knew a urinalysis test would return positive a result. One case explained, “that he went UAL as he know that additional drugs would show up in his urinalysis test and believed he would go back to jail.” One case involved a robbery of a pharmacy with the goal of acquiring drugs, while the remaining case involved offending behaviour to acquire money to pay for drugs while UAL. In 13 cases (23%), the offence or offences were committed while intoxicated. In addition to the offences, a substance use related condition was breached and contributed to the decision to revoke in 25 cases (46%), compared to 21 cases (37%) which had non-substance use related breached conditions contributing to the revocation.

## Discussion

This study demonstrated that substance use was an important contributing factor to offenders' revocation with or without offence in a sample of offenders with moderate or high substance use needs and who were revoked on their conditional release. In fact, among offenders who had a revocation without offence and among those with the respective conditions imposed 66% of offenders had breached the 'not to consume drugs' condition and 21.7% had breached the 'not to consume alcohol' condition. Furthermore, substance use was involved in 57% (n = 138) of the 240 cases for which a primary reason for the decision to revoke was identified; 69% (n = 167) were due to a breached condition and 54% (n = 130) were due to a breach of a substance use condition (usually related to breaches of conditions to not consume drugs). These results are not surprising given the results of previous CSC studies. For example, Farrell MacDonald (2014) found that as the severity of substance use increased, the likelihood of returning to custody following release increased and, among readmitted offenders, those with a substantial or severe substance abuse problem remained in the community for almost a month less than those without a substance abuse problem. Similarly, in a more recent qualitative study examining offenders who were successful or who were revoked while on community release, those successful on release were statistically significantly more likely to be rated as managing issues related to substance misuse in a positive manner compared to those who were revoked (Brown et al, in press).

UAL cases were frequently observed among offenders with revocations without an offence and those with an offence. UALs were a common theme in coded information of additional factors not directly related to substance use contributing to decisions to revoke without an offence, and they were the most common offence type among offenders with revocations with an offence. There is a possible link between substance use behaviour among offenders on conditional release in the community and offenders going UAL. While offenders with substance use conditions frequently breached these conditions, the circumstances were often exacerbated when the offender went UAL. Given that a history of alcohol use and a history of drug use were among the variables predictive of offenders going UAL even when other factors are taken into account (Dunbar & Helmus, 2014), this finding is not surprising. In fact, more recent findings

involving a snapshot of offenders who were UAL demonstrated that the majority of men and women who went UAL scored moderate to high on all need domains, with substance abuse and personal/emotional being the most salient need domains (Derkzen, Smeth, & Farrell MacDonald, in press). Other researchers have found a link between substance use and absconding on parole (also referred to as going UAL). For example, using a large sample of offenders on parole in Colorado (n = 30,181), Powers, Kaukinen and Khachatryan (2018) found that the largest predictors of absconding were substance abuse problems and education. In addition, and particularly relevant for the current study, two types of prior parole violations increased the likelihood of absconding, curfew and drug related violations. These authors postulated that:

With regard to drug abuse issues, it is possible that parolees may temporarily abscond in an attempt to bypass a urinalysis or other drug test as part of their parole conditions if they know that they will fail. This suggests the need for careful case management for those paroled offenders entering the community with high needs for substance abuse treatment. Furthermore, future research should systematically disentangle the motivations to abscond among parolees with drug abuse problems to inform prevention efforts. (pp. 4636)

The authors of the present report also recommend further research into the relationship between substance use while under community supervision and going UAL, and whether certain case management approaches can decrease the likelihood that offenders with a history of moderate to severe substance use (especially drug use) go UAL while under community supervision.

Another area of potential focus of future research is the relationship between offenders undergoing correctional programming while under community supervision and substance use related revocations with or without offence, whether it be community-based maintenance programming for offenders who had participated in correctional programming while incarcerated or community-based correctional programming among those who had not completed programming while incarcerated. The current study was not able to fully examine the impact of community-based programming, although the findings demonstrated that Indigenous community maintenance participants may be more likely to breach conditions to not consume alcohol than those who did not participate in community maintenance. Community program participants were

more likely to breach conditions to avoid certain persons if they were non-Indigenous, and not to consume drugs if they were Indigenous. These results may have been due to higher risk among the Community Program participants. Prior research that examined the additive effects that key services and interventions had on the rates of revocations of conditional release for federally sentenced men demonstrated that the completion of correctional programs in the community provided some of the most positive findings (Wilton, Nolan, & Stewart, 2015).

In addition, there are a variety of case management tools, strategies or approaches that case managements teams may use as part of the community supervision of offenders in order to ensure that offenders comply with their special conditions regarding substance use, such as:

- Electronic Monitoring (alcohol/cannabis related establishments)
- Urinalysis Testing
- Opioid Agonist Treatment/Recovery prescription (suboxone/methadone providers)
- Local Community Residential Facilities that offer substance abuse counselling/programs (e.g., Maison Decision House, Seventh Street, Harvest House)
- Collateral contacts (Narcotics Anonymous/Alcoholics Anonymous sponsors, family, friends)
- Reporting Centre
- House confinement
- Reduced curfew/reduced sign out time
- Registered Social Worker/Psychology (CSC)

The use of these tools were not examined in this study and may have had important impacts on outcomes. Future research focusing on the use of these tools and their relationship to outcomes is warranted in order to disentangle the best practices in the community supervision of offenders with a history of moderate to severe substance abuse.

Another promising approach to community supervision that may be particularly impactful for offenders with a history of substance abuse is graduated sanctions, which refers to the imposition of swift, certain and proportionate punishments for offenders who violate the

conditions of their supervision (Taxman, Soule, & Gelb, 1999). Graduated sanctions are official responses to noncompliance, but do not involve the formal revocation of community supervision, and can allow the offender to avoid revocation and remain under community supervision. Within CSC, this approach may be applied when an offender is suspended. Suspension means that an offender's release or long-term supervision order is put on hold due to reasons such as a breach of condition, to prevent a breach of conditions, to protect society, or due to the offender receiving another sentence. Following a suspension, a post-suspension interview will occur between the Parole Officer and the offender where alternatives to return to custody, including changes to the offender's correctional plan may be discussed. This may include the identification of factors that contributed to lapses and relapses, which are not uncommon among those who have substance misuse histories. Strategies that are effective in managing the risks associated with substance use in a specific case can then be supported, and new strategies may be identified to replace those that are not as successful. Given that research has demonstrated that community-based sanctions are as effective in increasing offender compliance as spending time in custody (Wodahl, Boman & Garland, 2015), and that custodial costs are significantly higher than community costs (Public Safety Canada, 2022), this approach of adjusting the offender's correctional plan in response to the violation of conditions and potential increased risk is expected to be as effective and more cost-effective than a return to custody. Furthermore, in a 2019 study (Boman, Mowen, Wodahl, Lee Miller & Miller, 2019) the application of graduated sanctions in response to substance use related violations was found to be significantly associated with increased odds of successful intensive supervision probation completion whereas return to custody was not significantly associated with successful outcomes. It is likely the case that this finding related to probation would also apply to conditional release (i.e., day parole, full parole, statutory release).

### **Limitations**

It is important to note that given that the current study was limited to looking at offenders with moderate or high need in the substance use domain of the DFIA-R. Unsurprisingly, conditions such as not to consume drugs or alcohol were very common within the sample, and these conditions were commonly breached. There may be other factors of more relevance for offenders with lower or no levels of substance use need with respect to community supervisions

success or failure. In these cases, conditions other than substance use conditions may be more frequently breached. For example, in their examination of factors associated with successful release of offenders into the community from CSC institutions, Wardrop, Sheahan and Stewart (2019) found that in addition to substance use related variables (such as not associating with substance abusers), not having an unstable job history and not being impulsive were strongly related to community success among Indigenous and non-Indigenous men. In a qualitative study examining successful and unsuccessful release of offenders into the community, Brown and colleagues (in press) found that in addition to substance misuse, higher levels of criminogenic employment and emotional needs measured at intake and at release combine with lack of social support on release to increase the risk of revocation.

In addition, the current study was restricted to examining offenders who had a revocation. That is, among the entire release cohort (around 19,000 released offenders) this study only included a small slice (less than 10%) of the entire cohort. Therefore, the results of this study are only generalizable to the offenders that meet the same study criteria. For example, the study did not examine cases where offenders were suspended but not revoked; such as, those with a substance use related outcome (i.e., substance use related suspension and/or positive urinalysis result) and where the use of a suspension was effective in preventing a revocation.

It is important to note that the study groups compared program participants, rather than program completers, to those eligible to participate. Fourteen percent of non-Indigenous program participants and 30% of Indigenous program participants did not complete their last enrollment in a multi-target stream of ICPM. While a methodology focusing solely on program completers may over-estimate the positive effects of correctional interventions by excluding program dropouts, focusing on program participants introduces greater variability to the groups of program participants. Finding differences between program participants and eligible non-participants may be more difficult than between program completers and eligible non-participants.

Finally, given the study methodology and sample size, it was not possible to use statistical control or matching methodologies to control for group differences. As a result, it is not possible to clearly link differences in outcomes to the participation (or lack of participation)



in correctional programs and, where differences in outcomes were observed, they may be partly due to pre-existing group differences.

### **Conclusions**

Overall, this study demonstrated that substance use commonly plays a role in revocation among offenders with moderate to high levels of substance use needs. This was particularly the case for drug use. Among offenders who had a revocation without an offence, two-thirds with a 'not to consume drugs' condition breached that condition. Among revocation with an offence cases, parole officers often raised concerns regarding substance use, including observations of breached substance use conditions, and about one-quarter of offenders were intoxicated when the offence was committed. UALs were observed in both revocation with and without an offence cases, and were the most frequent offence type among revocation with an offence cases. In a few cases, substance use appeared to motivate an offender going UAL; offenders would go UAL in order to avoid the detection of drug use. Further research examining the events leading up to offenders going UAL and their motivations may be valuable. Given these results, best practices and approaches in the community to prevent relapse and revocation among conditionally released offenders with moderate to high levels of substance use needs should be further explored.

## References

- Andrews, D.A. & Bonta, J. (2006). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (4th ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexis.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering Psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, (1) 19-52. DOI: 10.1177/0093854890017001004
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52 (1), 7-27. DOI: 10.1177/0011128705281756
- Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-Based Corrections Programs: What Works and What Does Not*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Boman, IV, J. H., Mowen, T. J., Wodahl, E. J., Lee Miller, B., & Miller, J. M. (2019). Responding to substance-use-related probation and parole violations: Are enhanced treatment sanctions preferable to jail sanctions? *Criminal Justice Studies*, 32 (4), 356-370.
- Brown, G. P., Greco, C., Barker, J., McMillan, K., Tiersma, G., Wardrop, K., & Stewart L. A. (in press). *Returns to Custody and Successful Releases: Comparison of Findings from Two Qualitative Studies of Federal Releases* (Research Report R-454). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Canadian Substance Use Costs and Harms Scientific Working Group. (2018). *Canadian Substance Use Costs and Harms (2007-2014)*. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Substance Use Costs and Harms Scientific Working Group.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act SC 1992, c. 20). <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/>
- Correctional Service Canada (2009). *Evaluation report: Correctional Service Canada's Correctional Programs*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2019). *Commissioner's Directive 705-6: Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2020). *Evaluation of Correctional Reintegration Programs*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2021a, December 20). *Correctional Programs*. <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/002/002-0001-en.shtml>

- Correctional Service Canada. (2021b). *Guidelines 726-2: National Correctional Program Referral Guidelines*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2021c). *Commissioner's Directive 726: Correctional Programs*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- de Andrade, D., Ritchie, J., Rowlands, M., Mann, M., & Hides, L. (2018). Substance Use and Recidivism Outcomes for Prison-Based Drug and Alcohol Interventions. *Epidemiological Reviews*, 40, 121-133. DOI: 10.1093/epirev/mxy004.
- Derkzen, D. Smeth, & Farrell MacDonald (in press). *Offenders Currently Unlawfully at Large* (Research in Brief). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Dunbar, L., & Helmus, L. (2014). *Unlawfully at large: A profile of federal offenders who breach conditional release* (Research Report R-271). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Farrell MacDonald, S. (2014). *Severity of Substance Use, Discretionary Release, and Return to Federal Custody* (RS 14-19). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Farrell MacDonald, S., Curno, J., Biro, S.M., & Gobeil, R. (2015). *Patterns of suspension warrants* (Research Report R-368). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service Canada.
- McMurran, M. (2007). What works in substance misuse treatments for Offenders? *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 17, 225-233. DOI: 10.1002/cb.662.
- Motiuk, L., & Vuong, B. (2018). *Development and Validation of a Criminal Risk Index (CRI) for Federally Sentenced Offenders in Canada* (Research Report R-403). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service Canada.
- Pearson, F. S., & Lipton D. S. (1999). A Meta-Analytic Review of the Effectiveness of Corrections-Based Treatments for Drug Abuse. *The Prison Journal*, 79 (4), 384-410.
- Powers, R. A., Kaukinen, C., & Khachatryan, N. (2018). Risk factors for absconding among adult parolees in Colorado. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62 (14), 4622-4641.
- Public Safety Canada (2022). *Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview 2020*. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.
- Seal, D. W., Parisot, M., & DiFranceisco, W. (2012). Substance Use and Sexual Behavior among Men Prior to Parole Revocation: Prevalence and Correlates. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, 18 (2): 96-104. DOI: 10.1177/1078345811435322.
- Stewart, L.A., Wardrop, K., Wilton, G., Thompson, J., Derkzen, D., & Motiuk, L.L. (2017). *Reliability and Validity of the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised*

- (Research Report R-395). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Taxman, F. S., Soule, D., & Gelb, A. (1999). Graduated sanctions: Stepping into accountable systems and offenders. *The Prison Journal*, 79 (2), 182-204.
- Ternes, M., Farrell MacDonald, S., & Cheverie, M. (2019). Substance Use Disorder Typologies of Canadian Federally Sentenced Men: Relationship with Institutional Behavior and Postrelease Success. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 46 (3), 457-474. DOI: 10.1177/0093854818812516
- Wardrop, K., Sheahan, C., & Stewart, L. A. (2019). *A Quantitative Examination of Factors Available in the Offender Management System Associated with Successful Release* (Research Report R-429). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Wilton, G., Nolan, A., & Stewart, L. A. (2015). *The Additive Effects of Participation in Multiple Correctional Interventions and Services for Federally Sentenced Men* (Research Report R-363). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Wilton, G., Stewart, L.A., & Motiuk, L.L. (2017). *Can the Predictive Validity of the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised Be Improved by Calculated Ratings?* (Research Report R-400). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Wodahl, E. J., Boman IV, J. H., & Garland, B. E. (2015). Responding to probation and parole violations: Are jail sanctions more effective than community-based graduated sanctions? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43 (3), 242-250.

**Appendix A: Cohort of Offenders Eligible for inclusion in the study**

Table A1

*Revocation types by study group of the Cohort of Offenders Eligible for Inclusion in the Study.*

	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Revocations without an offence	525	93.1	141	92.8	330	79.9	152	83.5
Revocations with an offence	39	6.9	11	7.2	83	20.1	30	16.5

Table A2

*Profile of the Cohort of Offenders Eligible for Inclusion in the Study: Categorical Variables*

	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
First Federal Sentence	518	91.8	134	88.2	373	90.3	165	90.7
Region of Admission								
Atlantic	87	15.4	10	6.6	20	4.8	6	3.3
Quebec	122	21.6	47	30.9	14	3.4	9	5.0
Ontario	165	29.3	53	34.9	62	15.0	33	18.1
Prairie	159	28.2	30	19.7	289	70.0	128	70.3
Pacific	31	5.5	12	7.9	28	6.8	6	3.3
Release Type								
Parole	282	50.0	35	23.0	141	34.1	16	8.8
Statutory Release	282	50.0	117	77.0	272	65.9	166	91.2
Schedule 1 or Homicide Offence	310	55.0	89	58.6	276	66.8	138	75.8
Index Offence Type								
Homicide	9	2.2	-	-	21	7.4	7	5.9
Robbery	26	6.4	8	7.4	24	8.5	12	10.1
Assault	66	16.3	25	23.2	68	24.0	28	23.5
Sexual	25	6.2	10	9.3	25	8.8	22	18.5
Other Violent	52	12.8	13	12.0	35	12.4	16	13.5
Drug	135	33.3	23	21.3	49	17.3	10	8.4
Property	70	17.3	22	20.4	38	13.4	19	16.0
Other Non-Violent	22	5.4	7	6.5	23	8.1	5	4.2
Race								
White	473	83.9	122	80.3	-	-	-	-
First Nations	-	-	-	-	316	76.5	148	78.6
Métis	-	-	-	-	87	21.1	33	18.1
Inuit	-	-	-	-	10	2.4	6	3.3
Black	36	6.4	11	7.2	-	-	-	-
Other	55	9.8	19	12.5	-	-	-	-

Table A3

*Profile for the Cohort of Offenders Eligible for Inclusion in the Study: Continuous Variables*

	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Age at Admission	33	9.5	32	9.0	30	8.2	29	7.4
Sentence Length (in years)	2.9	1.0	2.6	0.8	3.2	1.2	2.8	1.0
Days from Admission to Release	531	207.0	520	216.7	618	206.9	594	209.8
Days from Release to Revocation	244	147.2	201	124.3	214	148.2	186	115.4

Table A4

*Moderate or High Ratings of Needs across DFIA-R Domains among the Cohort of Offenders Eligible for Inclusion in the Study*

	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Employment Need	331	58.8	105	69.1	332	80.3	160	87.9
Marital/Family Need	223	39.5	60	39.5	242	58.6	120	65.9
Associates Need	449	79.6	122	80.3	337	81.6	149	81.9
Community Functioning Need	178	31.6	67	44.1	208	50.5	117	64.3
Personal/Emotional Need	466	82.6	134	88.2	385	93.2	167	91.8
Attitudes Need	453	80.3	131	86.2	299	72.4	157	86.3

Table A5

*Number of Substance use Domain Indicators Endorsed*

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Non-Indigenous Program Participants	11.7	3.52	3 to 18
Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	12.2	3.84	2 to 18
Indigenous Program Participants	13.7	3.39	1 to 18
Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	13.6	3.40	1 to 18

Table A6

*Frequencies of Substance use Domain Indicators Endorsed for the Cohort of Offenders Eligible for Inclusion in the Study*

Indicator	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Early age of alcohol use	340	61.3	101	68.2	360	87.6	161	89.9
Frequently engages in binge drinking	217	40.6	66	46.2	256	63.2	103	59.2
Has combined the use of alcohol and drugs	382	81.7	109	77.9	352	87.1	164	91.1
Alcohol use interferes with employment	150	28.0	47	33.8	198	49.4	84	48.0
Alcohol use interferes with interpersonal relationships	227	41.5	74	51.4	275	68.6	121	67.2
Alcohol use interferes with physical or emotional well-being	240	43.9	76	52.4	260	64.4	113	63.5
Excessive alcohol use is part of the offender's lifestyle	304	38.0	68	46.9	245	61.0	114	64.0
Early age drug use	403	72.2	113	75.3	370	90.0	169	93.9
Has gone on drug-taking bouts or binges	453	83.3	125	86.2	353	86.3	147	83.1
Has combined the use of different drugs	433	80.3	117	83.0	325	81.3	142	80.7
Drug use interferes with employment	389	72.6	105	72.4	273	67.9	117	68.0



Table A6 *cont.*

Indicator	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Drug use interferes with interpersonal relationships	458	82.8	122	82.4	334	82.5	147
Drug use interferes with physical or emotional well-being	484	86.9	124	83.2	335	81.9	147	82.6
Regular drug use is part of the offender's lifestyle	501	90.1	136	89.5	366	89.5	163	91.6
Alcohol or drug use has resulted in law violations	530	94.6	141	93.4	402	97.6	179	98.4
Becomes violent when drinking or using drugs	320	62.3	96	70.6	317	79.5	147	86.0
Alcohol and/or drug use is part of the offence cycle	524	93.9	140	92.7	404	98.1	169	93.4
Has previously been referred to programs addressing deficit(s)	321	57.5	92	60.5	217	52.8	92	51.4

Table A7

*Criminal Risk Index Categories of the Cohort of Offenders Eligible for Inclusion in the Study*

	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	High	119	21.1	55	36.2	132	32.0	87
High Moderate	100	17.7	47	30.9	72	17.4	36	19.8
Moderate	195	34.6	30	19.7	114	27.6	34	18.9
Low Moderate	144	25.5	19	12.5	93	22.5	25	13.7
Low	6	1.1	1	0.7	2	0.5	-	-

**Appendix B: Coding Manual of Substance-Use Related Outcomes on Community  
Supervision**

**Substance Use Need and Related Community Outcomes: Comparing  
Correctional Program Participants to Eligible Non-Participants**

\*\*\*Be sure to refer to Coding Guideline document, as needed\*\*

Coder Name:	
Coding Date:	

**Offender Information** (comes from extracted data)

FPS number:	Nothing to enter in spreadsheet.
Supervision Type:	Nothing to enter in spreadsheet. Day parole_____ Full parole_____ Statutory Release_____

**Supervision Conditions** (comes from extracted data)

Which conditions were imposed?

<b>CONDITION</b>	<b>[Yes = 1, No = 0]</b>
1. Not to consume drugs	Nothing to enter in spreadsheet.
2. Avoid certain persons	
3. Not to consume alcohol	
4. Follow Treatment Plan	
5. Report Relationships	
6. Seek Employment	
7. Avoid Victims	
8. Reside at Place	
9. Avoid Drinking Establishments	
10. Financial Disclosure	
11. Respect curfew	
12. Telecommunications Restrictions	
13. Take medication as prescribed	
14. Psychological or Psychiatric Counselling/Treatment	
15. Avoid Children	
16. Motor vehicle restrictions	
17. Other (specify):	

Date and type of documents reviewed  
 What documents were reviewed during coding?

Document Type	Date of the Document
A4D	

**Revocation without an Offence Information**

1. Revocation without an offence? [Yes = 1, No = 0] ( <i>comes from extracted data</i> )	Nothing to enter in spreadsheet.
➔ If YES, revocation date (dd/mm/yyyy): (comes from extracted data)	Nothing to enter in spreadsheet.
2. Did one or more <b>breached conditions</b> lead to the revocation without an offence? [Yes = 1, No = 0]	

➔ If YES, what <b>breached conditions</b> led to the revocation without an offence? ( <i>select multiple if applicable</i> )	1. Not to Consume Drugs 2. Avoid Certain Persons 3. Not to Consume Alcohol 4. Follow Treatment Plan 5. Report Relationships 6. Seek Employment 7. Avoid Victims 8. Reside at Place 9. Avoid Drinking Establishments 10. Financial Disclosure 11. Respect Curfew 12. Telecommunications Restrictions 13. Take Medication as Prescribed 14. Psychological or Psychiatric Counselling/Treatment 15. Avoid Children 16. Motor Vehicle Restrictions 17. Other (specify):_____
3. Was a substance use-related breached condition recorded as a reason for the revocation without an offence? [Yes = 1, No = 0]	

<p>➔ If YES, which substance use-related conditions were breached?</p>	<p>1. Not to Consume Drugs  2. Not to Consume Alcohol  3. Follow Treatment Plan (check to ensure the treatment plan pertains to substance use)  4. Avoid Drinking Establishments  5. Take Medication as Prescribed (check to ensure the treatment plan pertains to substance use)  6. Psychological or Psychiatric Counselling/Treatment  17. Other (specify): _____</p>
<p>4. Was a non-substance use related breached condition recorded as a reason for the revocation without an offence? [Yes = 1, No = 0]</p>	
<p>➔ If YES, which non-substance use-related conditions were breached?</p>	
<p>5. Did substance use-related factors, other than the specific substance use related conditions (captured in 3), influence the decision to revoke without an offence? [Yes = 1, No = 0]</p>	
<p>➔ If YES, what were these factors (<i>list all</i>)?</p>	
<p>6. Did other factors contribute to the decision to revoke without an offence? [Yes = 1, No = 0]</p>	
<p>➔ If YES, what were these factors (<i>list all</i>)?</p>	
<p>7. Was a <b>primary</b> reason for the revocation without an offence indicated or implied by the Parole Officer? [Yes = 1, No = 0]</p>	
<p>If YES,  ➔ What was the <b>primary</b> reason?</p>	
<p>➔ Was the <b>primary</b> reason related to substance use? [Yes = 1, No = 0]</p>	
<p>➔ Was the <b>primary</b> reason due to a <b>breach of a condition</b>? [Yes = 1, No = 0]</p>	
<p>➔ Was the <b>primary</b> reason due to a <b>breach of a condition</b> related to substance use? [Yes = 1, No = 0]</p>	
<p>➔ What was the <b>primary</b> breached condition that led to the revocation without an offence?</p>	

### Revocation with an Offence Information

1. Revocation with an offence or offences? [Yes = 1, No = 0] ( <i>comes from extracted data</i> )	Nothing to enter in spreadsheet.
➔ If YES, revocation date (dd/mm/yyyy): (comes from extracted data)	Nothing to enter in spreadsheet.
2. Was at least one of the offence(s) a substance use offence? (e.g., drug offences, possession, trafficking, driving while intoxicated, etc.) [Yes = 1, No = 0]	
➔ If YES, what substance use offence(s) led to the revocation? ( <i>if more than one, list all</i> )	
3. Was at least one of the offence(s) a non-substance use offence? [Yes = 1, No = 0]	
➔ If YES, what non-substance use offence(s) led to the revocation? ( <i>if more than one, list all</i> )	
4. Was substance use a motivation in the commission of at least one of the offence(s)? (e.g., the offence was motivated by the acquisition of a substance, the offender went UAL after a urinalysis test, etc.) [Yes = 1, No/Information unavailable = 0]	
➔ If YES, how was substance use involved in the offence(s)?	
5. Was at least one of the offence(s) committed while in an inebriated state? (i.e., under the influence or intoxicated by drugs/alcohol) [Yes = 1, No/Information unavailable = 0]	

6. Did the Correctional Parole Officer raise concerns about the offenders' substance use behaviours while under supervision before the commission of at least one of offence? [Yes = 1, No/Information unavailable = 0]	
7. Was a substance use-related breached condition recorded as a reason for the revocation <i>in addition to</i> the offence(s)? [Yes = 1, No = 0]	
→ If YES, which substance use-related conditions were breached?	
→ If OTHER, specify.	
8. Was a non-substance use related breached condition recorded as a reason for the revocation <i>in addition to</i> the offence(s)? [Yes = 1, No = 0]	
→ If YES, which non-substance use-related conditions were breached?	

**Additional Information**

Additional substance-use related information: Is there any other information in the A4D that would be relevant to this study? Please specify in point form. (e.g., participation in NA, AA, or living in a recovery home, rules of the residence, etc.).	
Additional non-substance use related contributions: Is there any other information in the A4D that would be relevant to this study (not specific to substance use)? Please specify in point form. (e.g., associating with anti-social or criminal peers)	
Any other general comments?	

## Appendix C: Profile of Coded Cases

Within program participant and eligible non-participant groups of Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders, program participants and eligible non-participants did not differ significantly from one another on several variables such as percentage serving their first federal sentence, percentage with a violent offence (i.e., schedule 1<sup>14</sup> or homicide) and with selected offence types, race distribution, average age, average time incarcerated until release, average number of DFIA-R substance use domain indicators endorsed<sup>15</sup>, and percentage with selected DFIA-R substance use indicators. However, important differences between groups included the following:

- Non-Indigenous program participants were more likely to be from the Atlantic, Prairie, and Pacific regions than the eligible non-participants;
- Offenders in the eligible non-participants group and Indigenous offenders were much less likely to be released on day or full parole than non-Indigenous Program Participants;
- With respect to specific index offence, notable differences existed between non-Indigenous program participants and eligible non-participants on assault (8.8% vs. 12.4%), other violent (3.5% vs. 6.5%) and drug offences (18.2% vs. 10.6%). For Indigenous offenders, differences were found between program participants and eligible non-participants for assaults (14.5% vs. 11.5%), and other violent offences (9.6% vs. 7.2%);
- Non-Indigenous program participants' sentence length was significantly longer than non-Indigenous eligible non-participants (2.9 years vs. 2.6 years). Indigenous program participants also had significantly longer sentence lengths compared to their non-Indigenous counterparts (3.2 years vs 2.9 years);
- Non-Indigenous program participants spent significantly more time in the community before their release was revoked than non-Indigenous eligible non-participants (240 days

---

<sup>14</sup> The Criminal Code of Canada defines Schedule 1 offences. They are generally violent or sexual in nature. Conviction of a Schedule 1 offence means longer periods of parole ineligibility, and the PBC may impose a residency condition on statutory release.

<sup>15</sup> The mean number of substance use domain indicators endorsed can serve as an indication of need in the domain and is more strongly related to revocations outcomes than the substance use domain rating (see Wilton, Stewart & Motiuk, 2017).

vs. 202 days). However, the two Indigenous groups did not differ significantly on the time spent in the community prior to revocation;

- With respect to those rated at having moderate or high need ratings across six of the DFIA-R domains, Indigenous program participants had statistically significantly fewer cases with moderate or high need on the Community Functioning and Attitude need domains. Otherwise, the two groups of Indigenous offenders had similar need ratings. For non-Indigenous coded cases, the program participant and eligible non-participant groups had similar proportions of moderate or high need ratings across the domains.
- The mean number of DFIA-R substance use domain indicators endorsed suggests that the program participant and eligible non-participant groups had similar degree of need in this domain. On average, non-Indigenous program participants had just less than 12 of 18 indicators endorsed, and eligible non-participants had just over 12 ( $t(241) = 1.2, p = .231$ ). Indigenous program participants had nearly 14 of the 18 indicators endorsed on average, compared to about 13 and a half for Indigenous eligible non-participants ( $t(240) = 0.81, p = .421$ ).
- With regard to specific DFIA-R substance use indicators, among non-Indigenous offenders, program participants differed from the eligible non-participant counterparts on “Frequently engages in binge drinking” (36% vs. 49%), “Alcohol use interferes with interpersonal relationships” (34% vs. 54%), “Alcohol use interferes with physical or emotional well-being” (39% vs. 53%), and “Excessive alcohol use is part of the offender's lifestyle” (36% vs. 48%). Indigenous program participants differed from the eligible non-participant counterparts on “Becomes violent when drinking or using drugs” (76% vs. 89%).
- For both non-Indigenous and Indigenous men, the program participant and eligible non-participant groups were significantly different in their risk levels measured on the CRI<sup>16</sup>. In

---

<sup>16</sup> The CRI is a measure of criminal history risk, examining prior youth and adult convictions and current criminal offences. The CRI scores were one of the inclusion criteria for the study since it is the main consideration in



both analyses, the eligible non-participant groups had higher risk ratings than the program participant groups.

---

eligibility for participation in correctional reintegration programs. The low frequencies of “low moderate” and “low” ratings were expected. The low moderate and low ratings were combined into one category in Table C6 for this reason. For both non-Indigenous and Indigenous men, the program participant and eligible non-participant groups were significantly different in their risk levels measured on the CRI (Non-Indigenous:  $\chi^2(3) = 23.01, p < .001$ ; Indigenous:  $\chi^2(3) = 13.72, p = .003$ ).

Table C1

*Profile of the coded cases in the study: Categorical variables.*

Variable	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
	First Federal Sentence	112	91.8	108			89.3	0.46	0.498	110		
Region of Admission					14.09	.007					7.53	.110
Atlantic	21	17.2	9	7.4			9	7.4	2	1.7		
Quebec	20	16.4	38	31.4			4	3.3	3	2.5		
Ontario	34	27.9	42	34.7			11	9.0	20	16.7		
Prairie	36	29.5	25	20.7			91	74.6	90	75.0		
Pacific	11	9.0	7	5.8			7	5.7	5	4.2		
Release Type					29.57	<.001					14.98	<.001
Parole	64	52.5	23	19.0			35	28.7	11	9.2		
Statutory Release	58	47.5	98	80.9			87	71.3	109	90.8		
Violent Index Offence	69	56.6	75	62.0	0.74	.389	89	73.0	87	72.5	0.01	.937

Table C1 *cont.*

Variable	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
	Index Offence Type							9.56	0.215			
Homicide	2	2.4	-	-			4	4.7	5	6.2		
Robbery	8	9.6	7	8.1			9	10.6	8	9.9		
Assault	15	18.1	21	24.1			24	28.2	19	23.5		
Sexual	5	6.0	8	9.2			8	9.4	10	12.4		
Other Violent	6	7.2	11	12.6			16	18.8	12	14.8		
Drug	31	37.4	18	20.7			9	10.6	9	11.1		
Property	12	14.5	17	19.5			10	11.8	14	17.3		
Other Non-Violent	4	4.8	5	5.8			5	5.9	4	4.9		
Race					3.07 <sup>a</sup>	.215					< 0.01 <sup>b</sup>	1.00
White	99	81.2	97	80.2			-	-	-	-		
First Nations	-	-	-	-			98	80.3	96	80		
Métis	-	-	-	-			22	18.0	22	18.3		
Inuit	-	-	-	-			2	1.6	2	1.7		
Black	5	4.1	11	9.1			-	-	-	-		
Other	18	14.8	13	10.7			-	-	-	-		

<sup>a</sup>This chi-square test compared non-Indigenous groups – White, Black, and Other program participants and eligible non-participants.

<sup>b</sup>This chi-square test compared Indigenous groups – First Nations, Métis, and Inuit program participants and eligible non-participants.

Table C2

*Profile of the coded cases in the study: Continuous variables*

	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non- Participants		<i>t</i> (241)	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non- Participants		<i>t</i> (240)	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Age at Admission	32	9.2	30	8.2	1.74	.083	30	8.2	29	7.7	1.11	.269
Sentence Length (in years)	3.0	1.0	2.6	0.8	2.69	.008	3.2	1.2	2.9	1.1	2.16	.032
Days from Admission to Release	532	215.3	531	211.5	0.07	.945	618	206.9	608	215.3	0.37	.714
Days from Release to Revocation	240	127.2	202	116.2	2.45	.015	214	148.2	184	113.7	1.77	.077

Table C3

*Moderate or High Ratings of Needs across DFIA-R Domains among coded cases*

	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
	Employment Need	78	64.5	82			67.8	0.30	.587	104		
Marital/Family Need	48	39.3	43	35.5	0.38	.540	73	59.8	79	65.8	0.93	.335
Associates Need	101	82.8	96	79.3	0.47	.493	98	80.3	99	82.5	0.19	.664
Community Functioning Need	41	33.9	51	42.2	1.75	.185	63	51.6	85	70.8	9.38	.002
Personal/Emotional Need	100	82.0	107	88.4	2.01	.156	114	93.4	109	90.8	0.57	.451
Attitude Need	98	80.3	100	82.6	0.22	.642	87	71.3	104	86.7	8.58	.003

Table C4

*Number of Substance use Domain Indicators Endorsed among coded cases*

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Non-Indigenous Program Participants	11.61	3.55	3 to 18
Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants <sup>a</sup>	12.17	3.81	3 to 18
Indigenous Program Participants	13.89	3.32	1 to 18
Indigenous Eligible non-Participants <sup>b</sup>	13.54	3.46	1 to 18

<sup>a</sup> Non-Indigenous program participants and eligible non-participants did not significantly differ in the number of substance abuse indicators endorsed ( $t(241) = 1.20, p = .231$ ).

<sup>b</sup> Non-Indigenous program participants and eligible non-participants did not significantly differ in the number of substance abuse indicators endorsed ( $t(241) = 0.81, p = .421$ ).

Table C5

*Proportions of offenders in each study group with Substance use Domain Indicators Endorsed among coded cases*

Substance Use Indicator	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
	Early age of alcohol use	74	61.2	80			67.2	0.96	.327	104		
Frequently engages in binge drinking	43	36.1	56	49.1	4.02	.045	77	65.8	71	61.2	0.53	.465
Has combined the use of alcohol and drugs	83	70.9	85	78.0	1.47	.226	108	91.5	109	91.6	0.00	.984
Alcohol use interferes with employment	27	23.3	39	34.8	3.69	.055	60	50.4	57	49.6	0.02	.896
Alcohol use interferes with interpersonal relationships	41	34.5	62	53.9	8.99	.003	87	74.4	76	64.4	2.74	.098
Alcohol use interferes with physical or emotional well-being	47	39.2	61	52.6	4.28	.039	78	66.1	72	61.5	0.53	.467
Excessive alcohol use is part of the offender's lifestyle	42	35.6	56	48.3	3.87	.049	76	64.41	73	62.4	0.10	.749
Early age drug use	86	71.1	90	75.0	0.47	.492	112	92.6	110	93.2	0.04	.843
Has gone on drug-taking bouts or binges	102	85.0	100	84.8	< 0.01	.956	106	89.1	95	81.9	2.45	.118

Table C5 *cont.*

Substance Use Indicator	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
	Has combined the use of different drugs	97	82.9	94			84.7	0.13	.716	102		
Drug use interferes with employment	85	74.6	79	69.3	0.78	.377	85	71.4	79	69.9	0.06	.800
Drug use interferes with interpersonal relationships	103	85.8	96	80.7	1.14	.285	103	85.8	97	82.9	0.39	.535
Drug use interferes with physical or emotional well-being	106	89.1	97	81.5	2.71	.100	102	84.3	96	82.1	0.21	.643
Regular drug use is part of the offender's lifestyle	114	95.0	107	88.4	3.42	.065	110	90.9	104	89.7	0.11	.744
Alcohol or drug use has resulted in law violations	113	92.6	111	91.7	0.07	.797	119	98.4	119	99.2	0.33	.566
Becomes violent when drinking or using drugs	68	59.1	79	70.5	3.23	.072	88	75.9	99	89.2	6.94	.008

Table C5 *cont.*

Substance Use Indicator	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
	Alcohol and/or drug use is part of the offence cycle	117	96.7	111			91.7	2.73	.099	119		
Has previously been referred to programs addressing deficit(s)	68	57.1	70	57.9	0.01	.912	59	48.8	57	48.7	0.00	.995

Table C6

*Criminal Risk Index Categories among Coded Cases*

	Non-Indigenous Program Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Program Participants		Indigenous Eligible non-Participants		$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%		
							23.01	< .001				
High	22	18.0	48	39.7			37	30.3	57	47.5		
High Moderate	27	22.1	36	29.8			19	15.6	26	21.7		
Moderate	40	32.8	19	15.7			39	32.0	20	16.7		
Low Moderate or Low	33	27.1	18	14.9			27	22.1	17	14.2		



### Appendix D: Suspension Activities of Cancelled Suspensions

Table 1

*Frequencies of suspension activity categories of cancelled suspensions across study groups of coded cases with revocations without an offence*

Category of Suspension Activity	All Coded Cases		Non-Indigenous Participants		Non-Indigenous Eligible Non-Participants		$\chi^2$ (1)	<i>p</i>	Indigenous Participants		Indigenous Eligible Non-Participants		$\chi^2$ (1)	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Breach of Conditions <sup>a</sup>	52	12.2	14	12.3	12	10.7	0.14	.712	10	10.0	16	15.7	1.46	.228
Breach of Substance Use Conditions <sup>b</sup>	49	11.5	14	12.3	11	9.8	0.35	.556	9	9.0	15	14.7	1.57	.210
Breach Not to Consume Drugs <sup>c</sup>	43	10.1	12	10.5	9	8.0	0.42	.519	7	7.0	15	14.7	3.09	.079
Fail to Report, Walkaway <sup>d</sup>	20	4.7	4	3.5	4	3.6	<0.01	.980	5	5.0	7	6.9	0.31	.576
Increasing Risk/Deteriorating Behaviour <sup>e</sup>	52	12.2	14	12.3	11	9.8	0.35	.556	16	16.0	11	10.8	1.19	.276
Other Reasons <sup>f</sup>	20	4.7	7	6.1	5	4.5	0.316	.574	4	4.0	4	3.9	<.01	.977

Note: Percentages indicate the proportion of offenders in each study group with a cancelled suspension due to the specified suspension activity. Columns do not sum to the number of offenders in each study group who had cancelled suspensions because some offenders

had multiple suspensions and some had multiple suspension activities.

<sup>a</sup> Breach of conditions suspension activities included Breach to Follow Treatment Plan, Breach Avoid Persons – Victims, Breach Avoid Certain Persons, Breach Not to Consume Alcohol, Breach Not to Consume Drugs, Refuse/Unable to Provide Urine Sample, and Breach of Standard Conditions.

<sup>b</sup> Breach of Substance use Conditions suspension activities included Breach Not to Consume Alcohol, Breach Not to Consume Drugs, Refuse/Unable to Provide Urine Sample

<sup>c</sup> Breach not to consume drugs is a single response option of suspension activities. It accounts for the majority of the Breaches of Substance Use Conditions category.

<sup>d</sup> Fail to Report, Walkaway suspension activities included Whereabouts Unknown, Fail to Report to CBRF (Excluding CCCs), Fail to Return to CBRF (Excluding CCCs), Fail to Return to CCC, Walkaway from CCC, Walkaway from CBRF (Excluding CCCs), and Fail to Report to CCC.

<sup>e</sup> Increasing Risk/Deteriorating Behaviour did not combine different suspension activities.

<sup>f</sup> Other Reasons included Suspicion of Criminal Activity, Violation of CBRF Rules or Withdrawal of Support, Other, New Criminal Charge, and New Conviction.