

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Regional Profiles of the Canadian In-Custody Women Federal Offender Population

2023 N° R-467

ISBN: 978-0-660-68105-4

Cat. No.: PS83-3/467E-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.

Regional Profiles of the Canadian In-Custody Women Federal Offender Population

Kayla Wanamaker

&

Nick Chadwick

Correctional Service of Canada

2023

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Andrea Moser and Sara Johnson for your thoughtful and thorough reviews of early drafts of the report. We would also like to thank Leslie Anne Keown for her feedback on the methodology, Geoff Wilton for his support with the data extraction, Daniella Filoso for her assistance with the annotated bibliography and literature search for this study, and Wardah Mahboob for her assistance with the creation of the tables in this report. We would also like to express our gratitude to all the personnel who participated in consultations on this report, including Brigitte Bouchard, Marie-Lynn Bériau, Karen Sorenson, Marie-Christine Pépin, Hilary Cockerill, and Julie Sénécal from the Women Offenders Sector, and Jessica Feiereisen and Sandra Molyneux from the Indigenous Initiatives Directorate.

Executive Summary

Key words: *women offenders, in-custody profile, regional comparison*

Recent research has demonstrated that the national profile of in-custody women has changed over time, with a particular shift in the custody profile over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, changes are marked by a greater proportion of women rated as poor or very poor criminal risk ratings, more likely to be serving a sentence for a violent offence, and more likely to be rated as having a high overall level of criminogenic need (Motiuk & Keown, 2022). The current study examined regional profiles for in-custody women at three time points to further understand these differences and to provide more nuanced findings that can be used to inform planning around resource allocation, infrastructure needs, and population management.

Three fiscal year end (FYE) snapshots were examined for the purpose of this study. All women who were federally incarcerated at the end of fiscal years 2011/12 ($N = 593$), 2016/17 ($N = 635$), and 2021/22 ($N = 558$) comprised the cohort for that given year. Data extracted from the Offender Management System (OMS) were analyzed to construct profiles for each region that contained information pertaining to demographics, sentence and offence information, and risk and need assessments.

Analyses focused on describing the regional profile of in-custody women at each FYE snapshot, with an examination of how the profile had changed across the three time points as well as how regions differed from each other. A national profile was also examined for reference purposes.

Results indicated that the profiles of women across regions differed in a few meaningful ways. For example, at FYE 2021/22, most women in the Atlantic, Ontario, and Quebec region were White, whereas the majority of women in Pacific and Prairie region were Indigenous. Sentences between 2 to 4 years were most common in the Atlantic, Ontario, and Prairie regions, while indeterminate sentences were most common for women in Pacific and Quebec. In addition, the proportion of women affiliated with a security threat group varied considerably across regions, with the highest proportion in the Prairie region (21%).

Most regions also demonstrated changes in their profiles over time. The general pattern observed across most regions was that women at FYE 2021/22 had more complex and elevated levels of risk and need, and a greater proportion had a need for substance use treatment and correctional programming compared to the earlier cohorts. Additionally, Indigenous women made up the largest proportion of in-custody women in FYE 2021/22, whereas for earlier cohorts, White women made up the largest proportion of in-custody women.

The most recent regional profiles had some notable changes compared to 5- and 10- years ago, which may have been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the noted changes in the most recent regional profiles, resource allocation, population management, and infrastructure planning can be informed by the results of this study. Future research to understand these differences would be beneficial, as well as to explore other important areas of women's corrections, such as the impact of transfers on access to programming and visits.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	vii
Introduction.....	1
Current Study	2
Method	3
Participants.....	3
Data.....	3
Plan of Analysis	5
Results.....	7
Part I: National Profile of In-Custody Federal Women Offenders	7
Demographic information.....	7
Sentence and offence information	8
Risk and need information	9
Indigenous corrections	12
Summary of national profile for in-custody women.....	13
Part II: Regional Profiles of In-Custody Federal Women Offenders	14
Atlantic Region	14
Demographic information.....	14
Sentence and offence information	15
Risk and need information	16
Summary of findings for Atlantic region.....	19
Quebec Region.....	20
Demographic information.....	20
Sentence and offence information	21
Risk and need information	22
Summary of findings for Quebec region	25
Ontario Region.....	26

Demographic information	26
Sentence and offence information	27
Risk and need information	28
Indigenous corrections	31
Summary of findings for Ontario region	32
Prairie Region	32
Demographic information	33
Sentence and offence information	34
Risk and need information	34
Indigenous corrections	37
Summary of findings for Prairie region	38
Pacific Region	39
Demographic information	39
Sentence and offence information	40
Risk and need information	41
Indigenous corrections	44
Summary of findings for Pacific region	45
Discussion	47
Limitations	49
Conclusion	51
References	52

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Demographic Information for In-Custody Women over Time</i>	8
Table 2 <i>Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women over Time</i>	9
Table 3 <i>Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women over Time</i>	11
Table 4 <i>Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women over Time</i>	12
Table 5 <i>Indigenous Corrections information for In-Custody Women over Time</i>	13
Table 6 <i>Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Atlantic Region over Time</i>	15
Table 7 <i>Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Atlantic Region over Time</i>	16
Table 8 <i>Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Atlantic Region over time</i>	18
Table 9 <i>Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Atlantic Region over Time</i>	19
Table 10 <i>Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Quebec Region over Time</i> ...	21
Table 11 <i>Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Quebec Region over Time</i>	22
Table 12 <i>Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Quebec Region over Time</i> ..	24
Table 13 <i>Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Quebec Region over Time</i>	25
Table 14 <i>Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time</i> ...	27
Table 15 <i>Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time</i>	28
Table 16 <i>Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time</i> ..	30
Table 17 <i>Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time</i>	31
Table 18 <i>Indigenous Corrections information for In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time</i>	32
Table 19 <i>Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time</i>	33
Table 20 <i>Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time</i>	34
Table 21 <i>Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time</i> ...	36

Table 22 <i>Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time</i>	37
Table 23 <i>Indigenous Corrections information for In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time</i>	38
Table 24 <i>Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time</i>	40
Table 25 <i>Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time</i>	41
Table 26 <i>Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time</i> ...	43
Table 27 <i>Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time</i>	44
Table 28 <i>Indigenous Corrections information for In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time</i>	45

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic Information at Each Time Point by Region.....	53
Appendix B: Offence and Sentencing Information at Each Time Point by Region	56
Appendix C: Risk and Need Information at Each Time Point by Region	59
Appendix D: Indigenous Corrections Information at Each Time Point by Region.....	68
Appendix E: Demographic Information for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Women at Each Time Point by Region.....	71

Introduction

Although women represent a small proportion of the federally incarcerated population in Canada (e.g., 5% at year-end of 2020/21; Motiuk, 2022), over the past 20 years, the rate of women in federal correctional institutions has increased by 50% (Balfour, 2020). Over this same period, criminal justice research, as well as policy and program development have come to recognize the distinctiveness of women offenders in comparison to men. As such, enhancing understanding around the characteristics of women offenders can help ensure that correctional programs, policies, and institutional services are responsive to women's unique risk and needs and adequately account for women's demographic, sentencing, and offence information. In turn, this further supports the Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) goal of enhancing public safety through the use of effective rehabilitation efforts with incarcerated women.

Previous examinations of federal in-custody women have found that over half of women have less than a high school diploma and unstable accommodations, and that the majority of women were unemployed at the time of their arrest and were experiencing financial instability (findings from mid-year in the 2020/21 fiscal year; Motiuk & Keown, 2021). In other recent reports, it was found that about 6% of women in custody are affiliated with a security threat group (STG; Cram & Farrell MacDonald; 2022), and that over half of women in custody have moderate to severe substance use issues (Farrell MacDonald & Cram, 2023). These findings highlight key programming needs and operational considerations that can have an impact on resource allocation, infrastructure, and population management.

It is also important to consider trends and changes over time among the population of in-custody women as this information can be used to inform future needs in relation to women offender programming and institutional requirements. Recent examinations have found that women in federal custody have become more diverse over time (Motiuk & Arnet-Zargarian, 2021), with an increase in the proportion of Indigenous women admitted to federal custody from 1995/96 to 2020/21 (Motiuk, 2022). In comparison to 2014/15, research has demonstrated that women in custody in 2019/20 were slightly older, had longer sentences, were less likely to be housed in maximum-security settings, and were less violent (Motiuk & Arnet-Zargarian, 2021). Further, when considering the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the federal custody population profile of women, it was found that, in comparison to 2019/20, women in custody in

2021/22 were more likely to have poor or very poor criminal risk ratings, more likely to be serving a sentence for a violent offence, were slightly older, and were more likely to be assessed with high criminogenic need (Motiuk & Keown, 2022). However, it was also found that there continued to be a high proportion of women serving a sentence of less than 4 years. In addition, it was found that the proportion of women who were Indigenous had increased, whereas the proportion of women who belonged to other ethnocultural groups decreased. Taken together, these findings can assist with determining key areas where additional resources may be required (e.g., Indigenous services).

Current Study

Although there have been a number of research reports and briefs focusing specifically on women offenders, including profile examinations of the in-custody women population (e.g., CSC, 2022; Motiuk, 2022; Motiuk & Arnet-Zargarian, 2021), these findings have focused on results at the national-level. Given that the in-custody population of women may differ across regions in terms of demographics, sentencing and offence information, and risk and need information, it is imperative to examine the regional profiles of in-custody women to gain a more fulsome understanding of the operational and programming requirements within each region. Further, given the changes of the national in-custody women population over time, as evidenced by previous CSC research reports, a more thorough understanding of the changes and trends at the regional-level is warranted and can assist with future planning around resource allocation, infrastructure needs, and population management.

The goal of the current study is to examine the regional profile of women in custody at FYE 2021/22 and provide insight on how the profiles have changed over a 5- and 10-year period (i.e., since FYE 2011/12 and FYE 2016/17). The following three research questions will be addressed:

1. What is the national profile of the in-custody women offender population at FYE 2021/22?
2. What are the regional profiles of the in-custody women offender population at FYE 2021/22?
3. How has the in-custody profile of women within each region (and nationally) changed over time (i.e., from FYE 2016/17 and from FYE 2011/12)?

Method

Participants

Three FYE snapshots were examined for the purpose of this study. All women who were federally incarcerated¹ at the end of fiscal years 2011/12 ($N = 593$)², 2016/17 ($N = 635$)³, and 2021/22 ($N = 558$)⁴ comprised the cohort for that given year. Although rare, it was possible for an individual to be represented in multiple cohorts if they remained incarcerated for several years or were readmitted following a release to the community, or if they began a new federal sentence that overlapped with one or more of the later cohorts.⁵ As a result of relying on a FYE snapshot, admission dates for the cohorts varied considerably, ranging from 1979 to 2022.⁶

Data

Administrative data were extracted from the Offender Management System (OMS). The OMS is an electronic system containing offender file information. Variables included demographic characteristics, risk/need assessments, sentence length, offence information, offender security level placement, interest in components of the Indigenous Continuum of Care, and STG affiliation. Results are primarily based on assessments that were completed as part of the Offender Intake Assessment process at CSC. Need profiles were derived from the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis (DFIA) or the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis-

¹ CSC operates five women offender institutions across Canada as well as an Indigenous Healing Lodge. Each of the five regions have a women's institution (Atlantic region = Nova Institution for Women; Quebec region = Joliette Institution for Women; Ontario region = Grand Valley Institution for Women; Prairie region = Edmonton Institution for Women; Pacific region = Fraser Valley Institution for Women). Additionally, the Prairie region houses one CSC-operated healing lodge (Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge) as well as two healing lodges operated by community or partner agencies under Section 81 of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA; 1992)* (Buffalo Sage for Women and Eagle Women's Healing Lodge). For the Prairie region, findings could not be further disaggregated by facility due to sample sizes.

² Regional distribution of women in the FYE 2011/12 cohort was: Atlantic = 61 (10%), Quebec = 91 (15%), Ontario = 183 (31%), Prairie = 179 (30%), Pacific = 79 (13%).

³ Regional distribution of women in the FYE 2016/17 cohort was: Atlantic = 72 (11%), Quebec = 98 (15%), Ontario = 159 (25%), Prairie = 232 (37%), Pacific = 74 (12%).

⁴ Regional distribution of women in the FYE 2021/22 cohort was: Atlantic = 56 (10%), Quebec = 74 (13%), Ontario = 172 (31%), Prairie = 192 (34%), Pacific = 64 (11%).

⁵ There were 1,588 unique individuals reflected across the 3 cohorts (1,431 were reflected once, 116 were included in two cohorts, and 41 women were present in all three cohorts, totaling the $N = 1,786$ observations reflected throughout this report).

⁶ 60% of women in the 2011/12 FYE cohort were admitted during that same FY; 59% of the 2016/17 FYE were admitted during that same fiscal year (FY); and 56% of the 2021/22 FYE cohort were admitted during that same FY.

Revised (DFIA-R) tool completed at intake,⁷ which evaluates the level of criminogenic need across seven domains: employment and education, marital and family, associates, attitudes, substance abuse, community functioning, and personal and emotional. To provide insight on additional areas that may be particularly relevant for women offenders, indicators measuring parental responsibility and educational achievement were drawn from DFIA/DFIA-R items. Parental responsibility refers to whether the individual has children considered dependents under the age of 18. Whether the individual had a high school diploma or equivalent was assessed as a measure of education achievement.

To limit the amount of missing data for women who were admitted close to the end of the fiscal year and had not yet had the intake process completed, data from assessments completed within six months of FYE were included for analysis. Ratings based on offender intake assessments⁸ were used for overall static factor level, overall dynamic factor level, Criminal Risk Index (CRI)⁹, DFIA/DFIA-R domains and indicators, reintegration potential, accountability,

⁷ The DFIA-R replaced the DFIA in 2009. Given that some women included in this study were admitted to custody prior to 2009, their need information is based on this assessment. Both versions of the tool assess need across the same seven domains, however, revisions captured in the DFIA-R mean that indicators for each domain do not directly correspond, and the domain assessment ratings as well as staff training methods differ.

⁸ See CSC Commissioner's Directive 705-6, (CSC, 2019) for more detailed information on the measures used to complete the offender intake assessment process. Briefly, overall static factor level (low/medium/high) assesses risk based on criminal history, offence severity, and history of sexual offending. Overall dynamic factor level (low/medium/high) assesses dynamic need areas either related to criminal behaviour or where intervention would contribute to safe and timely reintegration. The overall dynamic factor level is based on the Dynamic Factor Assessment, which assesses needs across the following domains: employment/education, marital/family, associates, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional, and attitudes. Reintegration potential represents a combination of scores from measures assessing risk and need. Low reintegration potential indicates that the individual requires correctional interventions and risk management strategies while incarcerated and continued in the community. Accountability, motivation, responsivity, and engagement are key ratings associated with the correctional plan. Accountability (low/moderate/high) assesses whether the offender accepts responsibility for their actions, motivation (low/moderate/high) assesses the offender's willingness to change, responsivity (yes/no) assesses whether there are any barriers or facilitators to participating in programming that should be considered, and engagement (yes/no) combines ratings across motivation, accountability, and responsivity.

⁹ The results from the CRI have been used to inform program referral decisions since January 2018. However, the CRI is calculated based on the Criminal History Record of the Static Factor Assessment (SFA), which is completed during the offender intake assessment at CSC. As a result, CRI scores were retroactively computed for women who completed intake prior to the implementation of the CRI. It is important to note, however, that throughout this report, reference to the CRI in relation to correctional program requirements presents those who met program referral criteria in place at the time of data extraction, not necessarily at the time that they completed the intake process. As a result, it is more appropriate to view findings related to the CRI throughout this report as a supplemental measure of risk.

motivation, responsivity, engagement, offender security level (OSL)¹⁰, and link between substance use and criminal behaviour as well as treatment need for substance use¹¹. Information pertaining to STG affiliation was gathered throughout the sentence and up to six months following the FYE, with the most recent information prioritized in the case of multiple records. Similarly, information related to components of the Indigenous Continuum of Care (interest in Section 81 of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA; 1992)*), interest in Section 84 of the *CCRA*, interest in following a traditional healing path, and number of Elder reviews) was collected between sentence commencement and to up six months after FYE. Women were included in the study group regardless of whether they were missing information across any of the variables listed above. Those missing data on a specific variable were removed from the results for that variable, but that same individual would contribute to results on variables for which they had complete data. As a result, the number of women contributing to the results throughout the report varies. The amount of missing data across the variables ranged from 0.1% (Key ratings at intake) to as high as 11.6% (CRI) across each FY. Women missing CRI data tended to be rated as low overall static factor (73%) and medium overall dynamic need (43%), and placed in minimum security (73%) after intake. Given this, findings related to the CRI provide an overestimate of the risk profile of the entire custodial population for women, as these lower risk women missing CRI scores are not captured.

Plan of Analysis

Descriptive analyses, primarily frequencies and percentages, were used to compare the profiles of each of the FYE cohorts. Comparisons were made across each time point, as well as across regions (see Appendices A to D). It should be noted that the number of women

¹⁰ As detailed in Commissioner's Directive 705-7 (CSC, 2018) an inmate is classified as either minimum, medium, or maximum based on an assessment of institutional adjustment, escape risk, and public safety rating.

¹¹ Link between substance use and criminal behaviour (yes/no/unknown) and treatment need for substance use (no treatment/low/moderate/high) were two items drawn from the Women's Computerized Assessment of Substance Abuse (WCASA). The WCASA is self-administered and assesses and provides information on a variety of issues and information related to substance abuse. Results contained in this report are based on the Substance Abuse Summary Screen in the OMS, whereby an assessor reviews the information from the WCASA and forms a judgement to arrive at the abovementioned values. The items that inform the determination of whether substance use was linked to criminal behaviour are based on whether the offender was under the influence of substances when they committed their crime(s) or whether they committed their crime(s) to support their substance use. The assessor's determination may not always align with the responses that were provided by the offender.

contributing to the analyses was small for certain regions and/or FYs. This resulted in substantial changes in proportions, despite relatively minor fluctuations in frequencies (i.e., number of women). When there were sufficient numbers, comparisons were made between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women (see Appendix E). When fewer than five women contributed to a given finding, the result was suppressed to ensure individual privacy. Additionally, to ensure that the number of women contributing to the suppressed finding could not be derived from the remaining results, the finding based on the second lowest number of women was also suppressed.

Results

The results are presented in two parts. Part I focuses on examining the national profile of in-custody women federal offenders across three time points (FYE 2011/12, FYE 2016/17, and FYE 2021/22). Part II focuses on examining the regional profiles of in-custody women federal offenders across three time points (FYE 2011/12, FYE 2016/17, and FYE 2021/22). Each regional profile is examined independently. That is, profile descriptions are presented for the Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Prairie, and Pacific regions separately, and include demographic characteristics, their sentence and offence characteristics, and their risk and need information. Comparisons across regions at each time point are found in Appendices A to D.

Part I: National Profile of In-Custody Federal Women Offenders

Demographic information

The average age of in-custody women was consistent at each time point, at approximately 37 years old (FYE 2021/22: $M = 37.4$, $SD = 11.3$, range = 19-83, FYE 2016/17: $M = 37.2$, $SD = 11.8$, range = 19-80, FYE 2011/12: $M = 36.7$, $SD = 11.7$, range = 18-75). More than half of women at each time point comprised the 25 to 40 age category, while nearly a third were between the ages of 41 and 60. As displayed in Table 1, there was a shift in the racial composition of in-custody women over the three time points. At FYE 2021/22, White women comprised 39% of the population, having decreased from 48% at FYE 2011/12. The proportion of Black women also decreased at FYE 2021/22 relative to the earlier cohorts, accounting for 4% of the population, compared to 9% at FYE 2011/12. Nearly half of all women were Indigenous at FYE 2021/22, representing an increase relative to FYE 2011/12 (34%) and FYE 2016/17 (36%). Consistent across the cohorts, three-quarters of Indigenous women identified as First Nations, and approximately half of all federal in-custody women were single.

Table 1

Demographic Information for In-Custody Women over Time

Demographic Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 593)	(N = 635)	(N = 558)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Age			
< 24	14.2 (84)	12.4 (79)	9.9 (55)
25 - 40	51.6 (306)	54.5 (346)	54.3 (303)
41 - 60	30.4 (180)	28.7 (182)	32.3 (180)
61 +	3.9 (23)	4.4 (28)	3.6 (20)
Race			
White	47.6 (282)	49.0 (311)	39.4 (220)
Indigenous ^a	34.1 (202)	35.6 (226)	47.8 (267)
First Nations	77.7 (157)	76.1 (172)	74.2 (198)
Métis	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Inuit	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Black	8.8 (52)	6.0 (38)	3.8 (21)
Asian	4.2 (25)	4.4 (28)	2.9 (16)
Other ^b	5.4 (32)	5.0 (32)	6.1 (34)
Marital Status			
Common-law	20.1 (119)	19.1 (121)	15.1 (84)
Married	8.4 (50)	8.7 (55)	6.8 (38)
Single	55.1 (327)	52.9 (336)	54.5 (304)
Other ^c	16.4 (97)	19.4 (123)	23.7 (132)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. ^bOther^b race group includes Latin American, multiracial, 'other', unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sentence and offence information

Across each time point, the vast majority of women were on their first term (89% at FYE 2021/22, 93% at FYE 2016/17, and 89% at FYE 2011/12). Similarly, the majority of women were serving their first federal sentence, which increased over the time points (87% at FYE 2021/22, 85% at FYE 2016/17, and 82% at FYE 2011/12). As seen in Table 2, the distribution of sentence length categories has remained relatively consistent over the time points. At FYE 2021/22, approximately half of the women were serving a sentence between 2 to 4 years. Among those with a determinate sentence, the average aggregate sentence length remained consistent

across the time points, at approximately 4 years (FYE 2021/22: $M = 4.2$, $SD = 2.6$, FYE 2016/17: $M = 3.9$, $SD = 2.2$, FYE 2011/12: $M = 3.9$, $SD = 2.5$). The proportion of women whose most serious offence (MSO) on sentence was violent¹² increased at FYE 2021/22 (66%) relative to both FYE 2016/17 (59%) and FYE 2011/12 (61%). At FYE 2021/22, nearly half of women were in custody past their day parole eligibility date (DPED) at the time of the snapshot, although this decreased from 55% at FYE 2011/12. The proportion of women who were in custody past their full parole eligibility date (FPED) remained relatively consistent across the time points, at slightly more than a third.

Table 2

Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women over Time

Sentence and offence variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	($N = 593$)	($N = 635$)	($N = 558$)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Sentence length			
2 to 4 years	55.0 (326)	52.8 (335)	50.9 (284)
4 to 6 years	13.8 (82)	15.1 (96)	11.8 (66)
6 to 10 years	9.6 (57)	10.4 (66)	12.5 (70)
10+ years	3.0 (18)	1.6 (10)	3.8 (21)
Indeterminate	18.2 (108)	20.0 (127)	21.0 (117)
Violent offence ^a	61.1 (357)	58.8 (368)	66.1 (368)
Past DPED ^b	54.7 (324)	51.1 (324)	49.5 (275)
Past FPED ^c	37.8 (224)	33.8 (214)	34.9 (194)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent. ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Risk and need information

Generally, there was a pattern that demonstrated that the national profile of women at FYE 2021/22 had become more complex across several indicators of risk and need, with higher levels of risk and need observed, relative to FYE 2011/12 and FYE 2016/17 (see Table 3). For

¹² A violent most serious offence refers to offences listed under Schedule 1 of the *CCRA* (1992) or homicide offences. Offences listed under Schedule 1 include assault, use of firearms in the commission of an offence, sexual offending, attempted murder, and arson.

example, the proportion of women rated as having moderate or high overall static factor level increased, while women considered low static risk represented less than 10% of the population at FYE 2021/22, compared to a quarter of the population at FYE 2011/12. A similar trend was noted for the overall dynamic factor rating, where three-quarters of the population were considered to have a high rating at FYE 2021/22, relative to just over half (56%) at FYE 2011/12. In terms of reintegration potential, women were most often rated as medium and low, and the proportion of women rated as high decreased over time, to 10% at FYE 2021/22, relative to 20% at FYE 2011/12. The majority of women were rated as moderate for motivation level and accountability at intake across each cohort. The proportion of women with a responsivity flag remained consistent at each time point, at slightly more than a third of the population. The vast majority of the population had an engagement flag, and this was consistent at each time point.

The distribution of the population across the CRI categories remained relatively consistent across the three time points. Most often, women were assessed to be low on the CRI (ranged from 26% to 33% across time points). However, there was slight variation in the proportion of women who demonstrated a need for correctional programming based on the CRI. At FYE 2021/22, 61% of women demonstrated a need, compared to 53% at FYE 2016/17 and 59% at FYE 2011/12. Consistently, the largest proportion of women were rated as medium security level at intake, and this increased over time (from 49% at FYE 2011/12 to 60% at FYE 2021/22). There was a corresponding decrease in the proportion of women classified as minimum security at intake, from 33% at FYE 2011/12 to 18% at FYE 2021/22.

Across the three time points, a link between substance use and criminal behaviour was often noted, which increased over time (60% at FYE 2021/22 compared to 47% at FYE 2011/12). Similarly, the need for substance use treatment increased over time points, to 69% at FYE 2021/22 compared to 60% at FYE 2011/12. The proportion of women who had a high school diploma increased over time, from 35% at FYE 2011/12 to 42% at FYE 2021/22. Just over half of women at each time point had parental responsibilities, which slightly increased at FYE 2021/22 (57%) compared to FYE 2011/12 (52%). Finally, there was fluctuation in the proportion of women affiliated with an STG over the three time points, but an overall increase noted at FYE 2021/22 (10%) relative to 4% at FYE 2011/12.

Table 3

Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women over Time

Risk and Need Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 593)	(N = 635)	(N = 558)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor			
Low	25.3 (150)	25.2 (160)	9.3 (52)
Moderate	36.9 (219)	40.2 (255)	48.8 (272)
High	37.8 (224)	34.6 (220)	41.8 (233)
Overall Dynamic Factor			
Low	10.1 (60)	7.6 (48)	4.5 (25)
Moderate	34.4 (204)	29.0 (184)	20.7 (115)
High	55.5 (329)	63.5 (403)	74.8 (416)
Reintegration Potential ^a			
Low	28.8 (171)	29.4 (187)	36.9 (205)
Moderate	51.6 (306)	54.3 (345)	53.2 (296)
High	19.6 (116)	16.2 (103)	9.9 (55)
Motivation Level ^a			
Low	6.4 (38)	6.6 (42)	5.6 (31)
Moderate	42.5 (252)	58.7 (373)	68.0 (378)
High	51.1 (303)	34.6 (220)	26.4 (147)
Accountability ^a			
Low	12.9 (75)	14.8 (94)	11.7 (65)
Moderate	51.0 (297)	57.5 (365)	67.6 (376)
High	36.1 (210)	27.7 (176)	20.7 (115)
Responsivity Flag ^a	33.8 (197)	35.1 (223)	36.7 (204)
Engagement Flag ^a	86.6 (504)	85.2 (541)	87.8 (488)
Criminal Risk Index ^b			
Low	26.1 (130)	33.4 (176)	27.1 (150)
Low-Moderate	14.7 (73)	13.5 (71)	11.7 (65)
Moderate	21.5 (107)	17.3 (91)	23.1 (128)
High-Moderate	19.3 (96)	17.8 (94)	21.5 (119)
High	17.9 (89)	17.5 (92)	16.6 (92)
Offender Security Level ^a			
Minimum	32.7 (194)	27.1 (172)	18.3 (101)
Medium	49.4 (293)	51.5 (327)	60.1 (331)
Maximum	17.9 (106)	21.4 (136)	21.6 (119)
Correctional program need ^c	58.6 (292)	52.6 (277)	61.2 (339)
Link between crime and substance use			
Yes	47.1 (248)	49.7 (290)	60.0 (306)
Unknown	26.2 (138)	24.3 (142)	18.8 (96)
Substance use treatment required	60.6 (319)	60.4 (353)	69.4 (354)
High school diploma	35.0 (172)	37.3 (191)	41.9 (211)
Parental responsibilities	52.4 (257)	56.7 (296)	56.7 (285)
STG ^d affiliation	4.0 (24)	2.8 (18)	10.4 (58)

Note. ^a= scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the Static Factors Assessment (SFA). ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

An examination of the proportion of women with an identified need in each of the seven criminogenic need areas indicated that at FYE 2021/22, the majority of women had a need area in each domain (see Table 4). At FYE 2021/22, nearly all women (92%) had a need related to the personal and emotional domain, followed by substance abuse (79%), associates (75%), and family and marital (72%). Across the time points, increases in the proportion of women with a need in each domain were noted for all domains except for education and employment. The largest increases were noted for the attitudes domain, where 44% of women had a need at FYE 2011/12 compared to 67% of women at FYE 2021/22, and the community functioning domain (37% at FYE 2011/12 compared to 59% at FYE 2021/22).

Table 4

Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women over Time

Identified need area	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 593)	(N = 635)	(N = 558)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Associates	63.5 (363)	69.2 (434)	75.4 (417)
Attitudes	44.2 (252)	54.3 (341)	66.8 (369)
Community Functioning	37.0 (211)	46.7 (292)	59.4 (328)
Education and Employment	63.3 (362)	57.9 (363)	60.4 (334)
Family and Marital	60.8 (348)	67.8 (425)	72.3 (400)
Personal and Emotional	85.8 (491)	88.1 (553)	92.4 (511)
Substance Abuse	65.5 (374)	70.4 (441)	79.0 (436)

Note. Represents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need. Information presented in this table combines information scored by the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of ‘some need identified’ or ‘considerable need identified’, or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of ‘moderate need for improvement’ or ‘high need for improvement’. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Indigenous corrections

As seen in Table 5, the proportion of Indigenous women with at least one instance of an active flag for Section 81 and Section 84 steadily increased over the time points from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22. Similarly, the proportion of women with at least one instance of an active flag for interest in a traditional healing path increased considerably (90% at FYE 2021/22 from 55% at FYE 2011/12). Nearly all Indigenous women had at least one Elder review

completed, and this was consistent across time points.

Table 5

Indigenous Corrections information for In-Custody Women over Time

Indigenous corrections variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 202)	(N = 226)	(N = 267)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Section 81 ^a	43.6 (88)	58.4 (132)	74.5 (199)
Section 84 ^b	57.4 (116)	68.6 (155)	79.8 (213)
Interest in traditional healing path	54.5 (110)	73.0 (165)	89.9 (240)
At least one Elder review	90.1 (182)	94.7 (214)	93.6 (250)

Note. Although Indigenous programs and services are offered to non-Indigenous women who follow Indigenous cultural traditions, the information presented in this table only reflects Indigenous women. ^aSection 81 = Section 81 of the *CCRA* allows CSC to enter into an agreement with an Indigenous community for the provision of correctional services to Indigenous offenders. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 81. ^bSection 84 = Section 84 of the *CCRA* applies to offenders who want to serve their eventual conditional or statutory release in an Indigenous community or in an urban area with the support and direction of an Indigenous organization. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Summary of national profile for in-custody women

Overall, the national profile of in-custody women at FYE 2021/22 differed from earlier cohorts in several respects. There was a notable shift in the racial composition, marked by an increase in the proportion of Indigenous women and a decrease in the proportions represented by both White and Black women. Otherwise, the national profile at each FYE cohort remained largely consistent in terms of age and marital status. Although most sentence and offence information remained unchanged across the time points, a greater proportion of women had a violent offence associated with their sentence at FYE 2021/22. Changes in the risk and need profile were also noted, indicating that at FYE 2021/22, a greater proportion of in-custody women were rated as moderate or high for overall measures of risk and need. At FYE 2021/22 a link between substance use and criminal behaviour was more prevalent, and a greater proportion of women required substance use treatment. Affiliation with an STG also increased at FYE 2021/22 relative to the profile based on FYE 2016/17 and 2011/12. The vast majority of Indigenous women in custody demonstrated an interest in various components of the Indigenous Continuum of Care at FYE 2021/22, which generally marked an increase relative to earlier cohorts.

Part II: Regional Profiles of In-Custody Federal Women Offenders

Regional profiles of in-custody women are presented based on information from year-end snapshot data from three cohorts: 2011/12, 2016/17, and 2021/22. Results are presented for the Atlantic region, followed by the Quebec, Ontario, Prairie, and Pacific regions.

Atlantic Region

Demographic information

At FYE 2021/22, the average age of in-custody women was 35.7 ($SD = 11.1$; range = 19-64). In contrast, the average age at FYE 2016/17 was 35.2 ($SD = 10.6$; range = 19-60) and at FYE 2011/12 was 34.3 ($SD = 10.0$; range = 19-64). At each time point, most women were between the ages of 25 and 40 (see Table 6). However, from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22 the proportion of women between the ages of 25 and 40 decreased from 61% to 52%. At FYE 2021/22, two-thirds of women were White (66%), which differed markedly from FYE 2016/17, where 83% of women were White. Indigenous women comprised the next largest proportion of racial groups, representing 27% of the population at FYE 2021/22. Notably, of those who were Indigenous, nearly all were First Nations at each time point. Finally, approximately half of the women in the Atlantic region were single, and this was consistent over the three time points.

Table 6

Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Atlantic Region over Time

Demographic Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 61)	(N = 72)	(N = 56)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Age			
< 24	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
25 - 40	60.7 (37)	54.2 (39)	51.8 (29)
41 - 60	23.0 (14)	29.2 (21)	28.6 (16)
61 +	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Race			
White	60.7 (37)	83.3 (60)	66.1 (37)
Indigenous ^a	27.9 (17)	8.3 (6)	26.8 (15)
First Nations	88.2 (15)	100.0 (6)	93.3 (14)
Métis	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Inuit	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Black	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Asian	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Other ^b	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Marital Status			
Common-law	-- (--)	27.8 (20)	23.2 (13)
Married	-- (--)	8.3 (6)	10.7 (6)
Single	49.2 (30)	52.8 (38)	48.2 (27)
Other ^c	23.0 (14)	11.1 (8)	17.9 (10)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. ^b'Other' race group includes Latin American, multiracial, 'other', unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sentence and offence information

Across each time point, the majority of women in the Atlantic regions were on their first term, although there was a notable decrease in the proportion at FYE 2021/22 (75% at FYE 2021/22, 90% at FYE 2016/17, and 92% at FYE 2011/12). Similarly, approximately three-quarters of women were serving their first federal sentence (77% at FYE 2021/22, 79% at FYE 2016/17, and 74% at FYE 2011/12). As seen in Table 7, most women were serving a sentence between 2 to 4 years. However, at FYE 2021/22, a smaller proportion of women were serving a sentence of between 2 to 4 years (55%) compared to 2011/12 (66%) and 2016/17 (65%). There

was also a notable increase in the proportion of women serving an indeterminate sentence at FYE 2021/22 (25%), relative to earlier time points (16% at FYE 2011/12 and 15% at FYE 2016/17). For those with determinate sentences, the average aggregate sentence length was similar across the three time points ($M = 3.8$ years, $SD = 2.5$ at FYE 2021/22; $M = 3.5$ years, $SD = 1.9$ at FYE 2016/17; $M = 3.6$ years, $SD = 2.4$ at FYE 2011/12). At FYE 2021/22, a greater proportion of women had a violent MSO on their sentence (66%), compared to the earlier time points (both at 55%). The proportion of women who were in custody past their DPED and FPED tended to remain consistent across the time points, although the proportions decreased at FYE 2016/17 (42% and 29%, respectively), but returned to comparable proportions at FYE 2021/22 (45% and 36%, respectively).

Table 7

Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Atlantic Region over Time

Sentence and offence variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	($N = 61$)	($N = 72$)	($N = 56$)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Sentence length			
2 to 4 years	65.6 (40)	65.3 (47)	55.4 (31)
4 to 6 years	8.2 (5)	-- (--)	-- (--)
6 to 10 years	-- (--)	12.5 (9)	8.9 (5)
10+ years	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	16.4 (10)	15.3 (11)	25.0 (14)
Violent offence ^a	55.0 (33)	54.9 (39)	66.1 (37)
Past DPED ^b	45.9 (28)	41.7 (30)	44.6 (25)
Past FPED ^c	36.1 (22)	29.2 (21)	35.7 (20)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Risk and need information

Table 8 presents the distribution in ratings of risk, need, reintegration potential, motivation, accountability, responsivity, engagement, and offender security level. Across each time point, the largest proportion of women scored high on overall static factors, and the proportion of women scoring high increased over time, with 50% of in-custody women scoring

high at FYE 2021/22 in comparison to 41% at FYE 2011/12. Similarly, across each time point most women scored high on overall dynamic factors. In terms of reintegration potential, half of women were rated moderate at FYE 2021/22, which decreased slightly from 56% at FYE 2011/12. The majority of women were rated as moderate for motivation level and accountability at intake across each cohort. The proportion of women with a responsivity flag decreased over time (from 48% at FYE 2011/12 to 39% at FYE 2021/22), as did the proportion of women with an engagement flag (95% at FYE 2011/12 to 88% at FYE 2021/22). Nearly half of women scored as falling in the two highest risk categories on the CRI, although the proportion of women scored as low increased to 29% at FYE 2021/22 compared to 24% at FYE 2016/17. Similarly, the proportion of women who were eligible for correctional programs, based on the CRI, decreased over time, from 77% at FYE 2011/12 to 64% at FYE 2021/22. Consistently, the largest proportion of women were rated as medium security level at intake, and this increased over time (from 43% at FYE 2011/12 to 57% at FYE 2021/22). Across the three time points, the majority of women had a link between substance use and their criminal behaviour (66% at FYE 2021/22) and the need for substance use treatment increased over time (to 78% at FYE 2021/22 compared to 71% at FYE 2011/12). The proportion of women who had a high school diploma increased substantially over time, from 30% at FYE 2011/12 to 56% at FYE 2021/22. Conversely, the proportion of women with parental responsibilities decreased over the three time points, from nearly two-thirds of women (64%) at FYE 2011/12 to less than half (42%) at FYE 2021/22. Although comparisons to earlier cohorts were not possible due to small numbers, at FYE 2021/22, 9% of women were identified as being affiliated with an STG.

Table 8

Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Atlantic Region over time

Risk and Need Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 61)	(N = 72)	(N = 56)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor			
Low	19.7 (12)	31.9 (23)	-- (--)
Moderate	39.3 (24)	27.8 (20)	-- (--)
High	41.0 (25)	40.3 (29)	50.0 (28)
Overall Dynamic Factor			
Low	-- (--)	8.3 (6)	-- (--)
Moderate	-- (--)	12.5 (9)	-- (--)
High	85.2 (52)	79.2 (57)	89.3 (50)
Reintegration Potential ^a			
Low	34.4 (21)	31.9 (23)	-- (--)
Moderate	55.7 (34)	50.0 (36)	50.0 (28)
High	9.8 (6)	18.1 (13)	-- (--)
Motivation Level ^a			
Low	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	73.8 (45)	56.9 (41)	82.1 (46)
High	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Accountability ^a			
Low	-- (--)	11.1 (8)	12.5 (7)
Moderate	80.3 (49)	51.4 (37)	76.8 (43)
High	-- (--)	37.5 (27)	10.7 (6)
Responsivity Flag ^a	47.5 (29)	37.5 (27)	39.3 (22)
Engagement Flag ^a	95.1 (58)	94.4 (68)	87.5 (49)
Criminal Risk Index ^b			
Low	-- (--)	24.1 (14)	29.1 (16)
Low-Moderate	-- (--)	15.5 (9)	-- (--)
Moderate	25.0 (14)	24.1 (14)	-- (--)
High-Moderate	21.4 (12)	15.5 (9)	18.2 (10)
High	30.4 (17)	20.7 (12)	29.1 (16)
Offender Security Level ^a			
Minimum	34.4 (21)	36.1 (26)	10.7 (6)
Medium	42.6 (26)	48.6 (35)	57.1 (32)
Maximum	23.0 (14)	15.3 (11)	32.1 (18)
Correctional program need ^c	76.8 (43)	60.3 (35)	63.6 (35)
Link between crime and substance use			
Yes	64.4 (38)	62.0 (44)	65.5 (36)
Unknown	15.3 (9)	11.3 (8)	9.1 (5)
Substance use treatment required	71.2 (42)	66.2 (47)	78.2 (43)
High school diploma	30.4 (17)	43.1 (25)	56.4 (31)
Parental responsibilities	64.3 (36)	54.4 (31)	41.8 (23)
STG ^d affiliation	-- (--)	-- (--)	8.9 (5)

Note. ^a = scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

The proportion of women with an identified need in each of the seven criminogenic need areas stemming from the DFIA or DFIA-R is presented in Table 9. Overall, the domain that was most consistently considered a need area for women was the personal and emotional domain, followed by the substance abuse and associates domains. The proportion of women with a need in each domain increased for all domains over time, except for the education and employment domain, which decreased over time (54% at FYE 2021/22 compared to 69% at FYE 2011/12). Most notably, the proportion of women with an identified need in community functioning more than doubled from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22 (21% to 45%).

Table 9

Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Atlantic Region over Time

Identified need area	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 61)	(N = 72)	(N = 56)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Associates	70.5 (43)	69.4 (50)	80.4 (45)
Attitudes	52.5 (32)	48.6 (35)	73.2 (41)
Community Functioning	21.3 (13)	26.8 (19)	44.6 (25)
Education and Employment	68.9 (42)	47.2 (34)	53.6 (30)
Family and Marital	52.5 (32)	69.0 (49)	73.2 (41)
Personal and Emotional	86.9 (53)	77.8 (56)	96.4 (54)
Substance Abuse	80.3 (49)	70.8 (51)	82.1 (46)

Note. Represents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need. Information presented in this table combines information scored by the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of ‘some need identified’ or ‘considerable need identified’, or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of ‘moderate need for improvement’ or ‘high need for improvement’. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Summary of findings for Atlantic region

Overall, results indicated that the profile of women in custody in the Atlantic region has changed when examining FYE cohorts from 2011/12, 2016/17, and 2021/22. At FYE 2021/22, a greater proportion of women had higher static and dynamic need ratings, which also corresponded to increases in the proportion of women who had a need for intervention in the various dynamic need domains, there had been an increase in women with a violent MSO, a decrease in women with parental responsibilities, and an increase in women with a high school

diploma. STG affiliation has also become more common.

Quebec Region

Demographic information

At FYE 2021/22, the average age of in-custody women was 41.6 ($SD = 11.3$; range = 22-70); which was slightly lower than at FYE 2016/17 ($M = 42.3$; $SD = 13.4$; range = 20-80) and at FYE 2011/12 ($M = 42.4$; $SD = 13.2$; range = 22-70). As displayed in Table 10, the distribution of age categories followed a similar trend, where at FYE 2011/12 most women were between the ages of 41 and 60, but this shifted in FYE 2016/17 and FYE 2021/22, where most women were between the ages of 25 and 40. However, it is important to highlight that a large proportion of women were between the ages of 41 and 60 across both cohorts. Most often, women in the Quebec region were single, and this was relatively consistent across the three time points. At FYE 2021/22 over half of women were White (57%), which was considerably lower than both FYE 2016/17 and FYE 2011/12, where approximately three-quarters of women were White. Consistently, Indigenous women comprised the next largest proportion of racial groups, representing 24% of the population at FYE 2021/22. Notably, of those who were Indigenous at FYE 2021/22, half identified as Métis and half identified as First Nations.

Table 10

Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Quebec Region over Time

Demographic Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 91)	(N = 98)	(N = 74)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Age			
< 24	9.9 (9)	7.1 (7)	-- (--)
25 - 40	38.5 (35)	43.9 (43)	47.3 (35)
41 - 60	42.9 (39)	38.8 (38)	43.2 (32)
61 +	8.8 (8)	10.2 (10)	-- (--)
Race			
White	76.9 (70)	75.5 (74)	56.8 (42)
Indigenous ^a	12.1 (11)	12.2 (12)	24.3 (18)
First Nations	-- (--)	-- (--)	50.0 (9)
Métis	45.5 (5)	75.0 (9)	50.0 (9)
Inuit	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Black	7.7 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Asian	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Other ^b	-- (--)	5.1 (5)	10.8 (8)
Marital Status			
Common-law	23.1 (21)	19.4 (19)	28.4 (21)
Married	6.6 (6)	9.2 (9)	-- (--)
Single	46.2 (42)	55.1 (54)	52.7 (39)
Other ^c	24.2 (22)	16.3 (16)	-- (--)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. ^b“Other” race group includes Latin American, multiracial, ‘other’, unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sentence and offence information

Across each time point, nearly all women were on their first term. Similarly, the vast majority of women were serving their first federal sentence (89% at FYE 2021/22, 89% at FYE 2016/17, and 88% at FYE 2011/12). As demonstrated in Table 11, there was a notable shift in the distribution of sentence lengths among women in Quebec. At FYE 2021/22, most commonly women were serving an indeterminate sentence (38%), whereas at FYE 2011/12 and FYE 2016/17 it was more common that women were serving a sentence between 2 to 4 years. For those with determinate sentences, the average aggregate sentence length fluctuated across the

time points. At FYE 2021/22, the average determinate sentence length was 5.2 years ($SD = 3.0$), compared to 3.9 years ($SD = 2.5$) at FYE 2016/17 and 4.5 years ($SD = 3.1$) at FYE 2011/12. The proportion of women with a violent MSO on their sentence at FYE 2021/22 was 81%, which was markedly higher than the proportion at FYE 2016/17 (55%). Slight decreases were noted in the proportion of women who were in custody past their DPED. At FYE 2011/12, half of women were past their DPED, compared to 44% at FYE 2021/22. Nearly a third of women were in custody past their FPED, and this remained relatively consistent across the cohorts.

Table 11

Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Quebec Region over Time

Sentence and offence variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(<i>N</i> = 91)	(<i>N</i> = 98)	(<i>N</i> = 74)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Sentence length			
2 to 4 years	42.9 (39)	48.0 (47)	29.7 (22)
4 to 6 years	14.3 (13)	14.3 (14)	-- (--)
6 to 10 years	-- (--)	-- (--)	16.2 (12)
10+ years	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	26.4 (24)	26.5 (26)	37.8 (28)
Violent offence ^a	72.5 (66)	55.2 (53)	81.1 (60)
Past DPED ^b	50.0 (45)	43.9 (43)	44.4 (32)
Past FPED ^c	32.2 (29)	28.6 (28)	30.6 (22)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Risk and need information

Table 12 presents the distribution in ratings of risk, need, reintegration potential, motivation, accountability, responsivity, engagement, and offender security level. Across each time point, the vast majority of women were rated as moderate or high on overall static factors. Similarly, at FYE 2021/22, 80% of women were rated as high overall dynamic factor, which marked an increase relative to the earlier time points. Most women were rated as either having low or moderate reintegration potential, and this trend remained consistent over time. Further, the proportion of women rated as low and moderate reintegration potential tended to be evenly

distributed over time. For example, 43% of women were rated as low at FYE 2021/22 compared to 42% rated as moderate. The majority of women were rated as moderate for motivation level and accountability at intake across each cohort. The proportion of women with a responsivity flag decreased considerably over time (from 52% at FYE 2011/12 to 23% at FYE 2021/22), while nearly three-quarters of women were considered engaged in their correctional plan over time. Consistent across the time points, the largest proportion of women were rated as low risk on the CRI. For example, at FYE 2021/22 37% of women were considered low risk. Across each time point, more than 50% of women were rated as either low or low-moderate. Given that correctional program need is calculated based on the CRI categories, the proportion of women who met the criteria for correctional programs mirrored the distribution of CRI scores. Consistently, the largest proportion of women were rated as medium security level at intake, however, there was a relatively even distribution among the three levels at FYE 2016/17, and there was an increase in the proportion of women placed in maximum security at intake at FYE 2021/22 (37%) compared to FYE 2011/12 (26%).

In assessing the link between substance use and criminal behaviour, results indicated a considerable shift across the three time points. At FYE 2011/12 about 42% of women had a direct link between substance use and their criminal behaviour, while it was unknown for nearly a quarter of women. However, at FYE 2021/22, the relationship between substance use and criminal behaviour was unknown for nearly three-quarters of women, and only identified for 18% of the cohort. Despite this, the need for substance use treatment increased slightly over the time points, from 44% at FYE 2011/12 to 51% at FYE 2021/22. The proportion of women who had a high school diploma remained relatively consistent across the time points, at just over a third. The proportion of women with parental responsibilities also remained consistent, at slightly more than half. The proportion of women affiliated with an STG was suppressed due to small numbers.

Table 12

Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Quebec Region over time

Risk and Need Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 91)	(N = 98)	(N = 74)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor			
Low	13.2 (12)	23.5 (23)	-- (--)
Moderate	34.1 (31)	36.7 (36)	51.4 (38)
High	52.7 (48)	39.8 (39)	-- (--)
Overall Dynamic Factor			
Low	8.8 (8)	16.3 (16)	-- (--)
Moderate	17.6 (16)	22.4 (22)	-- (--)
High	73.6 (67)	61.2 (60)	79.7 (59)
Reintegration Potential ^a			
Low	47.3 (43)	35.7 (35)	43.2 (32)
Moderate	39.6 (36)	40.8 (40)	41.9 (31)
High	13.2 (12)	23.5 (23)	14.9 (11)
Motivation Level ^a			
Low	9.9 (9)	12.2 (12)	8.1 (6)
Moderate	62.6 (57)	69.4 (68)	64.9 (48)
High	27.5 (25)	18.4 (18)	27.0 (20)
Accountability ^a			
Low	24.2 (22)	22.4 (22)	23.0 (17)
Moderate	62.6 (57)	68.4 (67)	66.2 (49)
High	13.2 (12)	9.2 (9)	10.8 (8)
Responsivity Flag ^a	51.6 (47)	28.6 (28)	23.0 (17)
Engagement Flag ^a	72.5 (66)	76.5 (75)	73.0 (54)
Criminal Risk Index ^b			
Low	34.1 (29)	41.7 (35)	36.5 (27)
Low-Moderate	16.5 (14)	20.2 (17)	17.6 (13)
Moderate	25.9 (22)	10.7 (9)	20.3 (15)
High-Moderate	17.6 (15)	14.3 (12)	14.9 (11)
High	5.9 (5)	13.1 (11)	10.8 (8)
Offender Security Level ^a			
Minimum	20.9 (19)	34.7 (34)	16.4 (12)
Medium	52.7 (48)	36.7 (36)	46.6 (34)
Maximum	26.4 (24)	28.6 (28)	37.0 (27)
Correctional program need ^c	49.4 (42)	38.1 (32)	45.9 (34)
Link between crime and substance use			
Yes	41.8 (23)	24.7 (18)	17.5 (10)
Unknown	23.6 (13)	53.4 (39)	73.7 (42)
Substance use treatment required	43.6 (24)	45.2 (33)	50.9 (29)
High school diploma	34.1 (28)	34.6 (28)	38.4 (28)
Parental responsibilities	54.8 (46)	53.0 (44)	53.4 (39)
STG ^d affiliation	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)

Note. ^a= scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table 13 presents the proportion of women with an identified need in each of the seven criminogenic need areas stemming from the DFIA or the DFIA-R. Overall, the domain that was most consistently considered a need area for women was the personal and emotional domain, followed by the attitudes domain, and family and marital domain. Across the time points, there was an increase in the proportion of women with a need in the associates, attitudes, family and marital, and substance use domains.

Table 13

Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Quebec Region over Time

Identified need area	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 91)	(N = 98)	(N = 74)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Associates	43.0 (37)	46.9 (45)	53.4 (39)
Attitudes	67.4 (58)	69.8 (67)	75.3 (55)
Community Functioning	37.2 (32)	36.5 (35)	38.4 (28)
Education and Employment	59.3 (51)	61.5 (59)	56.2 (41)
Family and Marital	64.0 (55)	67.7 (65)	69.9 (51)
Personal and Emotional	88.4 (76)	82.3 (79)	87.7 (64)
Substance Abuse	53.5 (46)	50.0 (48)	63.0 (46)

Note. Represents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need. Information presented in this table combines information scored by the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of ‘some need identified’ or ‘considerable need identified’, or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of ‘moderate need for improvement’ or ‘high need for improvement’. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Summary of findings for Quebec region

Overall, results indicate that the profile of women in the Quebec region has changed when examining FYE cohorts from 2011/12, 2016/17, and 2021/22. The mean age decreased slightly over time, as did the proportion of women comprising the 41 to 60 age category. Women at FYE 2021/22 were also serving slightly longer determinate sentences, relative to the earlier cohorts, and there was a greater proportion of women serving indeterminate sentences. Further, the vast majority of women had a violent offence associated with their sentence. In terms of risk and need, women in Quebec were consistently rated as high risk and high need, and about half had a need for correctional programming and for substance use treatment. Lastly, fewer women

were placed in minimum security at intake at FYE 2021/22, relative to earlier cohorts.

Ontario Region

Demographic information

At FYE 2021/22, the average age of in-custody women was 39.6 ($SD = 11.0$; range = 20-70); whereas the average age at FYE 2016/17 was 38.6 ($SD = 11.7$; range = 21-77) and at FYE 2011/12 the average age was 37.4 ($SD = 11.9$; range = 19-72). Over time, the proportion of women who were under the age of 24 decreased, whereas the proportion of women between age ages of 25 and 40 remained relatively stable and the proportion of women between the ages of 41 and 60 increased slightly (see Table 14). The largest proportion of women were White across the time points, however, the proportion of Indigenous women steadily increased at FYE 2021/22 (37%) compared to earlier cohorts (approximately 20%). Notably, the proportion of women who are Black and who are Asian have steadily decreased over time. Of those who were Indigenous, the majority identified as First Nations, and this was consistent at each time point. Finally, the proportion of women who were single was lowest at FYE 2021/22 after decreasing from 63% to 47% over time. However, the proportion of women who were in the 'other' marital status category was highest at FYE 2021/22, after increasing from 13% to 38% over time.

Table 14

Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time

Demographic Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 183)	(N = 159)	(N = 172)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Age			
< 24	13.7 (25)	6.3 (10)	5.8 (10)
25 - 40	45.4 (83)	54.7 (87)	48.8 (84)
41 - 60	36.1 (66)	33.3 (53)	41.9 (72)
61 +	4.9 (9)	5.7 (9)	3.5 (6)
Race			
White	42.1 (77)	46.5 (74)	43.0 (74)
Indigenous ^a	18.6 (34)	20.1 (32)	36.6 (63)
First Nations	94.1 (32)	81.3 (26)	82.5 (52)
Métis	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Inuit	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Black	22.4 (41)	18.9 (30)	8.7 (15)
Asian	7.7 (14)	7.5 (12)	3.5 (6)
Other ^b	9.3 (17)	6.9 (11)	8.1 (14)
Marital Status			
Common-law	13.7 (25)	12.6 (20)	9.3 (16)
Married	10.9 (20)	11.3 (18)	5.8 (10)
Single	62.8 (115)	46.5 (74)	47.1 (81)
Other ^c	12.6 (23)	29.6 (47)	37.8 (65)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. Indigenous breakdown for women identifying as Indigenous could only be provided for First Nations, due to small numbers of Métis and/or Inuit women. ^b“Other” race group includes Latin American, multiracial, ‘other’, unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sentence and offence information

Across each time point, the majority of women were on their first term (93% at FYE 2021/22, 95% at FYE 2016/17, and 92% at FYE 2011/12). Similarly, the majority of women were serving their first federal sentence (87% at FYE 2021/22, 89% at FYE 2016/17, and 87% at FYE 2011/12). As seen in Table 15, the largest proportion of women were serving a sentence between 2 to 4 years at each time point. For those with determinate sentences, the average aggregate sentence length at FYE 2021/22 was 4.3 years ($SD = 2.6$), which was slightly higher

than at FYE 2016/17 ($M = 4.1, SD = 1.9$) and at FYE 2011/12 ($M = 3.8, SD = 2.4$). The proportion of women whose MSO on their sentence was violent increased over time from 49% to 62%. The proportion of women who were in custody past their DPED slightly decreased over time from 56% to 46%, whereas the proportion of women in custody past their FPED remained consistent across time points (approximately one-third of women).

Table 15

Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time

Sentence and offence variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	($N = 183$)	($N = 159$)	($N = 172$)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Sentence length			
2 to 4 years	56.8 (104)	43.4 (69)	47.7 (82)
4 to 6 years	14.2 (26)	22.6 (36)	14.0 (24)
6 to 10 years	10.9 (20)	-- (--)	12.8 (22)
10+ years	2.7 (5)	-- (--)	3.5 (6)
Indeterminate	14.8 (27)	22.0 (35)	22.1 (38)
Violent offence ^a	49.2 (88)	52.6 (82)	62.2 (107)
Past DPED ^b	56.3 (103)	48.4 (77)	45.9 (79)
Past FPED ^c	33.3 (61)	34.6 (55)	32.6 (56)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Risk and need information

As seen in Table 16, the largest proportion of women scored moderate on overall static factors level at each time point, whereas the proportion of women who scored low decreased over time and the proportion of women who scored high increased over time. For overall dynamic factors level, the largest proportion of women scored high at FYE 2021/22, whereas at FYE 2011/12, the largest proportion of women scored moderate. Additionally, the proportion of women scoring low on overall dynamic factors level decreased over time from 21% to 8%. In terms of reintegration potential, motivation, and accountability, the largest proportion of women at FYE 2021/22 were rated moderate at intake. For reintegration potential, the proportion of women rated high decreased over time, whereas the proportion of women rated low increased over time. For motivation level and accountability, the proportion of women rated high

substantially decreased from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22 (from 75% to 34% for motivation and from 55% to 28% for accountability). The proportion of women with a responsivity flag more than doubled over time (from 21% at FYE 2011/12 to 49% at FYE 2021/22), whereas the proportion of women with an engagement flag remained relatively consistent over time. Overall, the spread of scores on the CRI remained relatively consistent over time. However, the proportion of women with an identified correctional program need, based on the CRI, increased from 46% at FYE 2011/12 to 56% at FYE 2021/22. The largest proportion of women were rated as medium security level at intake at FYE 2021/22, whereas at FYE 2011/12, the largest proportion of women were rated as minimum. In fact, the proportion of women who were rated minimum OSL at intake decreased substantially over time, from 51% to 15% at FYE 2021/22. Almost two-thirds of women at FYE 2021/22 had a substance use treatment need and had a link between their offence and substance use. Notably, the proportion of women whose offence was linked to substance use increased substantially from 29% to 64% over time. However, this increase may be due to the reduced number of 'unknown' responses (from 23% to 6%). Similarly, the proportion of women with a substance use treatment requirement also increased over time from 42% to 65%. Across time, the proportion of women with a high school diploma, with parental responsibilities, or who had an STG affiliation remained consistent.

Table 16

Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over time

Risk and Need Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 183)	(N = 159)	(N = 172)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor			
Low	36.1 (66)	31.4 (50)	14.0 (24)
Moderate	43.7 (80)	44.7 (71)	48.5 (83)
High	20.2 (37)	23.9 (38)	37.4 (64)
Overall Dynamic Factor			
Low	20.8 (38)	12.6 (20)	8.2 (14)
Moderate	51.9 (95)	57.2 (91)	34.1 (58)
High	27.3 (50)	30.2 (48)	57.6 (98)
Reintegration Potential ^a			
Low	12.6 (23)	20.8 (33)	34.7 (59)
Moderate	51.4 (94)	57.9 (92)	52.4 (89)
High	36.1 (66)	21.4 (34)	12.9 (22)
Motivation Level ^a			
Low	5.5 (10)	5.7 (9)	5.3 (9)
Moderate	19.1 (35)	47.2 (75)	61.2 (104)
High	75.4 (138)	47.2 (75)	33.5 (57)
Accountability ^a			
Low	10.1 (18)	14.5 (23)	11.8 (20)
Moderate	34.8 (62)	45.3 (72)	60.6 (103)
High	55.1 (98)	40.3 (64)	27.6 (47)
Responsivity Flag ^a	21.3 (38)	34.0 (54)	49.4 (84)
Engagement Flag ^a	92.1 (164)	84.9 (135)	87.6 (149)
Criminal Risk Index ^b			
Low	36.8 (50)	44.6 (58)	28.7 (49)
Low-Moderate	14.7 (20)	12.3 (16)	15.2 (26)
Moderate	17.6 (24)	16.9 (22)	22.8 (39)
High-Moderate	17.6 (24)	17.7 (23)	19.9 (34)
High	11.0 (15)	6.9 (9)	13.5 (23)
Offender Security Level ^a			
Minimum	50.8 (93)	29.6 (47)	14.5 (24)
Medium	36.6 (67)	47.2 (75)	65.7 (109)
Maximum	12.6 (23)	23.3 (37)	19.9 (33)
Correctional program need ^d	46.3 (63)	41.5 (54)	56.1 (96)
Link between crime and substance use			
Yes	28.7 (49)	39.2 (60)	63.8 (104)
Unknown	23.4 (40)	11.8 (18)	5.5 (9)
Substance use treatment required	42.1 (72)	40.5 (62)	65.0 (106)
High school diploma	42.1 (56)	52.0 (66)	49.3 (74)
Parental responsibilities	59.1 (78)	69.3 (88)	62.4 (93)
STG ^c affiliation	3.8 (7)	-- (--)	4.1 (7)

Note. ^a= scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

As seen in Table 17, the domain that was most consistently considered a need area for women in custody in the Ontario region was the personal and emotional domain. The attitudes domain has had the largest change over time, with the proportion of women with an identified need increasing from 28% at FYE 2011/12 to 71% at FYE 2021/22. The associates and substance abuse domains also had an increase in the proportion of women with an identified need over time. In contrast, the family and marital and the education and employment domains remained relatively consistent over time, and these two domains had the smallest proportions of women with an identified need (47% and 51% respectively at FYE 2021/22).

Table 17

Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time

Identified need area	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 183)	(N = 159)	(N = 172)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Associates	56.6 (103)	57.6 (91)	74.0 (125)
Attitudes	27.5 (50)	47.5 (75)	71.0 (120)
Community Functioning	45.6 (83)	39.2 (62)	58.6 (99)
Education and Employment	56.6 (103)	41.8 (66)	50.9 (86)
Family and Marital	46.2 (84)	44.3 (70)	47.3 (80)
Personal and Emotional	75.3 (137)	87.3 (138)	88.8 (150)
Substance Abuse	45.1 (82)	54.4 (86)	71.6 (121)

Note. Represents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need. Information presented in this table combines information scored by the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of ‘some need identified’ or ‘considerable need identified’, or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of ‘moderate need for improvement’ or ‘high need for improvement’. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Indigenous corrections

For the Ontario region, there was a sufficient number of Indigenous women to report on Indigenous specific variables including flags for Section 81 and Section 84 of the *CCRA*, interest in a traditional healing path, and Elder review information. As seen in Table 18, the proportion of Indigenous women with at least one instance of an active flag for Section 81 and Section 84 steadily increased over time from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22. Similarly, the proportion of women with at least one instance of an active flag for interest in traditional healing path doubled

over time (81% at FYE 2021/22 from 35% at FYE 2011/12). While a majority of Indigenous women had at least one completed Elder review at each time point, at FYE 2021/22 about 81% of Indigenous women had at least one completed Elder review (which had decreased from 91% of Indigenous women at FYE 2011/12).

Table 18

Indigenous Corrections information for In-Custody Women in the Ontario Region over Time

Indigenous corrections variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 34)	(N = 32)	(N = 63)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Section 81 ^a	23.5 (8)	46.9 (15)	55.6 (35)
Section 84 ^b	47.1 (16)	62.5 (20)	71.4 (45)
Interest in traditional healing path	35.3 (12)	56.3 (18)	81.0 (51)
At least one Elder review	91.2 (31)	78.1 (25)	81.0 (51)

Note. Although Indigenous programs and services are offered to non-Indigenous women who follow Indigenous cultural traditions, the information presented in this table only reflects Indigenous women. ^aSection 81= Section 81 of the *CCRA* allows CSC to enter into an agreement with an Indigenous community for the provision of correctional services to Indigenous offenders. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 81. ^bSection 84 = Section 84 of the *CCRA* applies to offenders who want to serve their eventual conditional or statutory release in an Indigenous community, or in an urban area with the support and direction of an Indigenous organization. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 84.

Summary of findings for Ontario region

Overall, results indicate that the profile of women in the Ontario region has changed when examining FYE cohorts from 2011/12, 2016/17, and 2021/22. Although the largest proportion of women were White across each of the three time points, there were changes in other racial groups. Namely, the proportion of Indigenous women steadily increased whereas the proportion of Black women decreased from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22. There was an increase in women with a violent MSO, correctional programming eligibility, and high level of dynamic needs. Specifically, almost all women had an identified need in the personal and emotional domain, which was consistent over time. There has also been a large increase in the proportion of women who require substance use treatment over time. Importantly, there was an increase in engagement with various components of the Indigenous Continuum of Care for Indigenous women, although the proportion of Indigenous women with a completed Elder review had decreased from 91% at FYE 2011/12 to 81% at FYE 2021/22.

Prairie Region

Demographic information

At FYE 2021/22, the average age of in-custody women was 34.1 ($SD = 9.3$; range = 19-61); which was slightly higher than the average age at FYE 2016/17 ($M = 33.7$, $SD = 9.4$; range = 19-62) and at FYE 2011/12 ($M = 32.7$, $SD = 8.9$; range = 18-63). At each time point, just over 60% of women were between the ages of 25 and 40 (see Table 19), and at FYE 2021/22, nearly a quarter of women were between the ages of 41 and 60. The largest proportion of women were Indigenous at each time point, which had increased relative to the earlier cohorts to 71% at FYE 2021/22. Of those who were Indigenous, the majority identified as First Nations, and this was consistent at each time point. Finally, over half of women were single at each FYE.

Table 19

Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time

Demographic Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	($N = 179$)	($N = 232$)	($N = 192$)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Age			
< 24	19.0 (34)	-- (--)	-- (--)
25 - 40	62.6 (112)	61.2 (142)	62.0 (119)
41 - 60	-- (--)	19.4 (45)	24.0 (46)
61 +	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Race			
White	30.7 (55)	29.3 (68)	22.9 (44)
Indigenous ^a	62.0 (111)	61.2 (142)	70.8 (136)
First Nations	73.0 (81)	80.3 (114)	72.1 (98)
Métis	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Inuit	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Black	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Asian	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Other ^b	3.9 (7)	4.3 (10)	3.6 (7)
Marital Status			
Common-law	24.6 (44)	22.8 (53)	14.6 (28)
Married	4.5 (8)	4.7 (11)	5.7 (11)
Single	58.7 (105)	56.0 (130)	62.0 (119)
Other ^c	12.3 (22)	16.4 (38)	17.7 (34)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. ^b'Other' race group includes Latin American, multiracial, 'other', unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sentence and offence information

Across each time point, the majority of women were on their first term (88% at FYE 2021/22, 90% at FYE 2016/17, and 86% at FYE 2011/12). Similarly, the majority of women were serving their first federal sentence, and this percentage increased over time (89% at FYE 2021/22, 83% at FYE 2016/17, and 78% at FYE 2011/12). As seen in Table 20, the largest proportion of women were serving a sentence between 2 to 4 years at each time point. For those with determinate sentences, the average aggregate sentence length was 3.7 years (*SD* at FYE 2021/22 = 2.4, *SD* at FYE 2016/17 = 2.1, *SD* at FYE 2011/12 = 2.4) at all FYEs. At each time point, just under two-thirds of women had a violent MSO on their sentence. The proportion of women who were in custody past their DPED and FPED slightly decreased across the three time points.

Table 20

Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time

Sentence and offence variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(<i>N</i> = 179)	(<i>N</i> = 232)	(<i>N</i> = 192)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Sentence length			
2 to 4 years	61.5 (110)	64.2 (149)	67.7 (130)
4 to 6 years	16.2 (29)	12.5 (29)	12.0 (23)
6 to 10 years	-- (--)	9.5 (22)	9.9 (19)
10+ years	-- (--)	2.2 (5)	3.1 (6)
Indeterminate	12.3 (22)	11.6 (27)	7.3 (14)
Violent offence ^a	65.5 (116)	60.9 (140)	62.3 (119)
Past DPED ^b	60.3 (108)	59.3 (137)	52.6 (101)
Past FPED ^c	41.9 (75)	35.5 (82)	35.9 (69)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Risk and need information

As seen in Table 21, the proportion of women who scored moderate on overall static factors level increased over time, whereas the proportion of women who scored low or high decreased over time. For overall dynamic factors level, the majority of women scored high at FYE 2021/22 (increasing from 65% at FYE 2011/22 to 82% at FYE 2021/22). In terms of

reintegration potential and accountability, the largest proportion of women at each FYE were rated moderate at intake. However, for accountability at intake, the proportion of women rated moderate increased from 49% at FYE 2011/12 to 69% at FYE 2021/22 and over the same time period, those rated high decreased from 40% to 25%. Although the majority of women were rated as moderate for motivation level at intake at FYE 2021/22 (69%), at FYE 2011/12 the largest proportion of women were rated high (55%). The proportion of women with a responsivity flag decreased over time (from 38% at FYE 2011/12 to 29% at FYE 2021/22), whereas the proportion of women with an engagement flag increased over time (from 85% at FYE 2011/12 to 93% at FYE 2021/22). Overall, scores on the CRI decreased over time; at FYE 2021/22 a larger proportion of women scored in the moderate range, whereas at FYE 2011/12, a larger proportion of women scored in the high range. However, the proportion of women with an identified correctional program need, based on the CRI, remained relatively stable over time, with about 71% of women at FYE 2021/22 identified as having a correctional program need. Consistently, the largest proportion of women were classified as medium security level at intake, although there was a decrease in the proportion of women classified as maximum security level at intake over time (from 16% at FYE 2011/12 to 11% at FYE 2021/22). Interestingly, although the need for substance use treatment remained relatively stable over time, the proportion of women whose offence was linked with substance use actually increased (from 55% at FYE 2011/12 to 71% at FYE 2021/22). However, this increase may be due to the reduced number of 'unknown' responses (from 35% to 14%). Across time, the proportion of women with a high school diploma remained consistent, with almost one-third of women having a high school diploma at FYE 2021/22. The proportion of women with parental responsibilities increased over time, with just over half of women at FYE 2021/22 identified as having parental responsibilities. Finally, the proportion affiliated with an STG increased significantly, with 20% of women at FYE 2021/22 identified as affiliated with an STG compared to 6% at FYE 2011/12 and 5% at FYE 2016/17.

Table 21

Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over time

Risk and Need Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 179)	(N = 232)	(N = 192)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor			
Low	25.1 (45)	24.1 (56)	10.9 (21)
Moderate	31.3 (56)	43.1 (100)	52.1 (100)
High	43.6 (78)	32.8 (76)	37.0 (71)
Overall Dynamic Factor			
Low	3.4 (6)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	31.8 (57)	-- (--)	-- (--)
High	64.8 (116)	79.3 (184)	81.8 (157)
Reintegration Potential ^a			
Low	31.8 (57)	28.4 (66)	29.7 (57)
Moderate	56.4 (101)	59.5 (138)	62.5 (120)
High	11.7 (21)	12.1 (28)	7.8 (15)
Motivation Level ^a			
Low	5.6 (10)	6.0 (14)	4.7 (9)
Moderate	39.7 (71)	61.2 (142)	68.8 (132)
High	54.7 (98)	32.8 (76)	26.6 (51)
Accountability ^a			
Low	11.3 (20)	12.5 (29)	6.8 (13)
Moderate	49.2 (87)	59.5 (138)	68.8 (132)
High	39.5 (70)	28.0 (65)	24.5 (47)
Responsivity Flag ^a	37.9 (67)	39.2 (91)	29.2 (56)
Engagement Flag ^a	84.7 (150)	85.3 (198)	93.2 (179)
Criminal Risk Index ^b			
Low	15.5 (24)	22.9 (43)	21.1 (40)
Low-Moderate	16.1 (25)	13.3 (25)	8.4 (16)
Moderate	20.0 (31)	19.1 (36)	29.5 (56)
High-Moderate	22.6 (35)	21.3 (40)	25.3 (48)
High	25.8 (40)	23.4 (44)	15.8 (30)
Offender Security Level ^a			
Minimum	26.3 (47)	25.9 (60)	27.1 (52)
Medium	57.5 (103)	60.8 (141)	62.0 (119)
Maximum	16.2 (29)	13.4 (31)	10.9 (21)
Correctional program need ^c	68.4 (106)	63.8 (120)	70.5 (134)
Link between crime and substance use			
Yes	55.1 (92)	59.0 (131)	70.5 (122)
Unknown	34.7 (58)	26.6 (59)	13.9 (24)
Substance use treatment required	79.0 (132)	75.7 (168)	76.9 (133)
High school diploma	29.2 (45)	24.7 (45)	32.7 (54)
Parental responsibilities	39.9 (61)	52.9 (100)	58.2 (96)
STG ^d affiliation	6.1 (11)	5.2 (12)	19.8 (38)

Note. ^a = scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

As seen in Table 22, the domain that was most consistently considered a need area for women was the personal and emotional domain, followed by the substance abuse domain. The community functioning domain has had the largest change over time, with the proportion of women with an identified need more than doubling from 33% at FYE 2011/12 to 71% at FYE 2021/22. Similarly, the family and marital domain also saw a large change over time, with the proportion of women with an identified need increasing from 71% to 91% over the same time period. Although the proportion of women with a need in the attitudes domain increased to 57% at FYE 2021/22 (from 42% at FYE 2011/12), the proportion of women with a need in this domain was significantly lower than the other domains. With the exception of the attitudes domain, over 70% of women had an identified need in each domain at FYE 2021/22.

Table 22

Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time

Identified need area	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 179)	(N = 232)	(N = 192)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Associates	75.4 (129)	85.7 (197)	84.4 (162)
Attitudes	41.8 (71)	51.5 (119)	57.1 (109)
Community Functioning	32.7 (56)	59.6 (137)	70.8 (136)
Education and Employment	71.9 (123)	69.6 (160)	70.8 (136)
Family and Marital	71.3 (122)	82.3 (190)	90.6 (174)
Personal and Emotional	92.4 (158)	91.8 (212)	95.3 (183)
Substance Abuse	86.0 (147)	88.3 (203)	90.6 (174)

Note. Represents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need. Information presented in this table combines information scored by the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of ‘some need identified’ or ‘considerable need identified’, or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of ‘moderate need for improvement’ or ‘high need for improvement’. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Indigenous corrections

For the Prairie region, the number of Indigenous women was sufficient to allow for reporting on variables including flags for Section 81 and Section 84 of the *CCRA*, interest in a traditional healing path, and Elder review information. As seen in Table 23, the proportion of Indigenous women with at least one instance of an active flag for Section 81 and Section 84

steadily increased over time from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22. Similarly, the proportion of women with at least one instance of an active flag for interest in traditional healing path increased over time (97% at FYE 2021/22 from 64% at FYE 2011/12). Almost all Indigenous women had at least one completed Elder review at each time point (100% at FYE 2011/12, 99% at FYE 2016/17, and 98% at FYE 2021/22). Overall, at FYE 2021/22 about 90% or more of Indigenous women had at least one instance of an active flag for Section 81 and Section 84, were interested in a traditional healing path, and had at least one Elder review.

Table 23

Indigenous Corrections information for In-Custody Women in the Prairie Region over Time

	FYE 2011/12 (N = 111)	FYE 2016/17 (N = 142)	FYE 2021/22 (N = 136)
Indigenous corrections variable	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Section 81 ^a	55.0 (61)	67.6 (96)	89.7 (122)
Section 84 ^b	68.5 (76)	75.4 (107)	89.7 (122)
Interest in traditional healing path	64.0 (71)	81.0 (115)	97.1 (132)
At least one Elder review	100.0 (111)	99.3 (141)	97.8 (133)

Note. Although Indigenous programs and services are offered to non-Indigenous women who follow Indigenous cultural traditions, the information presented in this table only reflects Indigenous women. ^aSection 81= Section 81 of the *CCRA* allows CSC to enter into an agreement with an Indigenous community for the provision of correctional services to Indigenous offenders. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 81. ^bSection 84 = Section 84 of the *CCRA* applies to offenders who want to serve their eventual conditional or statutory release in an Indigenous community, or in an urban area with the support and direction of an Indigenous organization. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 84.

Summary of findings for Prairie region

Overall, the profile of women in custody in the Prairie region in relation to demographics, and sentence and offence information has remained consistent over time, although the proportion of Indigenous women has increased over time. Notably, the majority of women in the Prairies are Indigenous. It appears that static risk level has generally increased among women in the Prairie region, and they continue to demonstrate high levels of need for programming, with almost all women demonstrating a need in the personal and emotional domain. Additionally, substance use continues to be a concern for the majority of women, which was consistent over time. The proportion of women who are affiliated with an STG has also increased over time. Importantly, there was a noted increase in engagement with various components of the

Indigenous Continuum of Care for Indigenous women.

Pacific Region

Demographic information

At FYE 2021/22, the average age of in-custody women was 38.5 ($SD = 14.1$; range = 20-83); slightly lower than the average age at FYE 2016/17 which was 40.5 ($SD = 13.7$; range = 22-78) and 2011/12 which was 39.5 ($SD = 12.9$; range = 20-73). At each time point, the largest proportion of women were between the ages of 25 and 40 (see Table 24). However, from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22 the proportion of women between the ages of 25 and 40 increased from 49% to 56%, whereas the proportion of women between the ages of 41 and 60 decreased from 37% to 22%. At FYE 2021/22, over half of the women were Indigenous (55%) whereas at FYE 2011/12 over half of the women were White (54%). Notably, of those who were Indigenous, the majority were First Nations at each time point. Finally, the proportion of women who were single was highest at FYE 2021/22 at 59% compared to 44% at FYE 2011/12 and 54% at FYE 2016/17.

Table 24

Demographic Information for In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time

Demographic Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(<i>N</i> = 79) % (<i>n</i>)	(<i>N</i> = 74) % (<i>n</i>)	(<i>N</i> = 64) % (<i>n</i>)
Age			
< 24	7.6 (6)	9.5 (7)	10.9 (7)
25 - 40	49.4 (39)	47.3 (35)	56.3 (36)
41 - 60	36.7 (29)	33.8 (25)	21.9 (14)
61 +	6.3 (5)	9.5 (7)	10.9 (7)
Race			
White	54.4 (43)	47.3 (35)	35.9 (23)
Indigenous ^a	36.7 (29)	45.9 (34)	54.7 (35)
First Nations	86.2 (25)	67.6 (23)	71.4 (25)
Métis	-- (--)	32.4 (11)	28.6 (10)
Inuit	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Black	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Asian	6.3 (5)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Other ^b	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Marital Status			
Common-law	20.3 (16)	12.2 (9)	9.4 (6)
Married	15.2 (12)	14.9 (11)	12.5 (8)
Single	44.3 (35)	54.1 (40)	59.4 (38)
Other ^c	20.3 (16)	18.9 (14)	18.8 (12)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. ^b'Other' race group includes Latin American, multiracial, 'other', unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sentence and offence information

Across each time point, the majority of women were on their first term (89% at FYE 2021/22, 91% at FYE 2016/17, and 82% at FYE 2011/12). Similarly, the majority of women were serving their first federal sentence (88% at FYE 2021/22, 84% at FYE 2016/17, and 76% at FYE 2011/12). As seen in Table 25, there was variation in the most common sentence lengths over time. At FYE 2021/22, the largest proportion of women were serving an indeterminate sentence (36%). At FYE 2011/12 sentences of between 2 and 4 years were most common (42%), but this decreased over time to 30% at FYE 2021/22. In fact, the average aggregate sentence length of women serving determinate sentences was 4.7 years (*SD* = 2.5) at FYE 2021/22 and 4.6

years at FYE 2016/17 ($SD = 2.9$), whereas at FYE 2011/12 the average sentence length was 4.2 years ($SD = 2.5$). The proportion of women whose MSO on sentence was violent remained relatively consistent over time at approximately 70%. The proportion of women who were in custody past their DPED increased at FYE 2021/22 (59%) from 2011/12 (51%) and 2016/17 (50%). Notably, the proportion of women in custody past their FPED decreased from FYE 2011/12 to 2016/17 (47% to 38%), but then increased at FYE 2021/22 (42%).

Table 25

Sentence and Offence Information for In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time

Sentence and offence variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	($N = 79$)	($N = 74$)	($N = 64$)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Sentence length			
2 to 4 years	41.8 (33)	31.1 (23)	29.7 (19)
4 to 6 years	11.4 (9)	16.2 (12)	-- (--)
6 to 10 years	-- (--)	-- (--)	18.8 (12)
10+ years	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	31.6 (25)	37.8 (28)	35.9 (23)
Violent offence ^a	70.1 (54)	74.0 (54)	70.3 (45)
Past DPED ^b	50.6 (40)	50.0 (37)	59.4 (38)
Past FPED ^c	46.8 (37)	37.8 (28)	42.2 (27)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Risk and need information

Table 26 presents the distribution in ratings of risk, need, reintegration potential, motivation, accountability, responsivity, engagement, and offender security level. Across each time point, the largest proportion of women scored high on overall static factors level, which had increased over time, with 56% of in-custody women scoring high at FYE 2021/22 in comparison to 46% at FYE 2011/12. Similarly, across each time point the largest proportion of women scored high on overall dynamic factors level and the proportion of women scoring high increased over time from 56% at FYE 2011/12 to 81% at FYE 2021/22. In terms of reintegration potential, the largest proportion of women at FYE 2021/22 were rated low (52%), whereas at FYE 2011/12

the largest proportion of women were rated moderate (52%). The majority of women were rated as moderate for motivation level and accountability at intake across each cohort. In contrast, the proportion of women with a responsivity flag increased over time (from 21% at FYE 2011/12 to 39% at FYE 2021/22), however the proportion of women with an engagement flag remained consistent over time. Scores on the CRI increased over time with a larger proportion of women scoring high and high-moderate at FYE 2021/22 than at FYE 2011/12. However, the proportion of women with an identified correctional program need, based on the CRI, remained relatively stable over time, and at 2021/22 almost two-thirds (63%) were identified as having a correctional program need. Consistently, the largest proportion of women were rated as medium security level at intake. Interestingly, although the need for substance use treatment increased over time (from 66% at FYE 2011/12 to 69% at FYE 2021/22), the proportion of women whose offence was linked with substance use actually decreased over time (from 62% at FYE 2011/12 to 55% at FYE 2021/22). Consistent across time, less than half of women had a high school diploma, while slightly over half had parental responsibilities. Finally, at FYE 2021/22 9% of women were identified as being affiliated with an STG.

Table 26

Risk and Need Information for In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time

Risk and Need Variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 79)	(N = 74)	(N = 64)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor			
Low	19.0 (15)	10.8 (8)	-- (--)
Moderate	35.4 (28)	37.8 (28)	-- (--)
High	45.6 (36)	51.4 (38)	56.3 (36)
Overall Dynamic Factor			
Low	6.3 (5)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	38.0 (30)	-- (--)	-- (--)
High	55.7 (44)	73.0 (54)	81.3 (52)
Reintegration Potential ^a			
Low	34.2 (27)	40.5 (30)	51.6 (33)
Moderate	51.9 (41)	52.7 (39)	-- (--)
High	13.9 (11)	6.8 (5)	-- (--)
Motivation Level ^a			
Low	8.9 (7)	6.8 (5)	-- (--)
Moderate	55.7 (44)	63.5 (47)	75.0 (48)
High	35.4 (28)	29.7 (22)	-- (--)
Accountability ^a			
Low	16.0 (12)	16.2 (12)	12.5 (8)
Moderate	56.0 (42)	68.9 (51)	76.6 (49)
High	28.0 (21)	14.9 (11)	10.9 (7)
Responsivity Flag ^a	21.3 (16)	31.1 (23)	39.1 (25)
Engagement Flag ^a	88.0 (66)	87.8 (65)	89.1 (57)
Criminal Risk Index ^b			
Low	24.2 (16)	38.8 (26)	28.1 (18)
Low-Moderate	18.2 (12)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	24.2 (16)	-- (--)	-- (--)
High-Moderate	15.2 (10)	14.9 (10)	25.0 (16)
High	18.2 (12)	23.9 (16)	23.4 (15)
Offender Security Level ^a			
Minimum	17.7 (14)	6.8 (5)	10.9 (7)
Medium	62.0 (49)	54.1 (40)	57.8 (37)
Maximum	20.3 (16)	39.2 (29)	31.3 (20)
Correctional program need ^c	57.6 (38)	53.7 (36)	62.5 (40)
Link between crime and substance use			
Yes	62.2 (46)	56.9 (37)	54.8 (34)
Unknown	24.3 (18)	27.7 (18)	25.8 (16)
Substance use treatment required	66.2 (49)	66.2 (43)	69.4 (43)
High school diploma	39.4 (26)	42.2 (27)	39.3 (24)
Parental responsibilities	55.4 (36)	50.0 (33)	55.7 (34)
STG ^d affiliation	-- (--)	-- (--)	9.4 (6)

Note. ^a= scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table 27 presents the proportion of women with an identified need in each of the seven criminogenic need areas. Overall, the domain that was most consistently considered a need area for women was the personal and emotional domain, followed by the family and marital and substance abuse domains. The largest change was noted for the community functioning domain, with the proportion of women with an identified need in this domain increasing from 39% at FYE 2011/12 to 65% at FYE 2021/22. Similarly, the attitudes domain also saw a large change over time, with the proportion of women with an identified need in this domain increasing from 58% to 70% over the same time period. Generally, a large proportion of women were identified as having a need across a number of areas, with over 60% of women having an identified need in each domain at FYE 2021/22.

Table 27

Identified Criminogenic Needs of In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time

Identified need area	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 79)	(N = 74)	(N = 64)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Associates	70.8 (51)	71.8 (51)	73.0 (46)
Attitudes	57.7 (41)	63.4 (45)	69.8 (44)
Community Functioning	38.6 (27)	55.7 (39)	64.5 (40)
Education and Employment	59.7 (43)	62.0 (44)	65.1 (41)
Family and Marital	76.4 (55)	71.8 (51)	85.7 (54)
Personal and Emotional	93.1 (67)	95.8 (68)	95.2 (60)
Substance Abuse	70.4 (50)	75.7 (53)	79.0 (49)

Note. Represents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need. Information presented in this table combines information scored by the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of 'some need identified' or 'considerable need identified', or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of 'moderate need for improvement' or 'high need for improvement'. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Indigenous corrections

For the Pacific region, the number of Indigenous women was sufficient to allow for reporting on components of the Indigenous Continuum of Care, including flags for Section 81 and Section 84 of the *CCRA*, interest in a traditional healing path, and Elder review information. As seen in Table 28, the proportion of Indigenous women with at least one instance of an active flag for Section 81 and Section 84 steadily increased over time from FYE 2011/12 to FYE 2021/22. Similarly, the proportion of women with at least one instance of an active flag for interest in traditional healing path almost doubled over time (83% at FYE 2021/22 from 45% at FYE 2011/12). While a majority of Indigenous women had at least one completed Elder review at each time point, at FYE 2021/22 it was found that all Indigenous women had at least one completed Elder review.

Table 28

Indigenous Corrections information for In-Custody Women in the Pacific Region over Time

Indigenous corrections variable	FYE 2011/12	FYE 2016/17	FYE 2021/22
	(N = 29)	(N = 34)	(N = 35)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Section 81 ^a	27.6 (8)	44.1 (15)	60.0 (21)
Section 84 ^b	41.4 (12)	64.7 (22)	68.6 (24)
Interest in traditional healing path	44.8 (13)	73.5 (25)	82.9 (29)
At least one Elder review	75.9 (22)	91.2 (31)	100.0 (35)

Note. Although Indigenous programs and services are offered to non-Indigenous women who follow Indigenous cultural traditions, the information presented in this table only reflects Indigenous women. ^aSection 81 = Section 81 of the *CCRA* allows CSC to enter into an agreement with an Indigenous community for the provision of correctional services to Indigenous offenders. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 81. ^bSection 84 = Section 84 of the *CCRA* applies to offenders who want to serve their eventual conditional or statutory release in an Indigenous community, or in an urban area with the support and direction of an Indigenous organization. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 84.

Summary of findings for Pacific region

Overall, results indicate that the profile of women in the Pacific region has demonstrated changes when examining FYE cohorts from 2011/12, 2016/17, and 2021/22, especially with respect to demographic information. At FYE 2021/22, Indigenous women made up over half of the in-custody women population, which was greater than the earlier cohorts. The proportion of women with a high static factor rating and a high dynamic factor rating increased over time.

However, the need for correctional programming and substance use has remained relatively consistent across time points. There was an increase in motivation and accountability over time, as well as an increase in the proportion of women with a responsivity need. Among Indigenous women, there was a noted increase in engagement with various components of the Indigenous Continuum of Care over time.

Discussion

Recent research has demonstrated that the national profile of in-custody women has changed over time, with a particular shift in the custody profile over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic. These changes are marked by a greater proportion of women rated as poor or very poor criminal risk ratings, more likely to be serving a sentence for a violent offence, and more likely to be rated as having a high overall level of criminogenic need (Motiuk & Keown, 2022). Given that research had predominately focused on national-level results, and given that the in-custody population of women may differ across regions, it was imperative to examine the regional profiles of in-custody women to gain a more fulsome understanding of the operational and programming requirements in each region. The current study examined regional profiles for in-custody women from three time points to further understand these differences and to provide more nuanced findings that can be used to inform future planning around resource allocation, infrastructure needs, and population management. Specifically, the current study examined the regional profile of women in custody at FYE 2021/22 and provided insight on how the profiles have changed over a 5- and 10-year period (i.e., since FYE 2011/12 and FYE 2016/17).

In order to provide an overview of the in-custody women offender population at CSC, the first goal of the report was to examine the national profile of incarcerated women at FYE 2021/22. It was found that, overall, a large proportion of the in-custody women population were Indigenous (First Nations), between the ages of 25 and 40, and single. In terms of sentencing and offence information, women were typically on their first term serving their first federal sentence, with just over half of all women in custody serving a sentence between 2 and 4 years. Additionally, most women had a violent MSO associated with their sentence. A large proportion of in-custody women were rated as moderate or high for overall measures of static risk and dynamic need; however, for reintegration potential women were typically rated as low to moderate. A link between substance use and criminal behaviour was common, and a large proportion of women were rated as requiring substance use treatment. Almost all women had an identified need in the personal and emotional domain of the DFIA-R. Finally, the majority of Indigenous women in custody demonstrated an interest in various components of the Indigenous Continuum of Care.

The second goal of the report was to examine the regional profiles of the in-custody

population of women offenders at FYE 2021/22. Overall, across regions, the largest proportion of women were between the ages of 25 and 40 (although Quebec and Ontario also had a large proportion of women between the ages of 41 and 60), were single, and were rated as moderate or high for overall measures of static risk and dynamic need. However, there were significant differences across the regions in terms of racial breakdown, sentencing and offence information, and static risk and dynamic need information. Data indicated that most women in the Atlantic, Ontario, and Quebec regions were White, whereas the majority of women in Pacific and Prairie region were Indigenous. Sentences between 2 to 4 years were most common in the Atlantic, Ontario, and Prairie regions, whereas in Pacific and Quebec regions, it was more common for women to be serving indeterminate sentences. A larger proportion of women in the Pacific region were in custody past their DPED and their FPED in comparison to the other regions. The Quebec region had the largest proportion of women with a violent offence as their MSO (81% compared to 70% or lower for the other regions) and the lowest proportion of women with an engagement flag. In contrast, the Ontario region had a larger proportion of women with a responsibility flag (49% compared to 39% or lower for the other regions). The Quebec, Atlantic and Pacific regions had larger proportions of women who had an OSL of maximum compared to the Ontario and Prairie regions. Over half of women in the Atlantic region had a high school diploma, which was higher than the other regions. In terms of substance use, it was found that women in the Quebec region were less likely to have a substance use need and require substance use treatment. Lastly, the proportion of women affiliated with an STG varied considerably across regions, with the highest proportion in the Prairie region (21%).

The third and final goal of the report was to examine how the in-custody profile of women changed over time. This was done by comparing the FYE 2021/22 snapshot data to the snapshot data from FYE 2016/17 and from FYE 2011/12. Generally, the profile of in-custody women at FYE 2021/22 differed from earlier cohorts in several respects. There was a notable shift in the racial composition, marked by an increase in the proportion of Indigenous women and a decrease in the proportions represented by both White and Black women. At FYE 2021/22 there was a greater proportion of women who had a violent offence associated with their sentence, as well as a greater proportion who were rated as moderate or high for overall measures of static risk and dynamic need. The proportion of women with identified criminogenic needs increased over time across all regions, with the largest proportion of women having an

identified need in the substance abuse, and personal and emotional domains. Affiliation with an STG also increased at FYE 2021/22 relative to the profile based on FYE 2016/17 and 2011/12. The vast majority of Indigenous women in custody demonstrated an interest in various components of the Indigenous Continuum of Care at FYE 2021/22, which generally marked an increase relative to earlier cohorts.

Limitations

Although these results provide an overview of the in-custody women offender population, both regionally and nationally, there are some limitations that should be considered. First, results should be interpreted with the acknowledgement that the number of women contributing to the analyses was small for certain regions and FYs; an issue that was exacerbated when examining a variable that had several categories (e.g., Criminal Risk Index). As a result, relatively minor fluctuations in the number of women falling into one category of a variable in a given region and FY can lead to a substantial change in the proportions. In an effort to prevent highlighting differences that could easily result from small variations in group size, changes in proportions that were 5% or greater were interpreted as a potentially relevant difference, while differences less than 5% were considered not to have meaningfully changed. Nonetheless, caution should be exercised when interpreting findings based on small groups.

Results focussed on identifying similarities and differences across regions and over time points. Importantly, the results do not allow for determining the cause of any observed difference, and analyses do not control for other relevant variables, which would provide a more nuanced understanding of the differences. As such, future research should explore controlling for explanatory variables or examining how key variables might interact to better understand some of the observed differences, including other important areas of women's corrections, such as the impact of transfers on access to programming and visits.

Additionally, particularly for women, relying on snapshots results in a smaller number of women who will contribute to the analysis. For the current study, the relatively small number of women meant that certain comparisons were either limited or not possible. For example, results were unable to be considered across different ethnocultural groups (e.g., Black women, Asian women). Although previous research at CSC has examined differences across various ethnocultural groups at the national level (e.g., CSC, 2022; Gottschall, 2012), future research should consider a more in-depth analysis of ethnocultural differences at the regional level.

Regardless of the method used to identify a study group, there are few women who comprise these ethnocultural groups, which suggests that a qualitative study would be required to better understand any potential nuanced differences across racial groups at the regional level.

Relying on snapshot data of the in-custody population provided useful information for understanding the needs of the current population at that specific point in time and facilitated a direct comparison to previous FYs. For example, in-line with previous research, there have been changes to the most recent in-custody profiles, in comparison to 5- and 10-years ago. Notably, these changes in the most recent in-custody profile may have been a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, which had a profound influence on programming, infrastructure, and population management (Motiuk & Keown, 2022). In fact, previous research has highlighted that the shift in the custody profile of women over the pandemic era was unprecedented (Motiuk & Keown, 2022). As such, it would be beneficial for future research to further examine whether the regional in-custody profiles of women continue to change, particularly as it is unknown whether the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic will be long-standing or whether the end of the pandemic will mitigate these changes.

Although there are benefits to using snapshots, they are limited in that they do not fully capture the changes in the population throughout a given year (e.g., admissions and releases), or the various resources required to manage the population given the phase of institutional supervision that they are in. For example, a portion of women in each of the FYE cohorts had been incarcerated for a considerable amount of time at the point of data extraction. Given that this study relied predominantly on the results from intake assessments, more up-to-date information may have been available to speak to current needs demonstrated by the population, rather than needs presented at the time of intake. Further, it would be worthwhile for future planning around resource allocation and population management to consider regional admissions and releases, in addition to examining the current snapshot of the in-custody population. For example, research conducted by Motiuk and Hayden (2022) found that the federal women admission population differed from the end of year snapshots of in-custody women whereby women who were in the admission cohort tended to be younger, have shorter sentences, and less likely to be classified as maximum security. As such, it would be beneficial for future research to look at differences in admissions and snapshot information at the regional level.

Conclusion

Understanding how women's regional in-custody profiles are changing over time can help ensure that correctional programs, policies, and institutional services are responsive to women's unique risk and needs and adequately account for women's demographic, sentencing, and offence information. Overall, results suggested that the profile of women in custody has changed over time at both the national and regional levels. The general pattern observed across most regions was that women at FYE 2021/22 were more diverse, had more complex and elevated levels of static risk and dynamic need and a greater proportion had a need for substance use treatment and correctional programming compared to the earlier cohorts. Given the changes in the recent regional profiles compared to 5- and 10-years ago, resource allocation, population management, and infrastructure planning can be further informed by the results of this study.

References

- Balfour, G. (2020). *Women in Custody*. In *Adults Corrections in Canada*, by J. Winterdyk and M. Weinrath, (pp. 147-166). de Sitter Publications.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act*. (1992). S.C. 1992, c. 20.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2018). Security classification and penitentiary placement. *Commissioner's Directive 705-6*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada. Retrieved from Security Classification and Penitentiary Placement (csc-scc.gc.ca)
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2019). Correctional planning and criminal profile. *Commissioner's Directive 705-6*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada. Retrieved from Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile (csc-scc.gc.ca)
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2022). *Ethnocultural Offenders in Federal Custody: An Examination of Admission, In-Custody, and Community Supervision Indicators* (Research Report R-446). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Cram, S., & Farrell MacDonald, S. (2022). *Federal Women Offenders' Involvement in Security Threat Groups (STGs)* (Research in Brief RIB-21-23). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Farrell MacDonald, S., & Cram, S. (2023). *Women Offenders' Substance Use Patterns across Region* (Research in Brief; RIB-23-17). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Gottschall, S. (2012). *Ethnic diversity in Canadian federal offender admissions* (Research Report R-263). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Motiuk, L. (2022). *Women Admissions to Federal Custody: 1995-96 to 2020-21* (Research in Brief RIB-21-26). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Motiuk, L., & Arnet-Zargarian, A. (2021). *Changing Population of Women in Federal Custody: 2015 to 2020* (Research in Brief RIB-21-11). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Motiuk, L., & Hayden, M. (2022). *Comparing Federal Women Admissions and Custody Profiles: 2020-21* (Research in Brief RIB-21-19). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Motiuk, L., & Keown, L-A. (2021). *Identified Needs of Federal Offenders in Custody: 2020* (Research in Brief RIB-21-04). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Motiuk, L., & Keown, L-A. (2022). *Pandemic Era Impacts on the Federal Custody Population Profile: Women* (Research in Brief RIB-22-09). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Appendix A: Demographic Information at Each Time Point by Region

Table A1

Demographic Information at FYE 2011/12 by Region

Demographic Variable	Region					
	National (N = 593)	Atlantic (N = 61)	Quebec (N = 91)	Ontario (N = 183)	Prairie (N = 179)	Pacific (N = 79)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Age						
< 24	14.2 (84)	-- (--)	9.9 (9)	13.7 (25)	19.0 (34)	-- (--)
25 - 40	51.6 (306)	60.7 (37)	38.5 (35)	45.4 (83)	62.6 (112)	49.4 (39)
41 - 60	30.4 (180)	23.0 (14)	42.9 (39)	36.1 (66)	-- (--)	36.7 (29)
61 +	3.9 (23)	-- (--)	8.8 (8)	4.9 (9)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Race						
White	47.6 (282)	60.7 (37)	76.9 (70)	42.1 (77)	30.7 (55)	54.4 (43)
Indigenous ^a	34.1 (202)	27.9 (17)	12.1 (11)	18.6 (34)	62.0 (111)	36.7 (29)
Black	8.8 (52)	-- (--)	7.7 (7)	22.4 (41)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Asian	4.2 (25)	-- (--)	-- (--)	7.7 (14)	-- (--)	6.3 (5)
Other ^b	5.4 (32)	8.2 (5)	-- (--)	9.3 (17)	3.9 (7)	-- (--)
Marital Status						
Common Law	20.1 (119)	-- (--)	23.1 (21)	13.7 (25)	24.6 (44)	20.3 (16)
Married	8.4 (50)	-- (--)	6.6 (6)	10.9 (20)	4.5 (8)	15.2 (12)
Single	55.1 (327)	49.2 (30)	46.2 (42)	62.8 (115)	58.7 (105)	44.3 (35)
Other ^c	16.4 (97)	23.0 (14)	24.2 (22)	12.6 (23)	12.3 (22)	20.3 (16)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. ^b'Other' race group includes Latin American, multiracial, 'other', unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table A2

Demographic Information at FYE 2016/17 by Region

Demographic Variable	Region					
	National (<i>N</i> = 635)	Atlantic (<i>N</i> = 72)	Quebec (<i>N</i> = 98)	Ontario (<i>N</i> = 159)	Prairie (<i>N</i> = 232)	Pacific (<i>N</i> = 74)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Age						
< 24	12.4 (79)	-- (--)	7.1 (7)	6.3 (10)	-- (--)	9.5 (7)
25 - 40	54.5 (346)	54.2 (39)	43.9 (43)	54.7 (87)	61.2 (142)	47.3 (35)
41 - 60	28.7 (182)	29.2 (21)	38.8 (38)	33.3 (53)	19.4 (45)	33.8 (25)
61 +	4.4 (28)	-- (--)	10.2 (10)	5.7 (9)	-- (--)	9.5 (7)
Race						
White	49.0 (311)	83.3 (60)	75.5 (74)	46.5 (74)	29.3 (68)	47.3 (35)
Indigenous ^a	35.6 (226)	8.3 (6)	12.2 (12)	20.1 (32)	61.2 (142)	45.9 (34)
Black	6.0 (38)	-- (--)	-- (--)	18.9 (30)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Asian	4.4 (28)	-- (--)	-- (--)	7.5 (12)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Other ^b	5.0 (32)	-- (--)	5.1 (5)	6.9 (11)	4.3 (10)	-- (--)
Marital Status						
Common Law	19.1 (121)	27.8 (20)	19.4 (19)	12.6 (20)	22.8 (53)	12.2 (9)
Married	8.7 (55)	8.3 (6)	9.2 (9)	11.3 (18)	4.7 (11)	14.9 (11)
Single	52.9 (336)	52.8 (38)	55.1 (54)	46.5 (74)	56.0 (130)	54.1 (40)
Other ^c	19.4 (123)	11.1 (8)	16.3 (16)	29.6 (47)	16.4 (38)	18.9 (14)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. ^b'Other' race group includes Latin American, multiracial, 'other', unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table A3

Demographic Information at FYE 2021/22 by Region

Demographic Variable	Region					
	National (<i>N</i> = 558)	Atlantic (<i>N</i> = 56)	Quebec (<i>N</i> = 74)	Ontario (<i>N</i> = 172)	Prairie (<i>N</i> = 192)	Pacific (<i>N</i> = 64)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Age						
< 24	9.9 (55)	17.9 (10)	2.7 (2)	5.8 (10)	13.5 (26)	10.9 (7)
25 - 40	54.3 (303)	51.8 (29)	47.3 (35)	48.8 (84)	62.0 (119)	56.3 (36)
41 - 60	32.3 (180)	28.6 (16)	43.2 (32)	41.9 (72)	24.0 (46)	21.9 (14)
61 +	3.6 (20)	1.8 (1)	6.8 (5)	3.5 (6)	0.5 (1)	10.9 (7)
Race						
White	39.4 (220)	66.1 (37)	56.8 (42)	43.0 (74)	22.9 (44)	35.9 (23)
Indigenous ^a	47.8 (267)	26.8 (15)	24.3 (18)	36.6 (63)	70.8 (136)	54.7 (35)
Black	3.8 (21)	-- (--)	-- (--)	8.7 (15)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Asian	2.9 (16)	-- (--)	-- (--)	3.5 (6)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Other ^b	6.1 (34)	-- (--)	10.8 (8)	8.1 (14)	3.6 (7)	-- (--)
Marital Status						
Common Law	15.1 (84)	23.2 (13)	28.4 (21)	9.3 (16)	14.6 (28)	9.4 (6)
Married	6.8 (38)	10.7 (6)	-- (--)	5.8 (10)	5.7 (11)	12.5 (8)
Single	54.5 (304)	48.2 (27)	52.7 (39)	47.1 (81)	62.0 (119)	59.4 (38)
Other ^c	23.7 (132)	17.9 (10)	-- (--)	37.8 (65)	17.7 (34)	18.8 (12)

Note. ^aIndigenous category includes First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. ^b'Other' race group includes Latin American, multiracial, 'other', unknown, and missing. ^cOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Appendix B: Offence and Sentencing Information at Each Time Point by Region

Table B1

Offence and Sentencing Information at FYE 2011/12 by Region

Offence and Sentence Variable	Region					
	National (N = 593)	Atlantic (N = 61)	Quebec (N = 91)	Ontario (N = 183)	Prairie (N = 179)	Pacific (N = 79)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Sentence length						
2 to 4 years	55.0 (326)	65.6 (40)	42.9 (39)	56.8 (104)	61.5 (110)	41.8 (33)
4 to 6 years	13.8 (82)	8.2 (5)	14.3 (13)	14.2 (26)	16.2 (29)	11.4 (9)
6 to 10 years	9.6 (57)	-- (--)	-- (--)	10.9 (20)	-- (--)	-- (--)
10+ years	3.0 (18)	-- (--)	-- (--)	2.7 (5)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	18.2 (108)	16.4 (10)	26.4 (24)	14.8 (27)	12.3 (22)	31.6 (25)
Violent offence ^a	61.1 (357)	55.0 (33)	72.5 (66)	49.2 (88)	65.5 (116)	70.1 (54)
Past DPED ^b	54.7 (324)	45.9 (28)	50.0 (45)	56.3 (103)	60.3 (108)	50.6 (40)
Past FPED ^c	37.8 (224)	36.1 (22)	32.2 (29)	33.3 (61)	41.9 (75)	46.8 (37)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table B2

Offence and Sentencing Information at FYE 2016/17 by Region

Offence and Sentence Variable	Region					
	National (N = 635)	Atlantic (N = 72)	Quebec (N = 98)	Ontario (N = 159)	Prairie (N = 232)	Pacific (N = 74)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Sentence length						
2 to 4 years	52.8 (335)	65.3 (47)	48.0 (47)	43.4 (69)	64.2 (149)	31.1 (23)
4 to 6 years	15.1 (96)	-- (--)	14.3 (14)	22.6 (36)	12.5 (29)	16.2 (12)
6 to 10 years	10.4 (66)	12.5 (9)	-- (--)	-- (--)	9.5 (22)	-- (--)
10+ years	1.6 (10)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	2.2 (5)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	20.0 (127)	15.3 (11)	26.5 (26)	22.0 (35)	11.6 (27)	37.8 (28)
Violent offence ^a	58.8 (368)	54.9 (39)	55.2 (53)	52.6 (82)	60.9 (140)	74.0 (54)
Past DPED ^b	51.1 (324)	41.7 (30)	43.9 (43)	48.4 (77)	59.3 (137)	50.0 (37)
Past FPED ^c	33.8 (214)	29.2 (21)	28.6 (28)	34.6 (55)	35.5 (82)	37.8 (28)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table B3

Offence and Sentencing Information at FYE 2021/22 by Region

Offence and Sentence Variable	Region					
	National (N = 558)	Atlantic (N = 56)	Quebec (N = 74)	Ontario (N = 172)	Prairie (N = 192)	Pacific (N = 64)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Sentence length						
2 to 4 years	50.9 (284)	55.4 (31)	29.7 (22)	47.7 (82)	67.7 (130)	29.7 (19)
4 to 6 years	11.8 (66)	-- (--)	9.5 (7)	14.0 (24)	12.0 (23)	-- (--)
6 to 10 years	12.5 (70)	8.9 (5)	16.2 (12)	12.8 (22)	9.9 (19)	18.8 (12)
10+ years	3.8 (21)	-- (--)	6.8 (5)	3.5 (6)	3.1 (6)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	21.0 (117)	25.0 (14)	37.8 (28)	22.1 (38)	7.3 (14)	35.9 (23)
Violent offence ^a	66.1 (368)	66.1 (37)	81.1 (60)	62.2 (107)	62.3 (119)	70.3 (45)
Past DPED ^b	49.5 (275)	44.6 (25)	44.4 (32)	45.9 (79)	52.6 (101)	59.4 (38)
Past FPED ^c	34.9 (194)	35.7 (20)	30.6 (22)	32.6 (56)	35.9 (69)	42.2 (27)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Appendix C: Risk and Need Information at Each Time Point by Region

Table C1

Risk and Need Information at FYE 2011/12 by Region

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National (N = 593)	Atlantic (N = 61)	Quebec (N = 91)	Ontario (N = 183)	Prairie (N = 179)	Pacific (N = 79)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor						
Low	25.3 (150)	19.7 (12)	13.2 (12)	36.1 (66)	25.1 (45)	19.0 (15)
Moderate	36.9 (219)	39.3 (24)	34.1 (31)	43.7 (80)	31.3 (56)	35.4 (28)
High	37.8 (224)	41.0 (25)	52.7 (48)	20.2 (37)	43.6 (78)	45.6 (36)
Overall Dynamic Factor						
Low	10.1 (60)	-- (--)	8.8 (8)	20.8 (38)	3.4 (6)	6.3 (5)
Moderate	34.4 (204)	-- (--)	17.6 (16)	51.9 (95)	31.8 (57)	38.0 (30)
High	55.5 (329)	85.2 (52)	73.6 (67)	27.3 (50)	64.8 (116)	55.7 (44)
Reintegration Potential ^a						
Low	28.8 (171)	34.4 (21)	47.3 (43)	12.6 (23)	31.8 (57)	34.2 (27)
Moderate	51.6 (306)	55.7 (34)	39.6 (36)	51.4 (94)	56.4 (101)	51.9 (41)
High	19.6 (116)	9.8 (6)	13.2 (12)	36.1 (66)	11.7 (21)	13.9 (11)
Motivation Level ^a						
Low	6.4 (38)	-- (--)	9.9 (9)	5.5 (10)	5.6 (10)	8.9 (7)
Moderate	42.5 (252)	73.8 (45)	62.6 (57)	19.1 (35)	39.7 (71)	55.7 (44)
High	51.1 (303)	-- (--)	27.5 (25)	75.4 (138)	54.7 (98)	35.4 (28)
Accountability ^a						
Low	12.9 (75)	-- (--)	24.2 (22)	10.1 (18)	11.3 (20)	16.0 (12)
Moderate	51.0 (297)	80.3 (49)	62.6 (57)	34.8 (62)	49.2 (87)	56.0 (42)

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National (N = 593)	Atlantic (N = 61)	Quebec (N = 91)	Ontario (N = 183)	Prairie (N = 179)	Pacific (N = 79)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
High	36.1 (210)	14.8 (9)	13.2 (12)	55.1 (98)	39.5 (70)	28.0 (21)
Responsivity Flag ^a	33.8 (197)	47.5 (29)	51.6 (47)	21.3 (38)	37.9 (67)	21.3 (16)
Engagement Flag ^a	86.6 (504)	95.1 (58)	72.5 (66)	92.1 (164)	84.7 (150)	88.0 (66)
Criminal Risk Index ^b						
Low	26.1 (130)	-- (--)	34.1 (29)	36.8 (50)	15.5 (24)	24.2 (16)
Low-Moderate	14.7 (73)	-- (--)	16.5 (14)	14.7 (20)	16.1 (25)	18.2 (12)
Moderate	21.5 (107)	25.0 (14)	25.9 (22)	17.6 (24)	20.0 (31)	24.2 (16)
High-Moderate	19.3 (96)	21.4 (12)	17.6 (15)	17.6 (24)	22.6 (35)	15.2 (10)
High	17.9 (89)	30.4 (17)	5.9 (5)	11.0 (15)	25.8 (40)	18.2 (12)
Offender Security Level ^a						
Minimum	32.7 (194)	34.4 (21)	20.9 (19)	50.8 (93)	26.3 (47)	17.7 (14)
Medium	49.4 (293)	42.6 (26)	52.7 (48)	36.6 (67)	57.5 (103)	62.0 (49)
Maximum	17.9 (106)	23.0 (14)	26.4 (24)	12.6 (23)	16.2 (29)	20.3 (16)
Correctional program need ^c	58.6 (292)	76.8 (43)	49.4 (42)	46.3 (63)	68.4 (106)	57.6 (38)
Link between crime and substance use						
Yes	47.1 (248)	64.4 (38)	41.8 (23)	28.7 (49)	55.1 (92)	62.2 (46)
Unknown	26.2 (138)	15.3 (9)	23.6 (13)	23.4 (40)	34.7 (58)	24.3 (18)
Substance use treatment required	60.6 (319)	71.2 (42)	43.6 (24)	42.1 (72)	79.0 (132)	66.2 (49)
High school diploma	35.0 (172)	30.4 (17)	34.1 (28)	42.1 (56)	29.2 (45)	39.4 (26)
Parental responsibilities	52.4 (257)	64.3 (36)	54.8 (46)	59.1 (78)	39.9 (61)	55.4 (36)
STG ^d affiliation	4.0 (24)	-- (--)	-- (--)	3.8 (7)	6.1 (11)	-- (--)

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National (N = 593)	Atlantic (N = 61)	Quebec (N = 91)	Ontario (N = 183)	Prairie (N = 179)	Pacific (N = 79)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Dynamic Factor Domain ^e						
Associates	63.5 (363)	70.5 (43)	43.0 (37)	56.6 (103)	75.4 (129)	70.8 (51)
Attitudes	44.2 (252)	52.5 (32)	67.4 (58)	27.5 (50)	41.8 (71)	57.7 (41)
Community Functioning	37.0 (211)	21.3 (13)	37.2 (32)	45.6 (83)	32.7 (56)	38.6 (27)
Education and Employment	63.3 (362)	68.9 (42)	59.3 (51)	56.6 (103)	71.9 (123)	59.7 (43)
Family and Marital	60.8 (348)	52.5 (32)	64.0 (55)	46.2 (84)	71.3 (122)	76.4 (55)
Personal and Emotional	85.8 (491)	86.9 (53)	88.4 (76)	75.3 (137)	92.4 (158)	93.1 (67)
Substance Abuse	65.5 (374)	80.3 (49)	53.5 (46)	45.1 (82)	86.0 (147)	70.4 (50)

Note. ^a = scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. ^eRepresents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need in a given dynamic factor domain. Information combines the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of 'some need identified' or 'considerable need identified', or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of 'moderate need for improvement' or 'high need for improvement'. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table C2

Risk and Need Information at FYE 2016/17 by Region

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National (N = 635)	Atlantic (N = 72)	Quebec (N = 98)	Ontario (N = 159)	Prairie (N = 232)	Pacific (N = 74)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor						
Low	25.2 (160)	31.9 (23)	23.5 (23)	31.4 (50)	24.1 (56)	10.8 (8)
Moderate	40.2 (255)	27.8 (20)	36.7 (36)	44.7 (71)	43.1 (100)	37.8 (28)
High	34.6 (220)	40.3 (29)	39.8 (39)	23.9 (38)	32.8 (76)	51.4 (38)
Overall Dynamic Factor						
Low	7.6 (48)	8.3 (6)	16.3 (16)	12.6 (20)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	29.0 (184)	12.5 (9)	22.4 (22)	57.2 (91)	-- (--)	-- (--)
High	63.5 (403)	79.2 (57)	61.2 (60)	30.2 (48)	79.3 (184)	73.0 (54)
Reintegration Potential^a						
Low	29.4 (187)	31.9 (23)	35.7 (35)	20.8 (33)	28.4 (66)	40.5 (30)
Moderate	54.3 (345)	50.0 (36)	40.8 (40)	57.9 (92)	59.5 (138)	52.7 (39)
High	16.2 (103)	18.1 (13)	23.5 (23)	21.4 (34)	12.1 (28)	6.8 (5)
Motivation Level^a						
Low	6.6 (42)	-- (--)	12.2 (12)	5.7 (9)	6.0 (14)	6.8 (5)
Moderate	58.7 (373)	56.9 (41)	69.4 (68)	47.2 (75)	61.2 (142)	63.5 (47)
High	34.6 (220)	-- (--)	18.4 (18)	47.2 (75)	32.8 (76)	29.7 (22)
Accountability^a						
Low	14.8 (94)	11.1 (8)	22.4 (22)	14.5 (23)	12.5 (29)	16.2 (12)
Moderate	57.5 (365)	51.4 (37)	68.4 (67)	45.3 (72)	59.5 (138)	68.9 (51)
High	27.7 (176)	37.5 (27)	9.2 (9)	40.3 (64)	28.0 (65)	14.9 (11)
Responsivity Flag^a	35.1 (223)	37.5 (27)	28.6 (28)	34.0 (54)	39.2 (91)	31.1 (23)
Engagement Flag^a	85.2 (541)	94.4 (68)	76.5 (75)	84.9 (135)	85.3 (198)	87.8 (65)

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National (<i>N</i> = 635)	Atlantic (<i>N</i> = 72)	Quebec (<i>N</i> = 98)	Ontario (<i>N</i> = 159)	Prairie (<i>N</i> = 232)	Pacific (<i>N</i> = 74)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Criminal Risk Index ^b						
Low	33.4 (176)	24.1 (14)	41.7 (35)	44.6 (58)	22.9 (43)	38.8 (26)
Low-Moderate	13.5 (71)	15.5 (9)	20.2 (17)	12.3 (16)	13.3 (25)	-- (--)
Moderate	17.3 (91)	24.1 (14)	10.7 (9)	16.9 (22)	19.1 (36)	-- (--)
High-Moderate	17.8 (94)	15.5 (9)	14.3 (12)	17.7 (23)	21.3 (40)	14.9 (10)
High	17.5 (92)	20.7 (12)	13.1 (11)	6.9 (9)	23.4 (44)	23.9 (16)
Offender Security Level ^a						
Minimum	27.1 (172)	36.1 (26)	34.7 (34)	29.6 (47)	25.9 (60)	6.8 (5)
Medium	51.5 (327)	48.6 (35)	36.7 (36)	47.2 (75)	60.8 (141)	54.1 (40)
Maximum	21.4 (136)	15.3 (11)	28.6 (28)	23.3 (37)	13.4 (31)	39.2 (29)
Correctional program need ^c	52.6 (277)	60.3 (35)	38.1 (32)	41.5 (54)	63.8 (120)	53.7 (36)
Link between crime and substance use						
Yes	49.7 (290)	62.0 (44)	24.7 (18)	39.2 (60)	59.0 (131)	56.9 (37)
Unknown	24.3 (142)	11.3 (8)	53.4 (39)	11.8 (18)	26.6 (59)	27.7 (18)
Substance use treatment required	60.4 (353)	66.2 (47)	45.2 (33)	40.5 (62)	75.7 (168)	66.2 (43)
High school diploma	37.3 (191)	43.1 (25)	34.6 (28)	52.0 (66)	24.7 (45)	42.2 (27)
Parental responsibilities	56.7 (296)	54.4 (31)	53.0 (44)	69.3 (88)	52.9 (100)	50.0 (33)
STG ^d affiliation	2.8 (18)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	5.2 (12)	-- (--)
Dynamic Factor Domain ^e						
Associates	69.2 (434)	69.4 (50)	46.9 (45)	57.6 (91)	85.7 (197)	71.8 (51)

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National (<i>N</i> = 635)	Atlantic (<i>N</i> = 72)	Quebec (<i>N</i> = 98)	Ontario (<i>N</i> = 159)	Prairie (<i>N</i> = 232)	Pacific (<i>N</i> = 74)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Attitudes	54.3 (341)	48.6 (35)	69.8 (67)	47.5 (75)	51.5 (119)	63.4 (45)
Community Functioning	46.7 (292)	26.8 (19)	36.5 (35)	39.2 (62)	59.6 (137)	55.7 (39)
Education and Employment	57.9 (363)	47.2 (34)	61.5 (59)	41.8 (66)	69.6 (160)	62.0 (44)
Family and Marital	67.8 (425)	69.0 (49)	67.7 (65)	44.3 (70)	82.3 (190)	71.8 (51)
Personal and Emotional	88.1 (553)	77.8 (56)	82.3 (79)	87.3 (138)	91.8 (212)	95.8 (68)
Substance Abuse	70.4 (441)	70.8 (51)	50.0 (48)	54.4 (86)	88.3 (203)	75.7 (53)

Note. ^a = scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. ^eRepresents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need in a given dynamic factor domain. Information combines the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of 'some need identified' or 'considerable need identified', or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of 'moderate need for improvement' or 'high need for improvement'. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table C3

Risk and Need Information at FYE 2021/22 by Region

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National (N = 558)	Atlantic (N = 56)	Quebec (N = 74)	Ontario (N = 172)	Prairie (N = 192)	Pacific (N = 64)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Overall Static Factor						
Low	9.3 (52)	-- (--)	-- (--)	14.0 (24)	10.9 (21)	-- (--)
Moderate	48.8 (272)	-- (--)	51.4 (38)	48.5 (83)	52.1 (100)	-- (--)
High	41.8 (233)	50.0 (28)	-- (--)	37.4 (64)	37.0 (71)	56.3 (36)
Overall Dynamic Factor						
Low	4.5 (25)	-- (--)	-- (--)	8.2 (14)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	20.7 (115)	-- (--)	-- (--)	34.1 (58)	-- (--)	-- (--)
High	74.8 (416)	89.3 (50)	79.7 (59)	57.6 (98)	81.8 (157)	81.3 (52)
Reintegration Potential^a						
Low	36.9 (205)	-- (--)	43.2 (32)	34.7 (59)	29.7 (57)	51.6 (33)
Moderate	53.2 (296)	50.0 (28)	41.9 (31)	52.4 (89)	62.5 (120)	-- (--)
High	9.9 (55)	-- (--)	14.9 (11)	12.9 (22)	7.8 (15)	-- (--)
Motivation Level^a						
Low	5.6 (31)	-- (--)	8.1 (6)	5.3 (9)	4.7 (9)	-- (--)
Moderate	68.0 (378)	82.1 (46)	64.9 (48)	61.2 (104)	68.8 (132)	75.0 (48)
High	26.4 (147)	-- (--)	27.0 (20)	33.5 (57)	26.6 (51)	-- (--)
Accountability^a						
Low	11.7 (65)	12.5 (7)	23.0 (17)	11.8 (20)	6.8 (13)	12.5 (8)
Moderate	67.6 (376)	76.8 (43)	66.2 (49)	60.6 (103)	68.8 (132)	76.6 (49)
High	20.7 (115)	10.7 (6)	10.8 (8)	27.6 (47)	24.5 (47)	10.9 (7)
Responsivity Flag^a	36.7 (204)	39.3 (22)	23.0 (17)	49.4 (84)	29.2 (56)	39.1 (25)
Engagement Flag^a	87.8 (488)	87.5 (49)	73.0 (54)	87.6 (149)	93.2 (179)	89.1 (57)

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National (<i>N</i> = 558)	Atlantic (<i>N</i> = 56)	Quebec (<i>N</i> = 74)	Ontario (<i>N</i> = 172)	Prairie (<i>N</i> = 192)	Pacific (<i>N</i> = 64)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Criminal Risk Index^b						
Low	27.1 (150)	29.1 (16)	36.5 (27)	28.7 (49)	21.1 (40)	28.1 (18)
Low-Moderate	11.7 (65)	-- (--)	17.6 (13)	15.2 (26)	8.4 (16)	9.4 (6)
Moderate	23.1 (128)	-- (--)	20.3 (15)	22.8 (39)	29.5 (56)	14.1 (9)
High-Moderate	21.5 (119)	18.2 (10)	14.9 (11)	19.9 (34)	25.3 (48)	25.0 (16)
High	16.6 (92)	29.1 (16)	10.8 (8)	13.5 (23)	15.8 (30)	23.4 (15)
Offender Security Level^a						
Minimum	18.3 (101)	10.7 (6)	16.4 (12)	14.5 (24)	27.1 (52)	10.9 (7)
Medium	60.1 (331)	57.1 (32)	46.6 (34)	65.7 (109)	62.0 (119)	57.8 (37)
Maximum	21.6 (119)	32.1 (18)	37.0 (27)	19.9 (33)	10.9 (21)	31.3 (20)
Correctional program need ^c	61.2 (339)	63.6 (35)	45.9 (34)	56.1 (96)	70.5 (134)	62.5 (40)
Link between crime and substance use						
Yes	60.0 (306)	65.5 (36)	17.5 (10)	63.8 (104)	70.5 (122)	54.8 (34)
Unknown	18.8 (96)	9.1 (5)	73.7 (42)	5.5 (9)	13.9 (24)	25.8 (16)
Substance use treatment required	69.4 (354)	78.2 (43)	50.9 (29)	65.0 (106)	76.9 (133)	69.4 (43)
High school diploma	41.9 (211)	56.4 (31)	38.4 (28)	49.3 (74)	32.7 (54)	39.3 (24)
Parental responsibilities	56.7 (285)	41.8 (23)	53.4 (39)	62.4 (93)	58.2 (96)	55.7 (34)
STG ^d affiliation	10.4 (58)	8.9 (5)	-- (--)	4.1 (7)	19.8 (38)	9.4 (6)
Dynamic Factor Domain^e						
Associates	75.4 (417)	80.4 (45)	53.4 (39)	74.0 (125)	84.4 (162)	73.0 (46)

Risk and Need Variable	Region					
	National	Atlantic	Quebec	Ontario	Prairie	Pacific
	(<i>N</i> = 558)	(<i>N</i> = 56)	(<i>N</i> = 74)	(<i>N</i> = 172)	(<i>N</i> = 192)	(<i>N</i> = 64)
	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Attitudes	66.8 (369)	73.2 (41)	75.3 (55)	71.0 (120)	57.1 (109)	69.8 (44)
Community Functioning	59.4 (328)	44.6 (25)	38.4 (28)	58.6 (99)	70.8 (136)	64.5 (40)
Education and Employment	60.4 (334)	53.6 (30)	56.2 (41)	50.9 (86)	70.8 (136)	65.1 (41)
Family and Marital	72.3 (400)	73.2 (41)	69.9 (51)	47.3 (80)	90.6 (174)	85.7 (54)
Personal and Emotional	92.4 (511)	96.4 (54)	87.7 (64)	88.8 (150)	95.3 (183)	95.2 (60)
Substance Abuse	79.0 (436)	82.1 (46)	63.0 (46)	71.6 (121)	90.6 (174)	79.0 (49)

Note. ^a = scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. ^eRepresents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need in a given dynamic factor domain. Information combines the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of 'some need identified' or 'considerable need identified', or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of 'moderate need for improvement' or 'high need for improvement'. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Appendix D: Indigenous Corrections Information at Each Time Point by Region

Table D1

Indigenous Corrections Information at FYE 2011/12 by Region

	Regions			
	National (N = 202)	Ontario (N = 34)	Prairie (N = 111)	Pacific (N = 29)
Indigenous corrections variable	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Section 81 ^a	43.6 (88)	23.5 (8)	55.0 (61)	27.6 (8)
Section 84 ^b	57.4 (116)	47.1 (16)	68.5 (76)	41.4 (12)
Interest in traditional healing path	54.5 (110)	35.3 (12)	64.0 (71)	44.8 (13)
At least one Elder review	90.1 (182)	91.2 (31)	100.0 (111)	75.9 (22)

Note. Information is not reported for Atlantic and Quebec regions due to sample size constraints. Although Indigenous programs and services are offered to non-Indigenous women who follow Indigenous cultural traditions, the information presented in this table only reflects Indigenous women. ^aSection 81= Section 81 of the *CCRA* allows CSC to enter into an agreement with an Indigenous community for the provision of correctional services to Indigenous offenders. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 81. ^bSection 84 = Section 84 of the *CCRA* applies to offenders who want to serve their eventual conditional or statutory release in an Indigenous community, or in an urban area with the support and direction of an Indigenous organization. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 84.

Table D2

Indigenous Corrections Information at FYE 2016/17 by Region

	Regions			
	National (N = 226)	Ontario (N = 32)	Prairie (N = 142)	Pacific (N = 34)
Indigenous corrections variable	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Section 81 ^a	58.4 (132)	46.9 (15)	67.6 (96)	44.1 (15)
Section 84 ^b	68.6 (155)	62.5 (20)	75.4 (107)	64.7 (22)
Interest in traditional healing path	73.0 (165)	56.3 (18)	81.0 (115)	73.5 (25)
At least one Elder review	94.7 (214)	78.1 (25)	99.3 (141)	91.2 (31)

Note. Information is not reported for Atlantic and Quebec regions due to sample size constraints. Although Indigenous programs and services are offered to non-Indigenous women who follow Indigenous cultural traditions, the information presented in this table only reflects Indigenous women. ^aSection 81= Section 81 of the *CCRA* allows CSC to enter into an agreement with an Indigenous community for the provision of correctional services to Indigenous offenders. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 81. ^bSection 84 = Section 84 of the *CCRA* applies to offenders who want to serve their eventual conditional or statutory release in an Indigenous community, or in an urban area with the support and direction of an Indigenous organization. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 84.

Table D3

Indigenous Corrections Information at FYE 2021/22 by Region

	National (<i>N</i> = 267)	Regions		
		Ontario (<i>N</i> = 63)	Prairie (<i>N</i> = 136)	Pacific (<i>N</i> = 35)
Indigenous corrections variable	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)	% (<i>n</i>)
Section 81 ^a	74.5 (199)	55.6 (35)	89.7 (122)	60.0 (21)
Section 84 ^b	79.8 (213)	71.4 (45)	89.7 (122)	68.6 (24)
Interest in traditional healing path	89.9 (240)	81.0 (51)	97.1 (132)	82.9 (29)
At least one Elder review	93.6 (250)	81.0 (51)	97.8 (133)	100.0 (35)

Note. Information is not reported for Atlantic and Quebec regions due to sample size constraints. Although Indigenous programs and services are offered to non-Indigenous women who follow Indigenous cultural traditions, the information presented in this table only reflects Indigenous women. ^aSection 81= Section 81 of the *CCRA* allows CSC to enter into an agreement with an Indigenous community for the provision of correctional services to Indigenous offenders. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 81. ^bSection 84 = Section 84 of the *CCRA* applies to offenders who want to serve their eventual conditional or statutory release in an Indigenous community, or in an urban area with the support and direction of an Indigenous organization. This variable represents at least one instance of an active flag for interest in Section 84.

Appendix E: Demographic Information for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Women at Each Time Point by Region

Table E1

Demographic Information at FYE 2011/12 by Region and Indigenous Status

Demographic Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Age								
< 24	20.8 (42)	10.5 (40)	-- (--)	10.4 (15)	20.7 (23)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
25 - 40	57.9 (117)	48.7 (186)	41.2 (14)	46.5 (67)	65.8 (73)	57.6 (38)	55.2 (16)	47.9 (23)
41 - 60	-- (--)	35.3 (135)	29.4 (10)	38.2 (55)	-- (--)	24.2 (16)	31.0 (9)	37.5 (18)
61 +	-- (--)	5.5 (21)	-- (--)	4.9 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Marital Status								
Common Law	25.2 (51)	17.3 (66)	23.5 (8)	11.1 (16)	25.2 (28)	22.7 (15)	24.1 (7)	18.8 (9)
Married	4.5 (9)	10.7 (41)	-- (--)	13.2 (19)	5.4 (6)	-- (--)	-- (--)	22.9 (11)
Single	58.9 (119)	53.7 (205)	61.8 (21)	63.2 (91)	60.4 (67)	57.6 (38)	58.6 (17)	37.5 (18)
Other ^a	11.4 (23)	18.3 (70)	-- (--)	12.5 (18)	9.0 (10)	-- (--)	-- (--)	20.8 (10)

Note. ^aOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed.

Table E2

Demographic Information at FYE 2016/17 by Region and Indigenous Status

Demographic Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Age								
< 24	-- (--)	8.4 (33)	-- (--)	5.7 (7)	20.4 (29)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
25 - 40	58.0 (131)	53.2 (209)	56.3 (18)	54.1 (66)	62.0 (88)	62.2 (51)	47.1 (16)	48.7 (19)
41 - 60	23.9 (54)	32.1 (126)	28.1 (9)	35.2 (43)	-- (--)	23.2 (19)	38.2 (13)	30.8 (12)
61 +	-- (--)	6.4 (25)	-- (--)	4.9 (6)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Marital Status								
Common Law	23.0 (52)	16.8 (66)	31.3 (10)	8.2 (10)	23.9 (34)	19.5 (16)	-- (--)	12.8 (5)
Married	4.4 (10)	11.2 (44)	-- (--)	12.3 (15)	-- (--)	8.5 (7)	-- (--)	17.9 (7)
Single	56.6 (128)	51.4 (202)	34.4 (11)	50.0 (61)	61.3 (87)	51.2 (42)	58.8 (20)	48.7 (19)
Other ^c	15.9 (36)	20.6 (81)	-- (--)	29.5 (36)	-- (--)	20.7 (17)	17.6 (6)	20.5 (8)

Note. ^aOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed.

Table E3

Demographic Information at FYE 2021/22 by Region and Indigenous Status

Demographic Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Age								
< 24	-- (--)	6.7 (18)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
25 - 40	64.8 (173)	44.4 (119)	63.5 (40)	41.2 (42)	62.5 (85)	60.0 (30)	71.4 (25)	37.0 (10)
41 - 60	21.0 (56)	42.5 (114)	23.8 (15)	51.0 (52)	21.3 (29)	32.0 (16)	14.3 (5)	29.6 (8)
61 +	-- (--)	6.3 (17)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Marital Status								
Common Law	14.2 (38)	15.3 (41)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	26.0 (13)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Married	4.5 (12)	9.3 (25)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	14.0 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Single	61.4 (164)	49.3 (132)	49.2 (31)	48.0 (49)	67.6 (92)	46.0 (23)	62.9 (22)	59.3 (16)
Other ^a	19.9 (53)	26.1 (70)	30.2 (19)	40.2 (41)	18.4 (25)	14.0 (7)	17.1 (6)	18.5 (5)

Note. ^aOther includes divorced, separated, unknown, and widowed.

Table E4

Offence and Sentencing Information at FYE 2011/12 by Region and Indigenous Status

Offence and Sentence Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Sentence length								
2 to 4 years	55.4 (112)	54.2 (207)	52.9 (18)	56.3 (81)	62.2 (69)	60.6 (40)	37.9 (11)	43.8 (21)
4 to 6 years	12.9 (26)	14.4 (55)	-- (--)	15.3 (22)	16.2 (18)	16.7 (11)	-- (--)	14.6 (7)
6 to 10 years	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	13.2 (19)	-- (--)	12.1 (8)	17.2 (5)	-- (--)
10+ years	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	18.8 (38)	18.1 (69)	29.4 (10)	-- (--)	12.6 (14)	-- (--)	34.5 (10)	31.3 (15)
Violent Offence ^a								
Past DPED ^b	58.9 (119)	52.8 (201)	58.8 (20)	55.6 (80)	64.0 (71)	56.1 (37)	48.3 (14)	52.1 (25)
Past FPED ^c	43.1 (87)	35.4 (135)	41.2 (14)	31.9 (46)	45.0 (5)	37.9 (25)	44.8 (13)	47.9 (23)

Note. ^aViolent = most serious offence on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date.

Table E5

Offence and Sentencing Information at FYE 2016/17 by Region and Indigenous Status

Offence and Sentence Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Sentence length								
2 to 4 years	51.3 (116)	53.2 (209)	43.8 (14)	44.3 (54)	60.6 (86)	69.5 (57)	26.5 (9)	33.3 (13)
4 to 6 years	17.3 (39)	13.7 (54)	21.9 (7)	21.3 (26)	16.2 (23)	-- (--)	23.5 (8)	-- (--)
6 to 10 years	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	11.0 (9)	-- (--)	-- (--)
10+ years	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	20.4 (46)	20.1 (79)	28.1 (9)	20.5 (25)	12.0 (17)	11.0 (9)	32.4 (11)	43.6 (17)
Violent Offence ^a								
Past DPED ^b	64.0 (114)	44.5 (175)	56.3 (18)	47.5 (58)	68.1 (96)	45.1 (37)	58.8 (20)	43.6 (17)
Past FPED ^c	41.3 (93)	29.8 (117)	31.3 (10)	36.9 (45)	41.8 (59)	23.2 (19)	44.1 (15)	33.3 (13)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date.

Table E6

Offence and Sentencing Information at FYE 2021/22 by Region and Indigenous Status

Offence and Sentence Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Sentence length								
2 to 4 years	55.1 (147)	45.5 (122)	57.1 (36)	41.2 (42)	68.4 (93)	64.0 (32)	22.9 (8)	40.7 (11)
4 to 6 years	11.6 (31)	11.9 (32)	-- (--)	15.7 (16)	11.8 (16)	14.0 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)
6 to 10 years	13.1 (35)	12.3 (33)	15.9 (10)	11.8 (12)	10.3 (14)	-- (--)	25.7 (9)	-- (--)
10+ years	3.7 (10)	4.1 (11)	-- (--)	4.9 (5)	3.7 (5)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Indeterminate	16.5 (44)	26.1 (70)	17.5 (11)	26.5 (27)	5.9 (8)	10.0 (5)	31.4 (11)	40.7 (11)
Violent Offence ^a								
Past DPED ^b	60.3 (161)	39.8 (106)	68.3 (43)	34.3 (35)	57.4 (78)	44.0 (22)	65.7 (23)	55.6 (15)
Past FPED ^c	43.4 (116)	27.1 (72)	49.2 (31)	23.5 (24)	38.2 (52)	34.0 (17)	54.3 (19)	29.6 (8)

Note. ^aViolent = MSO on sentence was violent ^bDPED = Day Parole Eligibility Date. ^cFPED = Full Parole Eligibility Date.

Table E7

Risk and Need Information at FYE 2011/12 by Region and Indigenous Status

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Overall Static Factor								
Low	11.9 (24)	31.2 (119)	-- (--)	41.0 (59)	16.2 (18)	37.9 (25)	-- (--)	27.1 (13)
Moderate	37.6 (76)	36.9 (141)	55.9 (19)	41.7 (60)	29.7 (33)	34.8 (23)	-- (--)	35.4 (17)
High	50.5 (102)	31.9 (122)	-- (--)	17.4 (25)	54.1 (60)	27.3 (18)	62.1 (18)	37.5 (18)
Overall Dynamic Factor								
Low	3.0 (6)	13.6 (52)	-- (--)	24.3 (35)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	24.8 (50)	38.7 (148)	-- (--)	52.8 (76)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	50.0 (24)
High	72.3 (146)	47.6 (182)	50.0 (17)	22.9 (33)	73.0 (81)	51.5 (34)	82.8 (24)	-- (--)
Reintegration Potential ^a								
Low	41.1 (83)	22.5 (86)	35.3 (12)	6.9 (10)	38.7 (43)	19.7 (13)	55.2 (16)	22.9 (11)
Moderate	49.0 (99)	53.9 (206)	44.1 (15)	54.9 (79)	50.5 (56)	68.2 (45)	-- (--)	56.3 (27)
High	9.9 (20)	23.6 (90)	20.6 (7)	38.2 (55)	10.8 (12)	12.1 (8)	-- (--)	20.8 (10)
Motivation Level ^a								
Low	5.4 (11)	6.8 (26)	-- (--)	4.9 (7)	6.3 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)	14.6 (7)
Moderate	48.5 (98)	40.1 (153)	-- (--)	17.4 (25)	43.2 (48)	-- (--)	72.4 (21)	47.9 (23)
High	46.0 (93)	53.1 (203)	64.7 (22)	77.8 (112)	50.5 (56)	62.1 (41)	-- (--)	37.5 (18)
Accountability ^a								
Low	9.8 (19)	14.2 (54)	-- (--)	10.5 (15)	11.8 (13)	9.2 (6)	-- (--)	23.4 (11)
Moderate	57.2 (111)	48.3 (183)	-- (--)	35.0 (50)	54.5 (60)	41.5 (27)	73.1 (19)	46.8 (22)
High	33.0 (64)	37.5 (142)	66.0 (18)	54.5 (78)	33.6 (37)	49.2 (32)	-- (--)	29.8 (14)
Responsivity Flag ^a	40.7 (79)	30.6 (116)	20.0 (6)	21.7 (31)	44.5 (49)	26.2 (17)	34.6 (9)	14.9 (7)
Engagement Flag ^a	87.6 (170)	86.0 (326)	96.7 (29)	90.9 (130)	84.5 (93)	86.2 (56)	96.2 (25)	83.0 (39)
CRI ^b								

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Low	10.2 (19)	35.3 (109)	28.1 (9)	38.8 (40)	5.1 (5)	32.7 (18)	-- (--)	39.5 (15)
Low-Moderate	14.0 (26)	14.9 (46)	-- (--)	15.5 (16)	15.2 (15)	18.2 (10)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	24.7 (46)	19.7 (61)	-- (--)	16.5 (17)	22.2 (22)	16.4 (9)	33.3 (9)	18.4 (7)
High-Moderate	24.2 (45)	16.5 (51)	25.0 (8)	15.5 (16)	24.2 (24)	20.0 (11)	22.2 (6)	-- (--)
High	26.9 (50)	12.6 (39)	-- (--)	10.7 (11)	33.3 (33)	12.7 (7)	22.2 (6)	15.8 (6)
Offender Security Level ^a								
Minimum	13.9 (28)	41.9 (160)	20.6 (7)	56.9 (82)	13.5 (15)	47.0 (31)	-- (--)	27.1 (13)
Medium	62.9 (127)	42.9 (164)	50.0 (7)	34.0 (49)	67.6 (75)	42.4 (28)	75.9 (22)	54.2 (26)
Maximum	23.3 (47)	15.2 (58)	29.4 (10)	9.0 (13)	18.9 (21)	10.6 (7)	-- (--)	18.8 (9)
Correctional program need ^c	75.8 (141)	48.9 (151)	59.4 (19)	42.7 (44)	79.8 (79)	49.1 (27)	77.8 (21)	44.7 (17)
Link between crime and substance use								
Yes	63.6 (119)	38.8 (128)	54.8 (17)	23.7 (32)	57.7 (60)	52.5 (32)	89.7 (26)	44.2 (19)
Unknown	28.3 (15)	24.5 (81)	25.8 (8)	22.2 (30)	-- (--)	27.9 (17)	-- (--)	32.6 (14)
No	8.0 (15)	36.7 (121)	19.4 (6)	54.1 (73)	-- (--)	19.7 (12)	-- (--)	23.3 (10)
Substance use treatment required	80.7 (151)	50.3 (166)	61.3 (19)	39.3 (53)	83.7 (87)	72.1 (44)	96.6 (28)	46.5 (20)
High school diploma	20.8 (38)	43.6 (133)	28.1 (9)	47.0 (47)	17.3 (17)	50.9 (28)	22.2 (6)	50.0 (19)
Parental responsibilities	47.3 (86)	44.3 (135)	48.5 (15)	38.0 (38)	42.3 (41)	63.6 (35)	55.6 (15)	43.2 (16)
STG ^d affiliation	7.9 (16)	1.8 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)	8.1 (9)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Dynamic Factor Domain ^e								
Associates	79.3 (153)	55.7 (206)	69.7 (23)	54.2 (28)	81.1 (86)	66.7 (42)	88.5 (23)	61.4 (27)
Attitudes	51.0 (98)	40.9 (151)	48.5 (16)	22.2 (32)	46.7 (49)	33.3 (21)	57.7 (15)	60.5 (26)

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Community Functioning	47.2 (91)	32.6 (120)	69.7 (23)	41.7 (60)	38.7 (41)	23.8 (15)	53.8 (14)	31.0 (13)
Education and Employment	82.4 (159)	54.3 (201)	72.7 (24)	54.2 (78)	86.8 (92)	49.2 (31)	76.9 (20)	50.0 (22)
Family and Marital	74.6 (144)	54.3 (201)	69.7 (23)	41.7 (60)	75.5 (80)	65.1 (40)	88.5 (23)	70.5 (31)
Personal and Emotional	95.3 (184)	81.4 (301)	100.0 (33)	70.1 (101)	96.2 (102)	85.7 (54)	96.2 (25)	93.2 (41)
Substance Abuse	88.1 (170)	54.7 (202)	66.7 (22)	41.7 (60)	92.5 (98)	76.2 (48)	100.0 (26)	53.5 (23)

Note. ^a = scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. ^eRepresents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need in a given dynamic factor domain. Information combines the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of 'some need identified' or 'considerable need identified', or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of 'moderate need for improvement' or 'high need for improvement'. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table E8

Risk and Need Information at FYE 2016/17 by Region and Indigenous Status

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Overall Static Factor								
Low	10.6 (24)	32.8 (129)	-- (--)	36.9 (45)	13.4 (19)	41.5 (34)	-- (--)	12.8 (5)
Moderate	44.7 (101)	37.7 (148)	56.3 (18)	41.0 (50)	47.2 (67)	36.6 (30)	-- (--)	48.7 (19)
High	44.7 (101)	29.5 (116)	-- (--)	22.1 (27)	39.4 (56)	22.0 (18)	67.6 (23)	38.5 (15)
Overall Dynamic Factor								
Low	-- (--)	10.7 (42)	-- (--)	13.9 (17)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	-- (--)	35.9 (141)	-- (--)	63.9 (78)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
High	82.3 (186)	53.4 (210)	59.4 (19)	22.1 (27)	86.6 (123)	69.5 (57)	85.3 (29)	64.1 (25)
Reintegration Potential ^a								
Low	38.9 (88)	24.7 (97)	-- (--)	17.2 (21)	33.1 (47)	22.0 (18)	52.9 (18)	-- (--)
Moderate	55.3 (125)	53.4 (210)	50.0 (16)	59.0 (72)	61.3 (87)	54.9 (45)	-- (--)	61.5 (24)
High	5.8 (13)	21.9 (86)	-- (--)	23.8 (29)	5.6 (8)	23.2 (19)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Motivation Level ^a								
Low	5.3 (12)	7.1 (28)	-- (--)	4.1 (5)	4.9 (7)	7.3 (6)	-- (--)	12.8 (5)
Moderate	66.8 (151)	55.2 (217)	56.3 (18)	45.9 (56)	66.2 (94)	54.9 (45)	76.5 (26)	53.8 (21)
High	27.9 (63)	37.7 (148)	-- (--)	50.0 (61)	28.9 (41)	37.8 (31)	-- (--)	33.3 (13)
Accountability ^a								
Low	13.7 (31)	15.5 (61)	-- (--)	14.8 (18)	11.3 (16)	14.6 (12)	-- (--)	20.5 (8)
Moderate	61.1 (138)	55.7 (219)	50.0 (16)	44.3 (54)	60.6 (86)	58.5 (48)	76.5 (26)	61.5 (24)
High	25.2 (57)	28.8 (113)	-- (--)	41.0 (50)	28.2 (40)	26.8 (22)	-- (--)	17.9 (7)
Responsivity Flag ^a	39.8 (90)	32.3 (127)	28.1 (9)	35.2 (43)	44.4 (63)	30.5 (25)	38.2 (13)	25.6 (10)
Engagement Flag ^a	82.3 (186)	87.0 (342)	78.1 (25)	86.9 (106)	84.5 (120)	87.8 (72)	88.2 (30)	87.2 (34)
CRI ^b								

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Low	15.9 (32)	43.8 (138)	20.7 (6)	51.0 (49)	14.5 (18)	37.3 (22)	-- (--)	56.8 (21)
Low-Moderate	14.9 (30)	13.0 (41)	17.2 (5)	-- (--)	14.5 (18)	11.9 (7)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	21.9 (44)	14.3 (45)	31.0 (9)	12.5 (12)	20.2 (25)	16.9 (10)	20.0 (6)	-- (--)
High-Moderate	18.9 (38)	16.8 (53)	-- (--)	18.8 (18)	22.6 (28)	18.6 (11)	16.7 (5)	13.5 (5)
High	27.9 (56)	11.4 (36)	-- (--)	-- (--)	28.2 (35)	15.3 (9)	36.7 (11)	13.5 (5)
Offender Security Level ^a								
Minimum	15.0 (34)	34.1 (134)	-- (--)	35.2 (43)	20.4 (29)	35.4 (29)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Medium	59.7 (135)	46.3 (182)	56.3 (18)	44.3 (54)	64.1 (91)	54.9 (45)	52.9 (18)	53.8 (21)
Maximum	25.2 (57)	19.6 (77)	-- (--)	20.5 (25)	15.5 (22)	9.8 (8)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Correctional program need ^c	68.7 (138)	42.5 (134)	62.1 (18)	35.4 (34)	71.0 (88)	50.8 (30)	73.3 (22)	37.8 (14)
Link between crime and substance use								
Yes	60.6 (126)	44.0 (59)	56.7 (17)	35.6 (42)	62.2 (84)	55.0 (44)	69.0 (20)	48.6 (17)
Unknown	30.3 (63)	21.1 (76)	20.0 (6)	10.2 (12)	31.9 (43)	17.5 (14)	-- (--)	25.7 (9)
No	9.1 (19)	34.9 (126)	23.3 (7)	54.2 (64)	5.9 (8)	27.5 (22)	-- (--)	25.7 (9)
Substance use treatment required	81.3 (169)	49.6 (179)	63.3 (19)	35.6 (42)	85.2 (115)	62.5 (50)	86.2 (25)	51.4 (18)
High school diploma	23.6 (46)	46.1 (141)	37.9 (11)	55.9 (52)	20.7 (25)	33.9 (19)	32.1 (9)	50.0 (18)
Parental responsibilities	54.2 (109)	59.0 (183)	69.9 (20)	71.0 (66)	52.0 (65)	55.9 (33)	51.7 (15)	48.6 (18)
STG ^d affiliation	5.8 (13)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	7.7 (11)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Dynamic Factor Domain ^e								
Associates	84.3 (188)	60.6 (235)	68.8 (22)	54.5 (66)	92.9 (131)	74.1 (60)	75.0 (24)	68.4 (26)
Attitudes	60.5 (135)	50.9 (198)	56.3 (18)	43.8 (53)	56.0 (79)	45.1 (37)	78.1 (25)	52.6 (20)

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Community Functioning	65.0 (145)	36.3 (140)	56.3 (18)	34.7 (42)	66.7 (94)	48.1 (39)	68.8 (22)	45.9 (17)
Education and Employment	75.8 (169)	47.7 (185)	59.4 (19)	37.2 (45)	78.7 (111)	53.1 (43)	75.0 (24)	52.6 (20)
Family and Marital	83.4 (186)	59.0 (229)	59.4 (19)	40.5 (49)	87.9 (124)	73.2 (60)	84.4 (27)	60.5 (23)
Personal and Emotional	92.4 (206)	86.1 (335)	93.8 (30)	86.0 (104)	91.5 (129)	93.9 (77)	93.8 (30)	97.4 (37)
Substance Abuse	92.4 (206)	58.1 (225)	81.3 (26)	47.9 (58)	97.9 (138)	71.6 (58)	90.6 (29)	64.9 (24)

Note. ^a = scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. ^eRepresents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need in a given dynamic factor domain. Information combines the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of 'some need identified' or 'considerable need identified', or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of 'moderate need for improvement' or 'high need for improvement'. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table E9

Risk and Need Information at FYE 2021/22 by Region and Indigenous Status

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Overall Static Factor								
Low	7.9 (21)	10.9 (29)	9.5 (6)	17.8 (18)	8.8 (12)	16.0 (8)	-- (--)	3.7 (15)
Moderate	43.1 (115)	51.7 (138)	39.7 (25)	51.5 (52)	50.0 (68)	56.0 (28)	-- (--)	55.6 (15)
High	49.1 (131)	37.5 (100)	50.8 (32)	30.7 (31)	41.2 (56)	28.0 (14)	71.4 (25)	40.7 (11)
Overall Dynamic Factor								
Low	-- (--)	7.1 (19)	-- (--)	10.9 (11)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	-- (--)	30.3 (81)	-- (--)	45.5 (46)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
High	88.8 (237)	62.5 (167)	82.5 (52)	43.6 (44)	88.2 (120)	66.0 (33)	97.1 (34)	66.7 (18)
Reintegration Potential ^a								
Low	45.7 (122)	30.0 (80)	49.2 (31)	27.7 (28)	35.3 (48)	14.0 (7)	62.9 (22)	-- (--)
Moderate	50.6 (135)	55.1 (147)	-- (--)	56.4 (57)	61.0 (83)	66.0 (33)	-- (--)	51.9 (14)
High	3.7 (10)	15.0 (40)	-- (--)	15.8 (16)	3.7 (5)	20.0 (10)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Motivation Level ^a								
Low	3.0 (8)	7.9 (21)	-- (--)	5.9 (6)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	76.0 (203)	62.5 (167)	71.4 (45)	55.4 (56)	72.8 (99)	64.0 (32)	88.6 (31)	59.3 (16)
High	21.0 (56)	29.6 (79)	-- (--)	38.6 (39)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Accountability ^a								
Low	8.2 (22)	15.7 (42)	-- (--)	15.8 (16)	6.6 (9)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	71.5 (191)	63.3 (169)	66.7 (42)	55.4 (56)	69.9 (95)	68.0 (34)	82.9 (29)	70.4 (19)
High	20.2 (54)	21.0 (56)	-- (--)	28.7 (29)	23.5 (32)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Responsivity Flag ^a	37.8 (101)	36.3 (97)	58.7 (37)	44.6 (45)	28.7 (39)	26.0 (13)	42.9 (15)	37.0 (10)
Engagement Flag ^a	90.6 (242)	84.3 (225)	92.1 (58)	84.2 (85)	92.6 (126)	96.0 (48)	88.6 (31)	88.9 (24)
CRI ^b								

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Low	15.8 (42)	37.6 (100)	15.9 (10)	37.6 (38)	14.1 (19)	40.8 (20)	17.1 (6)	37.0 (10)
Low-Moderate	8.3 (22)	14.7 (39)	9.5 (6)	18.8 (19)	7.4 (10)	-- (--)	-- (--)	-- (--)
Moderate	27.2 (72)	18.8 (50)	23.8 (15)	21.8 (22)	31.1 (42)	24.5 (12)	-- (--)	18.5 (5)
High-Moderate	27.5 (73)	15.8 (42)	28.6 (18)	12.9 (13)	28.9 (39)	16.3 (8)	31.4 (11)	18.5 (5)
High	21.1 (56)	13.2 (35)	22.2 (14)	8.9 (9)	18.5 (25)	-- (--)	31.4 (11)	-- (--)
Offender Security Level ^a								
Minimum	15.4 (41)	20.5 (54)	8.1 (5)	18.2 (18)	23.5 (32)	36.0 (18)	-- (--)	18.5 (5)
Medium	63.9 (170)	55.7 (147)	72.6 (45)	60.6 (60)	65.4 (89)	54.0 (27)	60.0 (21)	55.6 (15)
Maximum	20.7 (55)	23.9 (63)	19.4 (12)	21.2 (21)	11.0 (15)	10.0 (5)	-- (--)	25.9 (7)
Correctional program need ^c	75.8 (201)	47.7 (127)	74.6 (47)	43.6 (44)	78.5 (106)	51.0 (25)	74.3 (26)	51.9 (14)
Link between crime and substance use								
Yes	74.5 (184)	46.7 (114)	79.7 (47)	53.1 (52)	78.4 (98)	48.9 (22)	61.8 (21)	50.0 (13)
Unknown	14.2 (35)	21.7 (53)	-- (--)	7.1 (7)	11.2 (14)	20.2 (9)	-- (--)	23.1 (6)
No	11.3 (28)	31.6 (77)	-- (--)	39.8 (39)	10.4 (13)	31.1 (14)	-- (--)	26.9 (7)
Substance use treatment required	84.2 (28)	54.9 (134)	81.4 (48)	54.1 (53)	83.2 (104)	57.8 (26)	88.2 (30)	50.0 (13)
High school diploma	28.9 (70)	53.9 (130)	38.6 (22)	56.3 (49)	26.1 (31)	48.8 (20)	23.5 (8)	56.0 (14)
Parental responsibilities	55.0 (133)	59.2 (142)	57.9 (33)	66.3 (57)	42.0 (50)	63.4 (26)	52.9 (18)	60.0 (15)
STG ^d affiliation	18.4 (49)	3.0 (8)	-- (--)	-- (--)	58.0 (69)	-- (--)	14.3 (5)	-- (--)
Dynamic Factor Domain ^e								
Associates	89.8 (239)	62.6 (166)	88.9 (56)	65.0 (65)	91.2 (124)	68.0 (34)	88.2 (30)	55.6 (15)
Attitudes	69.8 (185)	65.3 (173)	74.6 (47)	69.0 (69)	63.7 (86)	40.0 (20)	79.4 (27)	63.0 (17)

Risk and Need Variable	National		Ontario		Prairie		Pacific	
	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)	Indigenous % (n)	Non-Indigenous % (n)
Community Functioning	76.6 (203)	42.6 (113)	79.4 (50)	47.0 (47)	77.2 (105)	52.0 (26)	90.9 (30)	37.0 (10)
Education and Employment	77.8 (207)	44.9 (119)	66.7 (42)	42.0 (42)	80.1 (109)	46.0 (23)	85.3 (29)	44.4 (12)
Family and Marital	85.0 (226)	59.2 (157)	60.3 (38)	39.0 (39)	93.4 (127)	82.0 (41)	100.0 (34)	70.4 (19)
Personal and Emotional	95.5 (254)	89.1 (236)	92.1 (58)	86.0 (86)	97.1 (132)	90.0 (45)	97.1 (33)	92.6 (25)
Substance Abuse	94.0 (249)	64.5 (171)	87.3 (55)	60.0 (60)	97.1 (132)	74.0 (37)	100.0 (33)	59.3 (16)

Note. ^a = scores at intake. ^bCriminal Risk Index (CRI) = populated based on data from the SFA. ^cCorrectional program need = based on the CRI criteria (does not consider override information) ^dSTG = Security Threat Group. ^eRepresents the number and proportion of women who have an identified need in a given dynamic factor domain. Information combines the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) and the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R). Each area was identified as a need area if on the DFIA there was a score of 'some need identified' or 'considerable need identified', or if on the DFIA-R, there was a score of 'moderate need for improvement' or 'high need for improvement'. Numbers do not always sum to total population size due to missing data, which fluctuated across variables. Proportions may not add to 100 due to rounding.