

# CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



## RESEARCH REPORT

### Examining Differences between Security Threat Groups (STGs) and the General Offender Population

2023 N° R-465

Cat. No.: PS83-3/465E-PDF

ISBN: 978-0-660-68111-5

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.



**Examining Differences between Security Threat Groups (STGs) and the General Offender  
Population**

Shanna Farrell MacDonald

Sarah Cram

Angela Smeth

Karen Jones

Sophia Garrel

&

Dena Derkzen

Correctional Service of Canada

2023



## **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to extend appreciation to everyone who were involved in the consultation process from the Women Offender Sector (WOS), Preventive Security and Intelligence Branch (PSI), Indigenous Initiatives Branch (IID), and the Offender Programs and Reintegration Branch. Appreciation is also extended for report feedback received from Andrea Moser and all internal stakeholders.



## Executive Summary

**Key words:** *Security Threat Groups, women offenders, men offenders, characteristics, institutional experience, post-release outcomes.*

In order to understand the population management and operational impacts of Security Threat Group (STG)<sup>1,2</sup> affiliation, this study was conducted to provide a comparative examination of STG affiliated versus non-affiliated offenders under federal jurisdiction in Canada.

In total, 3,889 men offenders and 93 women offenders were identified as STG affiliated between FY2013-2014 and FY2018-2019. A matched comparison group<sup>3</sup> of non-STG affiliated men ( $N = 3,889$ ) and women offenders ( $N = 93$ ) were identified and compared to the general men ( $N = 34,677$ ) and women ( $N = 2,644$ ) offender populations. Offenders in-custody and in the community were examined separately. Demographics, sentence and offence information, criminogenic risk and need characteristics, institutional experience indicators, and post-release outcomes were explored.

Comparisons of STG affiliated men, the matched non-STG men's group, and the general men offender population showed unique differences. For instance, the STG and matched groups were more likely to be Indigenous and younger than the general men's population. STG affiliated men were more likely to have a high static risk and dynamic need, a high rating on the Criminal Risk Index (CRI), and a low reintegration potential compared to the other two groups. A higher proportion of STG affiliated men also had guilty disciplinary charges, positive urinalysis tests or refusals to provide urinalysis tests, and institutional incidents. The STG and matched groups were more likely to be on a non-discretionary release compared to the general men's population. STG affiliated men were most likely to have a suspension of their release.

Similar patterns were evident among the women's study groups. For example, STG women and the matched group were younger and more likely to be in the Prairie or Pacific regions compared to the general women offender population. STG affiliated women and the matched group had higher static risk and dynamic need factor ratings. Also, STG affiliated women were more likely to have a higher rating on the CRI and a low reintegration potential compared to the other two groups. As with the men's cohort, STG affiliated women were more likely to have institutional incidents and guilty disciplinary charges. Among women in the community, the STG and matched groups were more likely to be on non-discretionary release, have a residency condition, and to have a suspension of their release compared to the general women offender population.

Overall, the findings demonstrate the unique profile of STG affiliated men and women offenders compared to non-STG affiliated offenders. Understanding these differences may inform Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) management and operational approaches to STG affiliated offenders.

---

<sup>1</sup> STGs are defined as any formal or informal offender group, gang, or organization consisting of three or more members (e.g., street gangs, Indigenous gangs, prison gangs, outlaw motorcycle gangs, traditional organized crime, Asian gangs, white supremacy groups, subversive groups, terrorist organizations, and hate groups; CSC, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> The Correctional Service of Canada is currently reviewing and updating the STG definition.

<sup>3</sup> Matching variables included ethnocultural group, CSC region during the study period, age during the study period, sentence length, and for community cohorts, release type.





## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary .....	iii
List of Tables .....	v
List of Appendices .....	vi
Introduction.....	1
STG Management and Monitoring .....	2
Approaches for STG Offenders within CSC .....	2
Approaches for STG Offenders in Other Correctional Jurisdictions.....	5
Previous Research Comparing STG Affiliated and Non-Affiliated Offenders .....	8
Current Research.....	10
Method .....	11
Study Cohort .....	11
Men Offenders .....	11
Women Offenders.....	12
Data Sources .....	13
Analytical Approach.....	14
Results.....	15
Men’s In-Custody Cohort .....	15
Descriptive Characteristics .....	15
Institutional Experiences of Men Offenders .....	16
Men’s Community Cohort .....	22
Descriptive Characteristics .....	22
Release Characteristics and Outcomes for Men Offenders .....	23
Women’s In-Custody Cohort.....	26
Descriptive Characteristics .....	26
Institutional Experiences of Women Offenders.....	27
Women’s Community Cohort.....	32
Descriptive Characteristics .....	32
Release Characteristics and Outcomes for Women Offenders .....	33

Sub-analysis by Ethnocultural Groups for Men Offenders.....	36
In-Custody Men’s Cohort .....	36
Community Men’s Cohort .....	39
Discussion .....	44
Conclusions.....	50
References.....	51



## List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Comparison of Institutional Experience Indicators among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and the General Men Offender Population (In-Custody only) ...</i>	18
Table 2 <i>Comparison of Correctional Program Information among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and the General Men Offender Population (In-Custody only) ...</i>	19
Table 3 <i>Comparison of Education and Employment Information among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and the General Men Offender Population (In-Custody only) .....</i>	21
Table 4 <i>Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Men Offender Population (Community only) .....</i>	24
Table 5 <i>Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Men Offender Population (Community only) .....</i>	25
Table 6 <i>Comparison of Institutional Experience Indicators among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and the General Women Offender Population (In-Custody only) .....</i>	28
Table 7 <i>Comparison of Correctional Program Information among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and the General Women Offender Population (In-Custody only) .....</i>	29
Table 8 <i>Comparison of Education and Employment Information among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and the General Women Offender Population (In-Custody only) .....</i>	31
Table 9 <i>Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and Non-STG General Women Offender Population (Community only) .....</i>	34
Table 10 <i>Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and Non-STG General Women Offender Population (Community only) .....</i>	35



## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A: Overview of Other Correctional Jurisdictions Information .....	59
Appendix B: Descriptive Characteristics for Men Offenders .....	71
Appendix C: Descriptive Characteristics for Women Offenders .....	80
Appendix D: Study Results for Indigenous Men Offenders .....	89
Appendix E: Study Results for White Men Offenders .....	96
Appendix F: Study Results for Black Men Offenders .....	103
Appendix G: Study Results for Asian Men Offenders .....	110
Appendix H: Study Results for Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders .....	117



## Introduction

Security Threat Groups (STGs)<sup>4,5</sup> are a prevalent and persistent problem for correctional systems internationally. The presence of STGs within Canada has increased in recent years and although crime rates are dropping in Canada, gang violence continues to increase (Northcott, 2018). Northcott (2021) estimates that over 2,000 organized crime groups exist in Canada, including street and outlaw motorcycle gangs as well as traditional organized crime groups (e.g. the Mafia). The Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) definition of STGs encompasses those involved in organized crime, with 73% of these groups in Canadian society estimated to be involved in violent activities, 29% involved in money-laundering, and other illicit activities including drug trafficking, human trafficking, fraud, etc. (Northcott, 2021). The complexity and diversity of STGs within the broader Canadian population has impacts for corrections. Within the federal correctional system in Canada, a recent study indicated that 11% of men and 4% of women are STG affiliated, with higher proportions among in-custody populations (Farrell MacDonald, 2022). CSC is responsible for managing offenders during incarceration and supervising them once in the community as the Service aims to minimize the potential safety and security risk of STGs to CSC operations, decreasing the influence and power of these groups within federal correctional institutions, and preventing STGs from enhancing their reputation or prestige among federal offenders.

CSC is currently reviewing and updating *Commissioner's Directive 568-3: Identification and Management of Security Threat Groups* (CSC, 2016). As part of this review, CSC is developing a national STG strategy that focuses on four pillars: identification, information sharing, management, and prevention/disengagement. STG related initiatives at the local, regional, and national level aligning with these pillars are in various stages of implementation. Understanding the management, monitoring strategies, and interventions for STG offenders employed by various correctional jurisdictions may inform CSC's policy review process as well

---

<sup>4</sup> STGs are defined as any formal or informal offender group, gang, or organization consisting of three or more members. STGs may include street gangs, Indigenous gangs, prison gangs, outlaw motorcycle gangs, traditional organized crime, Asian gangs, white supremacy groups, subversive groups, terrorist organizations, and hate groups (CSC, 2016).

<sup>5</sup> The Correctional Service of Canada is currently reviewing and updating the STG definition.



as operational practices related to STG affiliated offenders.

### **STG Management and Monitoring**

Numerous strategies have been developed in an attempt to effectively manage STGs, broadly focusing on monitoring STG activity, identifying individuals affiliated with various STGs, operational management strategies using institutional transfers and separation of sub-populations, and providing programming to prevent the proliferation of STGs and inhibit the induction of new members (Di Placido et al., 2006; Michel & Stys, 2015; Petersillia, 2006; Winterdyk & Ruddell, 2010). Unfortunately, there is limited empirical research that has evaluated STG targeted interventions and the effectiveness of these strategies differ significantly between jurisdictions (Winterdyk & Ruddell, 2010).

### **Approaches for STG Offenders within CSC**

Within CSC, policies focus on the identification and management of STGs (CSC, 2016). Offenders affiliated with STGs are identified through monitoring and collecting information from criminal justice partners (e.g. law enforcement, provincial corrections, Canadian Border Services Agency, Canadian Security Intelligence Service, etc.). However, offenders cannot be assigned a STG designation if there is no evidence to prove affiliation (Michel & Stys, 2015). Through the use of the form 1184-01, *Identification of a New Security Threat Group* and form 1184-02, *Assessment of Affiliation with a Security Threat Group*, information is submitted by correctional staff to provide evidence and a record of the affiliation (Michel & Stys, 2015). If an offender wishes to terminate their STG affiliation, they will be interviewed and relevant information will be examined to determine whether they remain affiliated with the STG (CSC 2016; Michel & Stys, 2015).

Based on telephone interviews with CSC institutional staff in 2015, Michel and Stys categorized STG operational practices identified by staff into six general management approaches that were historically used in men's institutions for offenders affiliated with STGs: gang isolation, clustering/concentration, gang dispersion, gang integration and balance of power, key player separation, and disaffiliation transition units. *Gang isolation* referred to physically separating STG affiliated offenders from the general population, thereby decreasing the ability of STGs to recruit new members/associates or to intimidate offenders in the general population, reducing the likelihood of STG incompatibilities creating issues in the general population, and

potentially increasing the number of offenders choosing to disaffiliate from their respective STG. This approach, however, can create significant operational challenges as management of the correctional institution is a balancing act to ensure that the distinct subpopulations remain separate but still have access to correctional programming, interventions, and other services within the site. *Clustering/concentration* of STGs referred to the practice of ensuring that only compatible STGs were housed within the same correctional institution. This strategy attempted to minimize the number of distinct sub-populations within a particular site, but may have increased the influence of specific STGs alliances at those sites. *Gang dispersion* was identified as a potential strategy for use with smaller STGs, as members were placed in different living units or institutions, although some concerns were raised that this may also increase the risk of “spreading the gang” to new sites. The *gang integration and balance of power* strategy was also used with small STGs, whereby a variety of STGs co-existed within an institution. This approach attempted to maintain an even balance of power and low STG conflict, although it was identified that this could have created a situation where offenders re-affiliated to a new group to sway the balance of power within the institution. One suggestion for this strategy in the study was to target STG affiliated offenders who were in the process of disaffiliating or who had minimal influence in their STG. *Key player separation* was a targeted approach whereby those offenders deemed to be the most influential in a particular STG were removed from the remainder of the STG. This technique worked best with STGs with specific leadership structures and did not seem to work for street gangs or Indigenous gangs where leaders tended to be replaced when a power gap was present. The use of *disaffiliation transition units* was a complementary strategy for institutions that used the gang separation management approach, as this strategy focused on offenders who were choosing to disaffiliate from their STG and provided CSC staff with the opportunity to monitor those who were requesting disaffiliation, thereby providing physical safety to offenders choosing to disaffiliate from a variety of STGs, and provided peer support among offenders going through the disaffiliation process. This technique could only be used if a sufficient number of offenders chose to disaffiliate at the same time to warrant the creation of disaffiliation specific units.

Current population management initiatives in both men’s and women’s institutions utilizes an integrative approach to maintain safety and security of each institution and avoid conflict, particularly in women’s institutions. The strategies of *clustering/concentration* and

*balance of power* mentioned in the previous paragraph could be used to characterize the present-day practices utilized to ensure compatible STG populations or individuals could be managed at a particular institution. Placements of STG affiliated offenders are reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and would be dependent on the role and level of involvement with the STG of the offender; STG affiliated offenders trying to disaffiliate or who are no longer in good standing with their STG may be transferred to another region in order to maintain their placement in the integrated general population.

CSC has a legal mandate to provide programs and services to offenders that address their criminogenic risk and need factors. Correctional programming within CSC is based on the risk-needs-responsivity model of interventions (Bonta & Andrews, 2016) that aim to match the offender's level of risk to the intensity level of the program, based on evidence-based cognitive behavioural techniques to address criminogenic risk factors (e.g., criminal attitudes, pro-criminal associates, substance misuse, violence, etc.) and take into consideration the learning styles and potential responsivity challenges faced by individual offenders (CSC, 2019b). Correctional programs are specialized for specific sub-populations within the general offender population (e.g., men, women, Indigenous offenders including specific programs for Inuit offenders, and sex offenders). Correctional programs within CSC include multi-target streams that address individual risk factors and criminogenic needs, including those behaviours that are common to STG affiliated offenders, such as antisocial personality, pro-criminal attitudes/cognitions, and criminal associates. Offenders who are affiliated with a STG are referred to these programs based on their level of risk and need. In addition to correctional programs, CSC offers specific services and interventions related to education, employment, social programming, cultural programming, mental health services, and substance misuse (e.g., opioid agonist treatment; CSC, 2021b). Overall, CSC's correctional programs and interventions support offenders throughout their sentence with the aim to aid in the successful reintegration of offenders post-release.

Although there is limited research related to the effectiveness of interventions specifically for STG affiliated offenders within CSC, Di Placido et al. (2006) examined the impact of cognitive-behavioural programming that followed the risk, need, and responsivity principles and was provided at the federal Regional Psychiatric Centre (RPC) in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. Four matched offender groups were compared: untreated gang members, treated gang members, untreated non-gang members, and treated non-gang members ( $n = 160$ ). It was found that treated

gang members were significantly less likely to reoffend, and those who did reoffend committed less serious offences when compared to the other groups, including the untreated non-gang group (Di Placido et al, 2006). This research suggests that interventions for STGs can be effective, however, it is unclear if this is generalizable across other federal institutions, other correctional jurisdictions in Canada, or across gang types (Di Placido et al., 2006).

### **Approaches for STG Offenders in Other Correctional Jurisdictions**

A review of management practices, interventions, and programming strategies employed in other correctional jurisdictions was completed. Please refer to Appendix A for a tabular overview of this information.

### ***STG Management***

The majority of correctional systems have established policies for STG management strategies focused on monitoring communication between offenders, information gathering (e.g., identifying members, understanding the STG structure), and sharing and disseminating this information with other law enforcement agencies (Well et al., 2002, as cited in Winterdyk and Ruddell, 2010). Task forces have been created to proactively monitor STG activity (e.g., Security Risk Group; Connecticut State Department of Corrections, 2000, 2013, 2020) and zero tolerance policies have been enacted, restricting the possession of STG related paraphernalia and imposing sanctions against the use of STG symbols, drawings, and tattoos (e.g., State of Alabama Department of Corrections, 2020) in an attempt to manage the threat associated with STG groups.

A 2009 survey distributed to correctional officials within the United States correctional systems, resulting in 37 responses (69.8% response rate) identified eight strategies for managing STG groups (Winterdyk & Ruddell, 2010). These institutional management strategies included isolating offenders affiliated with STGs through segregation or special living units and increasing security classifications.

Isolating offenders affiliated with STGs has historically been common amongst jurisdictions. Examples include transferring identified members to administrative segregation, housing them in specialized gang management units, or delegating these offenders to specific institutions (Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2018). The majority of U.S jurisdictions have assigned identified members to administrative segregation (e.g., Alaska, California, Idaho, and Texas; as

identified in Winterdyk & Ruddell, 2010; Michigan Department of Corrections, 2021; Texas Department of Corrections, 2022), although some states have begun to discontinue this practice following legal challenges (St. John, 2015). Further preventative measures have involved transferring offenders affiliated with STGs to designated institutions or increasing the security classification of identified members; for example, states including Arizona, Connecticut, and Michigan have transferred these offenders to maximum-security institutions (Fischer, 2002; State of Connecticut Department of Corrections, 2013) while the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (2007) reportedly has several institutions designated for STG members. Similarly, Arizona has isolated STG affiliated offenders in Security Management Units, which has reportedly resulted in a decrease of institutional misconduct (e.g., drug violations, assaults) by 50% (Fischer, 2002).

In 2005, South Africa introduced Unit Management, which entailed dividing the prison population into smaller, more manageable groups and allowing for increased direct supervision (Government of South Africa, 2005). While Unit Management was not introduced solely because of the high number of gang affiliates in its prison population, it became the main management strategy of these groups (Government of South Africa, 2005).

Beginning in 2018, Ara Poutama Oatearua (New Zealand's Correctional Services) introduced gang management plans for each of their 15 men's institutions (New Zealand Ara Poutama Oatearua, 2021). These plans are unique to each institution as they consider gang-related risk factors specific to the institution, specific solutions to address those risks, while also taking into account the overall offender population and gang membership among them (New Zealand Ara Poutama Oatearua, 2019). This new style of gang management came after an increase in assaults within the institutions that involved gang affiliates and associates (New Zealand Ara Poutama Oatearua, 2019). According to the 2020-2021 Annual Report, approximately 35% of offenders are connected to gangs (New Zealand Ara Poutama Oatearua, 2021).

### ***Intervention Practices and Programming Strategies***

Regarding interventions, limited research exists related to the effectiveness of various approaches for STG affiliated offenders. In Australia, the New South Wales Department of Communities and Justice introduced a STG intervention program called the Institutionalised Violence Intervention Unit (IVIU). It is a 22-bed unit within the Lithgow maximum-security

institution and provides specific programming targeting the needs and risk factors of STG offenders with the ultimate goal of reintegrating the offenders to the general prison population (New South Wales Department of Communities and Justice, n.d.). Additional intervention strategies employed in correctional jurisdictions include debriefing and renunciation processes, segregation step-down programs, and gang-targeted interventions (Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2018). Although not empirically validated, 75% of prison staff believed that segregation and isolation were the most effective intervention strategies (Winterdyk & Ruddell, 2010).

A 2016 U.S. survey of 39 prison systems found that only 14 states had a STG intervention strategy. Intervention focused on renunciation/debriefing, gang-targeted programs, and segregation step-down programs (Pyrooz and Mitchell, 2018). Debriefing is a common process for renouncing STG status. Many states including Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Wyoming, Connecticut and Massachusetts report requiring debriefing as a step to renunciation (Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2018). During the process, offenders affiliated with STGs provide correctional officials with details of the group's inner workings, including identifying members, outlining the hierarchical structure, and reporting the rules of the STG (Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2018). Revealing this information may result in a reclassification of the offender's STG status and initiate their transition back into the general population (Idaho Department of Corrections, 2012; Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2018; State of Connecticut Department of Corrections, 2013). Notably, there is a lack of incentive to renounce due to potential retaliation and the possibility of remaining in a higher security unit despite renunciation (Fischer, 2002). For example, in Arizona, when STG members renounce their membership they remain in segregation (Fischer, 2002).

Alternatively, with respect to isolation strategies, segregation step-down programs are designed to reduce security classifications, award privileges, and reintegrate affiliates to the general offender population from segregation (Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2018). For example, the California Department of Corrections initiated a four step, 24-month long program for offenders identified as STG affiliated that awards privileges at each step based on the offenders' progress, compliance, and ability to co-exist with other offenders. The final step involves the offender being placed in the general population where they are monitored for 12 months. If STG ties remerge, they are placed back in segregation (Pyrooz and Mitchell, 2018; California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2018). Comparatively, the Idaho Department of Corrections

(2012) has implemented a 24-week step-down program. Within the first 16 weeks, offenders receive individual treatment modules while following the rules of segregation (e.g., restricted privileges, 23-hour lock-down). During the last eight weeks, they are awarded numerous privileges (e.g., increased phone access, social time). Between 2010 and 2012, 34 STG affiliates completed the program successfully, renounced their STG status, and did not return to administrative segregation for the remainder of their sentences (Idaho Department of Corrections, 2012).

Additional targeted programs are offered for offenders affiliated with STGs who wish to renounce their status. The Connecticut Department of Corrections (2013) offers the Security Risk Group Member Phase Program, a five-phase program, for offenders interested in renouncing their STG status. The program includes topics such as cultural awareness and anger management. Furthermore, participants interact with members from rival STG groups to learn how to co-exist (Gaseau, 2002). Comparatively, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (2007) implemented the Gang Renouncement and Disassociation (GRAD) Program. To participate in this program, STG affiliates must inform correctional staff of their goal to renounce their status. Prior to enrollment, a review of their case file is completed to ensure that there have been no incidents of STG related behaviour within the past 12 months, they have completed a Gang Member Disassociation Packet, have not been assigned to administrative segregation for the past six months, have not engaged in violent behaviour in the past two years, and have not incurred any major disciplinary cases for a minimum of six months. The program is nine months long and is centred on cognitive interventions. During the early phases, offenders participate in programming and group activities, normally prohibited while in segregation. As the program progresses, offenders are housed with a rival gang member. During the last phase, offenders are transferred to the general population. In addition to GRAD, Administrative Segregation Diversion (ASD) is offered at intake to previously incarcerated STG affiliates which allows them to begin the diversion programming immediately. Between 2000 and 2014, 4,157 offenders graduated from the GRAD program. The administrative segregation population decreased by 31%, and the number of offenders reaching warrant expiry while in segregation decreased by 19% (Texas Department of Criminal Justice, 2014).

### **Previous Research Comparing STG Affiliated and Non-Affiliated Offenders**

Previous research demonstrates that there are differences between both men and women

STG affiliated offenders and non-STG affiliated offenders. Generally, affiliated men are younger and serving longer sentences than non-affiliates (Nafekh & Stys, 2004). Overall, gang members are more likely to commit violent offences (e.g., robbery and weapons-related offences) as well as drug trafficking offences but less likely to commit sexual offences (Decker, Melde & Pyrooz, 2013; Nafekh & Stys, 2004). A study of gang versus non-gang affiliated youth found that gang affiliates are more likely to hold anti-authority attitudes and blame the victims for their behaviour (Alleyne & Wood, 2010).

In other jurisdictions, particularly in the United States, STG affiliated offenders are more likely than non-STG affiliates to violate the rules of the institutions, including failure to participate in rehabilitative programming, distribution of drugs and other prohibited items, engaging in violence, and promoting disturbances and/or riots (Motz, Labrecque, & Smith, 2021). Due to the violent and/or disruptive behaviour, STG affiliated offenders are often overrepresented in restrictive housing or segregation compared to non-affiliates (Motz, Labrecque, & Smith, 2021; Pyrooz & Mitchell, 2020).

While there is little information that specifically compares the education/employment levels of STG affiliated offenders to those non-affiliated, examinations of programming and interventions suggests that education is an important area of need for affiliated offenders (Scott, 2012). Compared to non-STG affiliated offenders, those STG affiliated were more likely to experience victimization (Decker, Melde, & Pyrooz, 2013). STG affiliated offenders have greater need in the associates domain compared to the general offender population due to their association with antisocial peers (Decker, Melde, & Pyrooz, 2013; Nafekh & Stys, 2004).

There is less literature available that compares STG affiliated and non-STG affiliated women offenders. This is partly because women are less likely to be STG affiliated than men, however, the number of women and young girls with affiliations has increased over time (Alleyne & Wood, 2010). Nevertheless, on average, women STG affiliated offenders have more extensive criminal histories, higher static risk and dynamic need, and lower motivation and reintegration potential (Scott, 2012). In Canada, Indigenous women are overrepresented among women STG affiliated offenders (Mackenzie & Johnson, 2003). A 2012 study (Scott) demonstrated that 48% of women affiliated offenders were white and 41% were Indigenous, whereas 53% of women non-affiliated offenders were white and 29% were Indigenous. Affiliated women offenders are younger than their non-affiliated counterparts, however, the



average sentence length of both groups is comparable (Scott, 2012). This study also found that women who were STG affiliated were more likely than those who were not to have poor institutional adjustment seen through engagement in violent and disruptive behaviours while incarcerated (Scott, 2012). Lack of education or educational opportunities, and periods of unemployment prior to incarceration are also more likely among STG affiliated women compared to women who are not affiliated (Mackenzie & Johnson, 2003; Sutton, 2017). In addition, compared to men STG affiliated offenders and non-affiliated women, women affiliated with STGs are more likely to experience victimization and abuse, particularly during childhood (Sutton, 2017).

### **Current Research**

The current study aims to provide a comparative examination of STG affiliated versus non-affiliated offenders under federal jurisdiction in Canada. Specifically, this study explored:

- 1) What are the demographics, sentence/offence, and criminogenic risk and need characteristics of STG affiliated compared to non-STG affiliated federal offenders?
- 2) How do STG affiliated offenders compare to those who are not affiliated with regards to institutional indicators (disciplinary charges, institutional incidents, random urinalysis, correctional program participation, etc.)?
- 3) What are the post-release outcomes for STG affiliated federal offenders compared to non-affiliated federal offenders?

## Method

### Study Cohort

Retrospective year-end federal institutional and community supervision population cohorts for FY2014-2015 to FY2018-2019 were extracted. The population cohorts were divided by gender and custodial status (in-custody versus community) to be examined separately. STG affiliated offenders were identified and compared to both matched comparison groups and the general offender population.

### Men Offenders

#### *STG Affiliated Men Offenders*

The retrospective cohort included 3,889 men federal offenders who were identified as affiliated with STGs based on population profile snapshots during the study period. Overall 59% ( $n = 2,299$ )<sup>6</sup> of STG affiliated men offenders were in-custody while 41% ( $n = 1,590$ )<sup>7</sup> were on release in the community. Disaggregated analyses by ethnocultural group<sup>8</sup> (e.g., Indigenous, Black, White, Asian, all other ethnocultural groups) for men offenders were conducted.

Among STG affiliated offenders in-custody, 53% ( $n = 1,224$ ) were identified as street gangs,<sup>9</sup> followed by Indigenous gangs (25%,  $n = 559$ ), outlaw motorcycle gangs (OMGs)/traditional organized crime (TOC; 13%,  $n = 304$ ), prison gangs (5%,  $n = 119$ ), and all other STGs (4%,  $n = 93$ ).<sup>10</sup> Community STG men offenders were affiliated with street gangs (50%,  $n = 794$ ), OMGs/TOC (28%,  $n = 441$ ), Indigenous gangs (14%,  $n = 229$ ), prison gangs (3%,  $n = 45$ ),

---

<sup>6</sup> Sixty-eight percent of men in-custody who were affiliated with STGs were identified as a key player/member while 32% were associates. A key player is defined as an offender considered to have a strong leadership role or a degree of influence over other offenders affiliated with the STG; a member is considered to be actively and formally participating in the STG by promoting, furthering, and assisting the STGs functions; an associate is an offender who is involved with a security threat group but who is not considered a member of the group (CSC, 2016).

<sup>7</sup> In the community, 62% of men affiliated with STGs were identified as a key player/member while 38% were associates.

<sup>8</sup> Indigenous includes offenders self-reporting as First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. Black includes offenders self-reporting as Black, Caribbean, and Sub-Saharan African. White includes offenders self-reporting as White, and Eastern, Northern, Southern or Western European. Asian includes offenders self-reporting as Arab/West Asian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, South Asian, Southeast Asian, and East Indian. All other self-reported racial or ethnocultural groups were included in the “all other ethnocultural groups” category.

<sup>9</sup> During the study period, street gangs and Indigenous gangs were categorized separately, however changes to OMS in December has integrated the Indigenous gang category, as well as prison gangs, Asian gangs, and Indo-Canadian gangs, into the street gang category due to the similarity in structures of these groups (OMS Release Notes 1.38).

<sup>10</sup> Other STGs for men offenders included Asian gangs, white supremacist groups, terrorist organizations, and all other gangs.

and all other STGs (5%,  $n = 81$ ).

### ***Men's Matched Comparison Groups***

The men's matched comparison group<sup>11</sup> included 3,889 federal men offenders (59% in-custody, 41% in the community) matched to the STG affiliated group based on ethnocultural group (Indigenous,<sup>12</sup> White, Black, Asian, and all other ethnocultural groups), CSC region during the study period (Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Prairies, and Pacific),<sup>13</sup> age at study period (30 years or younger, 31-49 years, 50 years or older), and sentence length (four years or less, 4 to 10 years, 10 years or more, or indeterminate). For the community cohort, release type was also used as a matching variable (day parole, full parole, statutory release, or long term supervision order). Ninety-nine percent of all men in-custody within the STG and non-STG matched comparison group matched on all variables; the remaining 1% ( $n = 25$  of each group) of the in-custody men's groups matched on all variables except sentence length. For the community sample, 89% matched on the first round of matching. The remaining 11% ( $n = 169$  of each group) of men were matched with fewer indicators on the second round of matching.

### ***General Men Offender Population***

All remaining men identified during the study period were included in the general federal men offender population group ( $N = 34,677$ ). Of these 45% ( $N = 15,701$ ) were in-custody and 55% ( $N = 18,976$ ) were in the community.

### ***Women Offenders***

#### ***STG Affiliated Women Offenders***

In total, 93 women offenders were identified as STG affiliated during the study period. Forty-four percent ( $n = 41$ )<sup>14</sup> of STG affiliated women were in-custody while 56% ( $n = 52$ )<sup>15</sup> were on release in the community. Disaggregation analyses by ethnocultural group was not

---

<sup>11</sup> Matched comparison groups were identified using Coarsened Exact Matching (CEM) in Stata software. CEM is a technique that allows for the matching of study groups based on a variety of potentially confounding indicators by "coarsening" the data to allow for a higher likelihood of matching (Blackwell, Payne, & Prevost, 2010).

<sup>12</sup> Indigenous offenders were also matched on whether they identified as First Nations, Métis, or Inuit.

<sup>13</sup> Region during the study period and region at admission were the same for 80% of STG affiliated men in-custody and 86% of STG affiliated men in the community.

<sup>14</sup> Over half (59%) of women in-custody who were affiliated with STGs were identified as associates while 41% were members.

<sup>15</sup> Sixty percent of women in the community who were affiliated with STGs were identified as associates while 40% were members.

feasible for women offenders in the study given the small sample size.

Women STG groups were identified in three main STG subgroups: (a) Indigenous gangs, (b) street gangs, and (c) all other STGs. Among women in-custody, almost two-thirds (61%,  $n = 25$ ) were part of Indigenous gangs and 27% ( $n = 11$ ) were in street gangs; in the community cohort, street gangs were more prominent at 40% ( $n = 21$ ) followed by Indigenous gangs at 37% ( $n = 19$ ).<sup>16,17</sup>

### ***Women's Matched Comparison Group***

Ninety-three non-affiliated federal women offenders were identified for the matched comparison group<sup>18</sup> (44% in-custody and 56% in the community). Matching variables included ethnocultural group (Indigenous,<sup>19</sup> White, all other ethnocultural groups), CSC region during the study period (Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Prairies, and Pacific),<sup>20</sup> age at study period (30 years or younger, 31-49 years, 50 years or older), and sentence length (four years or less, 4 to 10 years, 10 years or more/indeterminate). For the community cohort, release type was also used as a matching variable (discretionary/non-discretionary release). One hundred percent of all women in the STG and non-STG matched comparison group matched on all variables. For the community sample, 85% ( $n = 44$  of each group) matched on the first round of matching. The remaining 15% ( $n = 8$  of each group) of women were matched with fewer indicators on the second round of matching.

### ***General Women Offender Population***

All remaining women identified during the study period were included in the general federal women offender population group ( $N = 2,644$ ). Of these, 36% ( $N = 951$ ) were in-custody and 64% ( $N = 1,693$ ) were in the community.

## **Data Sources**

Data were extracted from CSC's Offender Management System (OMS), the electronic administrative and operational data system that records offender information from sentence

---

<sup>16</sup> Five in-custody women were members of other STGs including motorcycle gangs and white supremacist groups.

<sup>17</sup> For women in the community, other STGs ( $n = 12$ ) included motorcycle gangs, traditional organized crime, Asian gangs, white supremacist groups, terrorist organizations, and all other gangs.

<sup>18</sup> Matching technique utilized was CEM (see footnote 5).

<sup>19</sup> Indigenous offenders were also matched on whether they identified as First Nations, Métis, or Inuit.

<sup>20</sup> Region during the study period and region at admission were the same for 68% of STG affiliated women in-custody and 71% of STG affiliated women in the community.

beginning to end. Demographics, sentence, and offence information for all study groups were extracted. Information related to disciplinary charges (minor and serious), institutional incidents, random urinalysis testing, correctional program participation during incarceration,<sup>21</sup> participation in education and employment initiatives, institutional transfers, and grievances for in-custody cohorts were examined. For community cohorts, release information (day/full parole versus statutory release/long term supervision orders), suspensions of release (including reasons for suspension), and returns to custody (with or without an offence) were also examined.

### **Analytical Approach**

As all offenders affiliated with STGs during the study period were included, inferential statistics were not used. Descriptive analyses (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) were conducted. Bivariate analyses were used to examine associations between STG type and indicators of institutional behaviour (such as charges and incidents) and post-release outcomes (e.g., suspensions and returns to custody). All analyses were completed using SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., 2013).

---

<sup>21</sup> Correctional programming would include the Integrated Correctional Program Model (ICPM), the Inuit Integrated Correctional Program (IICP), or the Women Offender Correctional Program (WOCP) and may also include nationally recognized correctional programs that were replaced by ICPM or WOCP, such as the Violence Prevention Program (VPP) or the National Substance Abuse Program (NSAP) among others.

## Results

The results section consists of three main sections: men offenders, women offenders, and sub-analysis by ethnocultural group for men offenders.<sup>22</sup> Within these sections, comparisons across the study groups (STG, matched comparison, general offender population) related to demographics, sentence and offence information, criminogenic risk and need information were conducted and presented separately for in-custody and community cohorts. In-custody institutional experience indicators across the study groups was examined (random urinalysis results, disciplinary charges with a guilty verdict, institutional incidents, grievances, transfers, and correctional program participation). Finally, post-release outcomes (suspensions of release and returns to custody) for the community study groups were examined.

### Men's In-Custody Cohort

#### Descriptive Characteristics

For men, descriptive characteristics information (demographics, sentence and offence information, and criminogenic risk and need information) is presented in Appendix B. Analyses focusing on the matching variables, the STG and matched groups were more likely than the general men's population to be Indigenous (47% versus 25%) or Black (13% versus 6%) while the general population group was more likely to be White (51% versus 23%). On average, men in the STG and matched comparison groups were younger than the general men offender population (approximately 34 or 35 versus 40 years). Also, more men in the STG and matched groups were in the Prairie region during the study period (47%) compared to 27% of the general men offender population (see Table B1). In the general population, about one-quarter of men offenders were also incarcerated in the Ontario (26%) or Quebec (22%) regions. Analyses examining region of admission indicated that over half of men in the STG affiliated and matched comparison groups were admitted in the Prairie region compared to less than one-third of the general men offender population.<sup>23</sup> Finally, a greater proportion of the general population group compared to the other two groups were serving less than four years (46% versus 34%).

---

<sup>22</sup> Due to the small number of STG affiliated women who were non-Indigenous ( $n = 4$  for the in-custody cohort and  $n = 17$  for the community cohort), sub-analyses by ethnocultural group were not completed.

<sup>23</sup> Region during the study period was a matching variable; however, region at admission and region during the study period were the same for 86% of STG affiliated men offenders.

The matched comparison group was most likely to have committed a violent offence although about three-quarters of each group had committed a violent offence (79% matched versus 71% general group and 72% STG); the STG group was more likely to have an assault related violent offence while the matched group was more likely to have a sex-related violent offence. The STG group was more likely to be serving a second or subsequent sentence (serving first federal sentence: 56% STG versus 73% matched and 66% general group, see Table B1). Men affiliated with STGs were more likely than the other two groups to be assessed as maximum security during the study period (29% STG versus 12% general group and 17% matched).

Criminogenic risk and need factors for the three men's groups are presented in Table B2. Men in the STG group were more likely to be high static risk (71% STG versus 64% for the other two study groups) and high dynamic need (76% STG versus 66% general group and 67% matched) during the study period. STG affiliated men were more likely to have a high rating on the Criminal Risk Index (CRI; 57% STG versus 35% general group and 40% matched) and a low reintegration potential (62% STG versus 45% general group and 48% matched). In addition, they were less likely to be engaged in their correctional plan when compared to the other two groups (60% STG versus 72% for the other two study groups). STG affiliated men were most likely to have identified needs with respect to associates, attitudes, and employment/education than the other two groups, were comparable to the matched comparison group with respect to community functioning and marital/family, but they were less likely to have identified needs than the matched comparison group with respect to personal/emotional orientation and substance abuse (see Table B2).

Additional analyses of all dynamic need domain indicators showed that STG affiliated offenders were more likely (greater than 5% difference) than both the matched comparison group and the general men offender population to have the following need domain indicators endorsed (see Table B3): unstable job history; unemployed at arrest; family members involved in criminal activity; has criminal acquaintances; has criminal friends; resides in a high crime area; supports instrumental violence; has negative attitudes towards criminal justice or correctional system; engages in thrill-seeking behaviour; aggressive towards others; hostile towards others or interprets neutral situations as hostile.

### **Institutional Experiences of Men Offenders**

Table 1 displays the indicators of institutional behaviour such as guilty disciplinary

charges, random urinalysis testing, and institutional incidents. Other indicators of institutional experience included offender grievances and institutional transfers. A greater proportion of STG affiliated men had guilty disciplinary charges, positive urinalysis test, refusals to provide urinalysis tests, institutional incidents, and filed grievances (see Table 1). However, all three study groups had comparable proportions with a history of institutional transfers (74% to 78%). The three most common incidents, regardless of study group, were contraband, behavioural, and assault-related. For institutional transfers, STG men were more likely to have inter-regional transfers while the matched group was most likely to have regional transfers. With respect to grievances, visits/leisure and interaction<sup>24</sup> issues were the most common issues for STG affiliated men offenders and the general population while the matched group had the most issues with conditions/routine<sup>25</sup> (see Table 1).

---

<sup>24</sup> Interaction related grievances include a variety of interpersonal issues, including discrimination concerns, harassment by staff, staff performance concerns, instances of sexual harassment, and cross-gender staffing concerns.

<sup>25</sup> Conditions/routine related grievances include a variety of issues such as food amenities (the timing or quality of meals), timing of activities, frequency and timing of offender counts, control of offender movements within the facility, opportunities for socializing and offender privileges, use of identification cards, access to basic legal documents, issues related to offender accounts, offender canteen, room and board, shared accommodations, etc.



Table 1

*Comparison of Institutional Experience Indicators among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and the General Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	General Population (N = 15,701)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Guilty Disciplinary Charges	65 (1,494)	53 (1,210)	47 (7,389)
<i>Average Number - Charges M (SD)</i>	7 (15.2)	4 (11.4)	4 (12.0)
Random Urinalysis			
<i>Positive Tests</i>	32 (508)	20 (301)	18 (1,835)
<i>Refusals</i>	29 (464)	18 (284)	17 (1,804)
Institutional Incidents	84 (1,940)	72 (1,655)	67 (10,522)
<i>Average Number of Incidents M (SD)</i>	10 (15.2)	8 (16.7)	7 (15.3)
<i>Assault related</i>	59 (1,345)	43 (987)	34 (5,414)
<i>Behavioural</i>	61 (1,399)	43 (989)	39 (6,150)
<i>Contraband</i>	65 (1,504)	48 (1,093)	41 (6,420)
Institutional Transfers*	78 (1,788)	74 (1,692)	77 (12,080)
<i>Average Number - Transfers M (SD)</i>	3 (3.9)	3 (3.7)	3 (3.9)
<i>Inter-Regional</i>	29 (661)	20 (451)	18 (2,866)
<i>Regional</i>	28 (641)	68 (1,567)	27 (4,311)
Grievances	74 (1,693)	64 (1,468)	63 (9,863)
<i>Average Number - Grievances M (SD)</i>	11 (36.7)	9 (43.3)	13 (118.2)
<i>Conditions/Routine</i>	17 (388)	49 (1,115)	14 (2,200)
<i>Interaction Issues</i>	38 (877)	30 (680)	28 (4,468)
<i>Visits/Leisure</i>	40 (909)	31 (709)	31 (4,870)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. \*Institutional transfers include inter-regional, regional, section 81, emergency, and federal/provincial transfers, but only inter-regional and regional are presented in the Table.

Table 2 displays the correctional program<sup>26</sup> results for men offenders. A greater proportion of STG affiliated men were referred for correctional programming (82% STG versus 75% general group and 77% matched). Among those assigned to correctional programming, STG affiliated offenders were as likely to complete any programming including readiness and maintenance components (91% STG versus 91% general group and 92% matched). However, among those assigned to programming, comparable completion rates for moderate or high intensity programming were evident across the three study groups (71% to 74%, see Table 2). It is important to note that these analyses were not specific to the current correctional programs or restricted to examine whether the completion occurred prior to parole eligibility dates.

Table 2

*Comparison of Correctional Program Information among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and the General Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	General Population (N = 15,701)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Assigned to Correctional Programming	82 (1,889)	77 (1,780)	75 (11,849)
<i>Among those assigned,</i>			
<i>Completed any programming</i>	91 (1,718)	91 (1,618)	92 (10,846)
<i>Completed Moderate or High</i>	71 (1,344)	74 (1,312)	73 (8,602)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. Moderate or high intensity programming would include the Integrated Correctional Program Model (ICPM) or the Inuit Integrated Correctional Program (IICP) and may also include nationally recognized correctional programs that were replaced by ICPM. Due to the changes in correctional programming referral guidelines over the course of the study period which changed the eligibility for offenders to be assigned to correctional programming, completion proportions were calculated using the total number of offenders in each study group. Some of the changes in program referral guidelines may have resulted in offenders not being assigned to correctional programming during the study period but they may have been eligible under current guidelines.

<sup>26</sup> As this is an in-custody population, correctional programming information may include the Integrated Correctional Program Model, the Inuit Integrated Correctional Program Model, as well as previously offered nationally recognized correctional programs for men.

As employment and education criminogenic needs were more prominent for STG affiliated offenders than the other two comparison groups (see Table B2, Appendix B), referral and participation in education and employment interventions were examined (see Table 3); although offenders without an identified criminogenic need in this area may still be referred to education<sup>27</sup> and employment<sup>28</sup> interventions. A greater proportion of STG affiliated offenders were referred to education and employment interventions, particularly compared to the general in-custody men offender population (education: 73% STG group versus 62% general population; employment 93% STG group versus 87% general population); however, examination of the referral rates for CORCAN<sup>29</sup> specific employment programs showed that STG affiliated men offenders (29%) were less likely to be referred than the general population (38%).

Participation rates in education and employment were also examined and presented in Table 3. Among those referred to education, about two-thirds participated in various education interventions, regardless of study group. Participation rates for employment programs were much lower, with about one-quarter of offenders participating in various employment opportunities, which was comparable across study groups. Participation was slightly higher for non-CORCAN employment than for CORCAN employment initiatives (see Table 3). Finally, although referrals for vocational certification programs were low (4% to 7%), the majority of offenders referred to these employment initiatives participated in these certification programs.

---

<sup>27</sup> According to *Commissioner's Directive 720: Education Programs and Services for Inmates* (CSC, 2017a), offenders with less than a high school diploma/provincial equivalent will be identified with an educational need, but post-secondary pre-requisite courses and post-secondary education opportunities are also available for offenders who may wish to pursue them.

<sup>28</sup> Commissioner's Direction 735: *Employment and Employability Programs* indicates that all offenders should be referred for employment (section 27; CSC, 2017b).

<sup>29</sup> CORCAN is a special operating agency within CSC responsible for Employment and Employability Programs for offenders; they provide vocational training and certification in manufacturing, textiles, construction, agriculture, and other services (e.g. vehicle dismantling, industrial laundry operations, printing, electronic assembly and testing, and laser engraving).

Table 3

*Comparison of Education and Employment Information among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and the General Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	General Population (N = 15,701)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Referred for Education Programs	73 (1,673)	67 (1,532)	62 (9,808)
<i>Among those referred, participated in Education Programs</i>	60 (1,007)	64 (981)	62 (6,095)
Referred for Any Employment Programs <sup>+</sup>	93 (2,147)	90 (2,079)	87 (13,612)
<i>Among those referred, participated in Any Employment Programs</i>	25 (527)	26 (536)	26 (3,504)
Referred for CORCAN Employment	29 (663)	33 (755)	38 (5,952)
<i>Among those referred, participated in CORCAN Employment</i>	11 (70)	11 (85)	12 (712)
Referred for non-CORCAN Employment	92 (2,110)	87 (2,003)	82 (12,947)
<i>Among those referred, participated in non-CORCAN Employment</i>	19 (405)	18 (376)	22 (2,831)
Referred for other vocational certification programs	7 (158)	8 (184)	4 (665)
<i>Among those referred, participated in other vocational certification programs</i>	87 (137)	84 (155)	89 (592)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. <sup>+</sup>Any employment program includes CORCAN, non-CORCAN, and vocational certification programs, therefore the referrals/participation rates for the specific sub-categories are not mutually exclusive.

## Men's Community Cohort

### Descriptive Characteristics

Table B1 in Appendix B also shows the demographic and sentence/offence information for the men's community groups. On average, men in the STG and matched comparison groups were younger than the general men offender population (38 years versus 43 years). Men in the STG and matched groups were more likely to be in the Prairie region during the study period (30% versus 24%) and were less likely to be in the Atlantic region (3% versus 11%), although the regional variation in the community cohort was less pronounced than the in-custody men's cohort. Region of admission information was comparable to the region during the study period. A greater proportion of Indigenous and Black men were in the STG and matched groups (25% and 15%) compared to the general men's population (15% and 5%). Finally, the STG and matched groups were less likely to be serving a sentence of less than four years (41% versus 59%).

The STG group was less likely to have committed a violent offence in the men's community cohort (50% STG, 64% matched, and 58% general group) but they were more likely to be involved in drug-related offences (32% STG versus 21% matched and 26% general group, see Table B1). STG affiliated men were more likely to be serving a second or subsequent sentence (first sentence: 64% STG versus 76% matched and 78% general group). Prior to release, men affiliated with STGs were also more likely than the other two groups to be assessed as maximum security (13% STG versus 5% general group and 7% matched).

Criminogenic risk and need information is presented in Table B2. The STG group had higher static risk (37% STG versus 25% general group and 31% matched) and dynamic need (38% STG versus 29% general group and 33% matched) during the study period. STG affiliated men were most likely to have a high rating on the CRI (37% STG versus 17% general group and 26% matched) and less likely to be engaged in their correctional plan (75% STG versus 80% matched and 84% general group). As shown in Table B2, STG affiliated men were more likely to have identified needs with respect to associates, attitudes, and employment/education while less likely to have a need in marital/family, personal/emotional orientation, or substance abuse. Community functioning was comparable for STG and the matched groups but higher than the general population.

Table B3 presents comparisons across the three study groups in the community related to

specific need domain indicators. The STG affiliated group was more likely (greater than a 5% difference) than the other two study groups to have less than a grade 10 or a high school diploma/provincial degree equivalency; to have an unstable job history; be unemployed at arrest; have family members who were criminally active; to have criminal acquaintances; to have criminal friends; to reside in a high crime area; to support instrumental violence; to have negative attitudes towards the criminal justice or correctional system; to engage in thrill-seeking behaviour; to be manipulative towards others; or to be aggressive towards others.

### **Release Characteristics and Outcomes for Men Offenders**

Release characteristics of the men's community groups are displayed in Table 4. The STG and matched groups were more likely to be on a non-discretionary release (statutory release or long term supervision order) compared to the men's general population (71% STG and 72% matched versus 50% general group). STG affiliated offenders were most likely to have a residency condition on release (24% STG versus 19% matched and 13% general group) and were more likely than the general population to have four face-to-face contacts<sup>30</sup> with their parole officers per month in the community (29% versus 21%, see Table 4). Men in the general population were more likely to be on the first term of release compared to the STG and matched groups (85% general group versus 76% STG and 79% matched).

---

<sup>30</sup> The level of intervention (commonly referred to as the frequency of contact) between an offender on release and their community parole officer is outlined under Section 20 of *Commissioner's Directive 715-1: Community Supervision* (CSC, 2019a). The highest level of intervention (Level I) requires eight face-to-face contacts per month while the lowest level is once every three months (Level E).

Table 4

*Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 18,975)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Release Type (matched)			
<i>Discretionary Release</i>	29 (459)	28 (450)	50 (9,497)
<i>Non-discretionary Release</i>	71 (1,131)	72 (1,140)	50 (9,478)
Released on First Term of Sentence	76 (1,202)	79 (1,250)	85 (16,222)
Residency Condition	24 (388)	19 (296)	13 (2,546)
Frequency of Contact			
<i>Four face-to-face contacts (Level A)</i>	29 (462)	26 (407)	21 (3,923)
<i>Two face-to-face contacts (Level B)</i>	35 (550)	37 (593)	37 (7,075)
<i>One face-to-face contacts per month (Level C) or less (Levels D, E, &amp; I)</i>	20 (320)	21 (335)	29 (5,410)
<i>Unspecified</i>	16 (258)	16 (255)	13 (2,567)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation.

Men's post-release outcomes are shown in Table 5. STG affiliated men were most likely to have a suspension of release (42% STG compared to 38% matched and 30% general group), although the difference between the STG and matched group was smaller than compared to the general group. In addition, the STG group was suspended faster than the other groups (at 9 months versus 11 to 13 months, on average). Breaching conditions/preventing a breach of conditions were the most common reasons for suspensions, regardless of study group. However, the STG and matched groups were more likely to have a release suspension due to a failure to report (20% STG and 17% matched compared to 12% for the general population, see Table 5). A

slightly higher proportion of the STG and matched groups returned to custody (14% STG and 12% matched versus 9% general group); however, on average, the time to return period was about 11 months. Returns to custody due to new offending was comparable across all three groups; however, it is important to remember that a greater proportion of the STG and matched groups had already experienced a failed release as evidenced by the proportion on a second or subsequent term (results shown in Table 4).

Table 5

*Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 18,975)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Suspension of Release	42 (666)	38 (601)	30 (5,681)
Days to First Suspension <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	260 (550.8)	317 (743.7)	394 (901.8)
General Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach Terms of Release/Prevent Breach</i>	66 (442)	68 (406)	67 (3,815)
<i>Protect Society</i>	34 (224)	32 (195)	33 (1,861)
Specific Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach of Conditions</i>	33 (219)	35 (206)	38 (2,119)
<i>Fail to Report</i>	20 (132)	17 (99)	12 (663)
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i>	26 (175)	26 (157)	27 (1,533)
Any Return to Custody	14 (219)	12 (190)	9 (1,650)
Any New Offence	2 (34)	2 (38)	1 (211)
Days to Return <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	320 (334.8)	348 (270.5)	337 (355.3)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation.



## **Women's In-Custody Cohort**

### **Descriptive Characteristics**

Descriptive characteristics information (demographics, sentence and offence information, and criminogenic risk and need information) for the women's study groups is presented in Appendix C. As presented in Table C1, comparisons of the matching variables between the STG and matched groups versus the general women offender population showed unique differences. On average, women in the STG and matched comparison groups were younger than the general women offender population (approximately 30 versus 36 years). Also, a greater proportion of women in the STG and matched groups were in the Prairie or Pacific regions during the study period (44% and 29%), while in the general women offender population 36% were in the Prairies and 11% in the Pacific region (see Table C1). Examination of region of admission showed a greater proportion of STG women (71%) and those in the matched comparison group (60%) were admitted in the Prairie region compared to 41% of the general women's population. Overall, 90% of the STG and matched groups were Indigenous compared to 37% of the general women's population. Finally, a greater proportion of the general population group compared to the other two groups were serving less than four years (63% versus 51%).

Violent offending was comparable between the STG and matched comparison groups (68% and 67%) but was higher than women in the general population at 57%; women in the general population were more likely to be involved in drug-related offences (28% general group versus 19% matched and 22% STG, see Table C1). STG affiliated women were less likely to be serving their first federal sentence compared to the other two groups (76% STG versus 84% general group and 85% matched). Women affiliated with STGs were also more likely than the other two groups to be assessed as maximum security during the study period (37% STG versus 9% general group and 10% matched).

Table C2 provides the overview of results regarding criminogenic risk and need factors for the three women's groups. Among women in-custody, the three groups had similar static factor ratings during the study period (high - 35% to 39%), but the STG affiliated and matched group were more likely to have a high dynamic factor rating (68% STG and 65% matched versus 56% general group). STG affiliated women were more likely to have a high rating on the CRI (42% STG versus 16% general group and 24% matched) and a low reintegration potential (37% STG compared to 24% general group and 28% matched). Although comparable in their

engagement to follow their correctional plans (87% to 90% engaged), STG affiliated women were most likely to have identified needs with respect to associates, attitudes, and employment/education but they were comparable to the matched comparison group with respect to community functioning, marital/family, and personal/emotional orientation. Both of these groups were more likely to have identified needs in these domains compared to the general women's population (see Table C2). In addition, STG affiliated women were more likely than the other two groups to have a moderate to severe substance use issue (83% STG versus 66% general group and 73% matched), although the STG affiliated and matched groups had equal proportions with a substance abuse need identified during the offender intake assessment (95% compared to 79% for the general women's population).

Table C3 presents the results from the comparisons of specific need domain indicators across the in-custody study groups for women. STG affiliated women were more likely (greater than 5% difference) than the other two groups to: have family members involved in criminal activity; have criminal acquaintances; have criminal friends; reside in a high crime area; have a criminal partner; support instrumental violence; be impulsive; engage in thrill-seeking behaviour; be manipulative towards others; be aggressive towards others; and have a low frustration tolerance.

### **Institutional Experiences of Women Offenders**

Indicators of institutional experience included guilty disciplinary charges, institutional incidents, institutional transfers, and offender grievances, as shown in Table 6. Regardless of the indicator examined, STG affiliated women were more likely to have guilty disciplinary charges (83% STG versus 48% general group and 54% matched), institutional incidents (100% STG versus 70% general group and 80% matched), a history of institutional transfers<sup>31</sup> (61% STG versus 25% general group and 32% matched), and filed grievances (93% STG versus 63% matched and 70% general group). On average, they also had a greater number of each of these indicators (see Table 6). The three most common incidents, regardless of study group, were assault-related, behavioural, and contraband. With respect to grievances, conditions/routine, interaction issues, and visits/leisure were the most common categories across all three study groups.

---

<sup>31</sup> As most geographic regions only have one women offender institution, the majority of institutional transfers were inter-regional.

Table 6

*Comparison of Institutional Experience Indicators among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and the General Women Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Women Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 41)	General Population (N = 951)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Guilty Disciplinary Charges	83 (34)	54 (22)	48 (458)
<i>Average Number - Charges M (SD)</i>	19 (33.8)	4 (8.4)	4 (11.9)
Institutional Incidents	100 (41)	80 (33)	70 (663)
<i>Average Number of Incidents M (SD)</i>	27 (40.2)	8 (13.2)	7 (21.4)
<i>Assault related</i>	80 (33)	49 (20)	40 (382)
<i>Behavioural</i>	68 (28)	61 (25)	37 (350)
<i>Contraband</i>	76 (31)	54 (22)	37 (353)
Institutional Transfers*	61 (25)	32 (13)	25 (233)
<i>Average Number - Transfers M (SD)</i>	2.0 (4.4)	1 (1.9)	0.6 (2.0)
Grievances	93 (38)	63 (26)	70 (662)
<i>Average Number - Grievances M (SD)</i>	10 (24.9)	3 (4.5)	5 (9.8)
<i>Conditions/Routine</i>	68 (28)	49 (20)	46 (442)
<i>Interaction Issues</i>	51 (21)	32 (13)	36 (343)
<i>Visits/Leisure</i>	44 (18)	24 (10)	34 (327)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation. \*Institutional transfers include inter-regional, regional, section 81, emergency, and federal/provincial transfers.

Correctional program<sup>32</sup> information for women offenders is presented in Table 7. Almost all women offenders were referred to correctional programming (including engagement and maintenance; 92% to 100%). Examination of completion rates showed that STG affiliated women were more likely to complete any program, but were also more likely to have completed a moderate intensity or high intensity program (88% STG versus 67% general group and 71% matched, see Table 7). However, these analyses were not specific to the current correctional programs or restricted to examine whether the completion occurred prior to parole eligibility dates.

Table 7

*Comparison of Correctional Program Information among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and the General Women Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Women Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 41)	General Population (N = 951)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Assigned to Correctional Programming	100 (41)	98 (40)	92 (875)
<i>Among those assigned,</i>			
<i>Completed any programming</i>	100 (41)	93 (37)	95 (835)
<i>Completed Moderate or High</i>	88 (36)	73 (29)	73 (637)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. Moderate or high intensity programming would include the Women’s Correctional Program Model (WOCP) but may also include nationally recognized correctional programs that were replaced by WOCP. Due to the changes in correctional programming referral guidelines over the course of the study period which changed the eligibility for offenders to be assigned to correctional programming, completion proportions were calculated using the total number of offenders in each study group. Some of the changes in program referral guidelines may have resulted in offenders not being assigned to correctional programming during the study period but they may have been eligible under current guidelines.

<sup>32</sup> As this is an in-custody population, correctional programming information may include the Women Offender Correctional Program as well as previously offered nationally recognized correctional programs for women offenders.

As shown in Table C2, Appendix C, employment and education criminogenic needs were more prominent for STG affiliated offenders, therefore referral and participation in education and employment interventions was examined (see Table 8). A greater proportion of STG affiliated offenders were referred to education and employment interventions, particularly compared to the general in-custody women offender population (education: 88% STG group versus 78% general population; employment 98% STG group versus 84% general population). Referral rates for CORCAN specific employment programs showed that STG affiliated women offenders (24%) were less likely to be referred than the general population (32%).

Participation rates in education and employment were also examined and presented in Table 8. Among those referred to education, 81% of STG affiliated women participated compared to 76% of the matched group and 71% of the general women's population. Participation rates for employment programs were lower, with about two-thirds of women offenders participating in various employment opportunities, which was comparable across study groups. Participation was higher for non-CORCAN employment for women in the STG group and the general group (see Table 8). CORCAN employment was lowest for the STG group compared to the other two groups (40% versus 58% matched group and 54% general group). Finally, although referrals for vocational certification programs were low (11% to 17%), the majority of women offenders referred to these employment initiatives participated in these certification programs.

Table 8

*Comparison of Education and Employment Information among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and the General Women Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Women Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 951)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Referred for Education Programs	88 (36)	83 (34)	78 (740)
<i>Among those referred, participated in Education Programs</i>	81 (29)	76 (26)	71 (524)
Referred for Employment or Employability Programs	98 (40)	93 (38)	84 (796)
<i>Among those referred, participated in Employment</i>	65 (26)	63 (19)	67 (530)
Referred for CORCAN Employment*	24 (10)	29 (12)	32 (304)
<i>Among those referred, participated in CORCAN Employment</i>	40 (4)	58 (7)	54 (164)
Referred for non-CORCAN Employment	98 (40)	85 (35)	77 (730)
<i>Among those referred, participated in non-CORCAN Employment</i>	60 (24)	46 (16)	61 (447)
Referred for other vocational certification programs	17 (7)	17 (7)	11 (100)
<i>Among those referred, participated in other vocational certification programs</i>	100 (7)	86 (6)	99 (99)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. \*CORCAN is a special operating agency within CSC responsible for Employment and Employability Programs for offenders; they provide vocational training and certification in manufacturing, textiles, construction, agriculture, and other services (e.g. vehicle dismantling, industrial laundry operations, printing, electronic assembly and testing, and laser engraving).

## **Women's Community Cohort**

### **Descriptive Characteristics**

Table C1 in Appendix C also shows the demographic and sentence/offence information for the women's community groups. On average, women in the STG and matched comparison groups were younger than the general women offender population (35 to 37 years versus 41 years). Women in the STG and matched groups were more likely to be in the Prairie (52% and 54%) or Ontario regions (23% and 21%, respectively) during the study period while 30% of the general women offender population were in the Prairies and 27% in the Pacific region (see Table C1). Region of admission results were comparable to the in-custody cohort for women, with STG affiliated women most likely admitted to the Prairie region (62%) compared to the matched (54%) and general women offender population (32%) groups. Two-thirds (67%) of the STG and matched groups were Indigenous compared to 23% of the general women's population; over half (51%) of the general women's population were white. Finally, the STG group was least likely to be serving less than four years (63% STG versus 67% matched and 70% general group).

Violent offending varied across the three study groups (48% STG, 54% matched, and 40% general group); women in the general population were most likely to be involved in drug-related offences (38% general group versus 23% STG and 29% matched, see Table C1). STG affiliated women were more likely to be serving a second or subsequent sentence (first sentence: 71% STG versus 85% matched and 90% general group). Prior to release, women affiliated with STGs were also more likely than the other two groups to be assessed as maximum security (16% STG versus 2% for the matched and general women's groups).

Criminogenic risk and need information is presented in Table C2. The STG group had higher static risk compared to the two other groups (27% STG versus 23% matched and 10% general group). Meanwhile, the STG affiliated and matched group were comparable yet had higher dynamic need than the general population (33% each versus 24% general group). STG affiliated women were most likely to have a high rating on the CRI (31% STG versus 7% general group and 10% matched) and less likely to have a high motivation level (46% STG compared to 70% general group and 75% matched). The STG and matched groups were less likely to be engaged than the general women's population (88% STG and 90% matched compared to 94% general group). STG affiliated women were most likely to have identified needs with respect to associates and attitudes compared to the other study groups. With respect to community

functioning, employment/education, marital/family, and substance abuse (including assessed as a moderate to severe issue), the STG and matched comparison group were comparable but higher than the general women's population. The matched comparison group had the highest identified need for personal/emotional orientation (see Table C2).

Additional analyses related to specific need indicators showed that STG affiliated women were more likely to (see Table C3): have less than a high school education; have an unstable job history; to be unemployed at arrest; experience childhood abuse; witness family violence in childhood; have family members criminally active; perpetrate family violence; not have parental responsibilities; have financial problems; have used social assistance; have criminal acquaintances; have criminal friends; reside in a high crime area; have a criminal partner; support instrumental violence; have negative attitudes towards the criminal justice or correctional system; engage in thrill-seeking behaviour; or be aggressive towards others.

### **Release Characteristics and Outcomes for Women Offenders**

Table 9 shows the release characteristics of the women's community groups. Women in the general population were more likely to be on a discretionary release (63% day or full parole) than the STG affiliated or matched groups (40% each). A greater proportion of STG affiliated women were on their second or subsequent release (77% on their first term) compared to the matched group (81%) or general women's population (90%). STG affiliated women were most likely to have a residency condition on release (17% STG versus 6% general group and 13% matched) and were more likely to have four face-to-face contacts with their parole officers per month in the community (25% STG versus 14% matched and 15% general group, see Table 9).



Table 9

*Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and Non-STG General Women Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Women Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 1,693)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Release Type (matched)			
<i>Discretionary Release</i>	40 (21)	40 (21)	63 (899)
<i>Non-discretionary Release</i>	60 (31)	60 (31)	37 (630)
Released on First Term of Sentence	77 (40)	81 (42)	90 (1,520)
Residency Condition	17 (9)	13 (7)	6 (102)
Frequency of Contact			
<i>Four face-to-face contacts (Level A)</i>	25 (13)	14 (7)	15 (258)
<i>Two face-to-face contacts (Level B)</i>	44 (23)	44 (23)	36 (605)
<i>One face-to-face contacts per month (Level C) or less (Levels D, E, &amp; I)</i>	17 (9)	25 (13)	38 (639)
<i>Unspecified</i>	14 (7)	17 (9)	11 (191)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group.

Post-release outcomes information is presented in Table 10. STG affiliated women and those in the matched group were more likely to have a suspension of release (44% STG and 40% matched compared to 28% general group) with the matched group suspended faster than the other groups (at 7 months versus 10 to 13 months, on average). Breaching conditions/preventing a breach of conditions were the most common reasons for suspensions, regardless of study group. However, the STG group was more likely to have a release suspension due to a failure to report (32% STG versus 15% general group and 19% matched, see Table 10). Returns to custody occurred for 8% to 15% of the women in the study groups. The STG affiliated group was in the

community for a shorter period of time prior to the return (8 months versus 11 to 12 months, on average).

Table 10

*Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG Women Offenders, Matched Non-STG Women Offenders, and Non-STG General Women Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Women Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 1,693)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Suspension of Release	44 (23)	40 (21)	28 (466)
Days to First Suspension <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	395 (1127.0)	225 (229.6)	314 (718.7)
General Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach Terms of Release/Prevent Breach</i>	69 (16)	67 (14)	72 (334)
<i>Protect Society</i>	26 (6)	33 (7)	28 (129)
Specific Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach of Conditions</i>	41 (9)	29 (6)	40 (186)
<i>Fail to Report</i>	32 (7)	19 (*)	15 (69)
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i>	18 (*)	38 (8)	27 (123)
Any Return to Custody	10 (5)	15 (8)	8 (135)
Any New Offence	0 (0)	8 (*)	2 (30)
Days to Return <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	245 (88.0)	367 (216.8)	334 (221.6)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

## **Sub-analysis by Ethnocultural Groups for Men Offenders**

### **In-Custody Men's Cohort**

Examination of specific characteristics and indicators of institutional experience for Indigenous, White, Black, Asian, and all other ethnocultural men offenders<sup>33,34</sup> was completed (see Appendices D to H). This section will highlight the overall patterns of these findings.

#### ***Indigenous men***

Indigenous men offenders in-custody accounted for 47% of the STG<sup>35</sup> and matched comparison groups and 25% of the general offender population. Over three-quarters (77%) of the Indigenous offenders in the STG and matched groups were First Nations, followed by 23% who were Métis and 1% Inuit. For the general population, two-thirds (65%) were First Nations, 30% were Métis, and 5% Inuit. As shown in Table D1 in Appendix D, Indigenous men in the STG and matched groups were younger (on average, 32 to 33 years versus 38 years), more likely to be in the Prairie region (72% versus 46%) and less likely to be serving a sentence of less than 4 years (38% versus 47%) than the general Indigenous men's population during the study period. Although similar proportions had committed violent offences across the three groups (77% to 82%), the STG group was least likely to be serving their first federal sentence (56% STG compared to 63% general group and 74% matched) and were more likely to be in maximum security during the study period (31% STG versus 13% general group and 16% matched). Table D2 shows the criminogenic risk and need information. Overall, the STG group was higher static risk, dynamic need, CRI rating, and more likely to have a low reintegration potential and be identified as not engaged in their correctional plan compared to the other two groups. As with the broader in-custody cohort, Indigenous men affiliated with STGs were more likely than the other study groups to have identified needs with associates, attitudes, and employment/education. Table D3 and D4 shows the institutional experience indicators and correctional program participation of these three groups – the STG group was more likely to have guilty disciplinary charges, institutional incidents, positive urinalysis results, and to have filed grievances than the

---

<sup>33</sup> Presentation of results for the sub-analysis by ethnocultural group was based on the overall proportion of each ethnocultural group among STG affiliated offenders in the in-custody population.

<sup>34</sup> Due to the small number of STG affiliated women who were non-Indigenous ( $n = 4$  for the in-custody cohort and  $n = 17$  for the community cohort), sub-analyses by ethnocultural group for women were not completed.

<sup>35</sup> Indigenous men were affiliated with the following STGs: 44% street gangs, 44% Indigenous gangs, 6% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, 4% prison gangs, and 2% all other STGs.

other two groups (see Table D3) and was also more likely to have been assigned to a correctional program (Table D4). They were equally likely as the other two groups to have completed a moderate or high intensity program.

### ***White men***

White men offenders accounted for 23% of the STG<sup>36</sup> and matched groups compared to 51% of the general offender population in-custody. As shown in Table E1 of Appendix E, the three groups were comparable in age during the study period and a similar proportion was in the Quebec region (29% to 30%); however, those in the STG and matched groups were more likely to be in the Prairie (27% versus 20%) and Pacific (20% versus 15%) regions, but less likely to be in the Ontario (16% versus 24%) or Atlantic (7% versus 13%) regions. STG affiliated White men were less likely than the general population to be serving less than four years (27% versus 43%), to be on their first federal sentence (41% versus 62%), or to have committed violent offences (64% versus 70%). They were more likely to be maximum security (25% versus 11%). STG affiliated White men were more likely than the other groups to: have a high static or dynamic factor rating, have a high CRI, have a low reintegration potential, and not be engaged in their correctional plan. As already identified, STG affiliated White men were more likely to have identified needs with associates, attitudes, and employment/education (see Table E2). Institutional experience indicators, as shown in Table E3, indicate that once again, the STG affiliated groups were more likely than the other two groups to have problematic institutional behaviour. Correctional programming information shows similar patterns for program assignment and completion of moderate or high intensity programs (see Table E4).

### ***Black men***

Black offenders accounted for 13% of the STG<sup>37</sup> and matched groups compared to 6% of the general men offender's in-custody population. All results for this sub-population are presented in Appendix F. As shown in Table F1, about half (49%) of all three study groups were in the Ontario region. The STG and matched groups were less likely than Black offenders in the general population to be serving less than four years (23% versus 34%). All three groups had

---

<sup>36</sup> White men in-custody were affiliated with the following STGs: 39% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, 38% street gangs, 9% prison gangs, 6% Indigenous gangs, 5% white supremacist groups, and 8% all other STGs.

<sup>37</sup> Black men in-custody were affiliated with the following STGs: 95% street gangs, 3% prison gangs, and 2% all other STGs.

comparable proportions who committed violent offences (75% to 78%) but STG affiliated Black men were less likely to be serving their first federal sentence (65% STG versus 72% matched and 74% general group) and were more likely to be maximum security (28% STG versus 17% general group and 23% matched). Table F2 presents the criminogenic risk and need information for all Black men in the in-custody cohort. STG affiliated Black men were higher static risk and dynamic need, as well as more likely to have a high CRI (47% STG versus 31% general group and 37% matched) and a low reintegration potential (65% STG versus 47% general group and 55% matched). Similar to patterns of identified need areas for the total in-custody population and Indigenous sub-population; STG affiliated Black men were more likely to have associates, attitudes, and employment/education identified (see Table F2). Institutional experience information is displayed in Table F3, showing that a greater proportion of STG affiliated Black men had disciplinary charges, positive random urinalysis tests, institutional incidents, institutional transfers, and filed grievances. Table F4 shows that Black offenders in the STG and matched groups were more likely than those in the general population to be assigned to correctional programming; however, similar proportions of the three groups completed moderate or high intensity programming (52% to 57%).

### *Asian men*

A smaller proportion of offenders in the in-custody cohort were identified as Asian: 5% of the STG<sup>38</sup> and matched groups and 4% of the general in-custody population. All tables are in Appendix G. Asian men in the STG and matched comparison groups were younger (33 or 34 years versus 39 years) and more likely to be in the Pacific region (35% versus 23%). The STG and the matched group were less likely to be serving less than four years (27% versus 37%), while the STG group was least likely to be on their first federal sentence (70% STG versus 78% matched and 85% general group). Asian men in the general population were the least likely to be maximum security (9% general group versus 18% matched and 21% STG, see Table G1). STG affiliated Asian men were more likely to have a high CRI rating (32% STG versus 14% general group and 24% STG, see Table G2), as well as a higher static factor rating and to have a low reintegration potential. Associates, attitudes, and employment/education continue to be the most prominent criminogenic need areas for the STG group in this sub-population. Table G3 indicates

---

<sup>38</sup> Asian men in-custody were affiliated with the following STGs: 72% street gangs, 10% Asian gangs, 8% terrorist organizations, 5% prison gangs, 4% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, and 1% all other STGs.

that the STG group continues to be more likely to have the indicators of the institutional experiences; they were also more likely to be assigned to correctional programming and to complete moderate or high intensity programming (see Table G4).

### ***Men from all other ethnocultural groups***

All other ethnocultural groups represent 11% of the STG<sup>39</sup> and matched groups and 14% of the general in-custody population. Tables for this sub-population are in Appendix H. Demographic and sentence/offence information in Table H1 shows the same patterns of results as the other sub-population ethnocultural analysis (e.g., Indigenous, Black, White, & Asian). Consistently, STG affiliated offenders are higher risk and need (see Table H2), more likely to have problematic institutional behaviour (Table H3), and to be assigned to and complete correctional programming (Table H4).

### **Community Men's Cohort**

Examination of specific characteristics and indicators of post-release outcomes for Indigenous, White, Black, Asian, and all other ethnocultural men's groups was completed (see Appendices D to H) and the overall findings are provided.

### ***Indigenous men***

Indigenous men offenders in the community accounted for 25% of the STG<sup>40</sup> and matched comparison groups and 15% of the general offender population. Over two-thirds (68%) of the Indigenous offenders in the STG and matched groups were First Nations, while 32% were Métis. For the general population, less than two-thirds (63%) were First Nations, 32% were Métis, and 5% Inuit. Table D1 in Appendix D shows that Indigenous men in the STG and matched groups were younger (on average, 35 years versus 41 years), more likely to be in the Prairie region (66% versus 44%) and less likely to be serving a sentence of less than 4 years (48% STG and 49% matched versus 59% general group) than the general Indigenous men's population during the study period. Although similar proportions had committed violent offences across the three groups (70% to 71%), the STG group was least likely to be serving their first

---

<sup>39</sup> Men from the other ethnocultural group who were in-custody were affiliated with the following STGs: 66% street gangs, 17% Indigenous gangs, 7% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, 6% prison gangs, and 4% all other STGs.

<sup>40</sup> Indigenous men in the community were affiliated with the following STGs: 42% street gangs, 42% Indigenous gangs, 12% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, 4% all other STGs.

federal sentence (56% STG versus 71% each for the matched and general population groups) and were more likely to be in maximum security prior to release (16% STG versus 4% and 5% for the other two groups). Table D2 shows the criminogenic risk and need information. Overall, the STG group was higher static risk, dynamic need, CRI rating, and more likely to have a low reintegration potential. Indigenous men affiliated with STGs were more likely than the other study groups to have identified needs with associates, attitudes, and employment/education. As shown in Table D5, 86% of the STG and matched groups compared to 62% of the general community Indigenous population were on statutory release or a long-term supervision order. Residency conditions were most common for Indigenous offenders in the STG affiliated group (36% STG versus 23% general group and 25% matched), and they were more likely to have four face-to-face contacts per month with their parole officer (47% STG versus 32% general group and 39% matched). Examination of post-release outcomes in Table D6 shows that STG affiliated Indigenous offenders were more likely to be suspended or returned to custody, and both outcomes happened quicker for STG affiliated offenders than either the matched Indigenous comparison group or the general Indigenous community population.

### ***White men***

White men offenders accounted for 33% of the STG<sup>41</sup> and matched groups compared to 56% of the general community offender population. As shown in Table E1 of Appendix E, the three groups were comparable in age during the study period and the same proportion of each group was in the Quebec region (34%); however, those in the STG and matched groups were less likely to be in the Atlantic region (5% versus 14%). STG affiliated White men were less likely than the general population to be serving less than four years (33% versus 56%), to be on their first federal sentence (56% versus 76%), or to have committed violent offences (44% versus 60%). They were more likely to be maximum security at release (11% STG versus 3% general group and 5% matched). STG affiliated White men were more likely than the other groups to have a high CRI or have a low reintegration potential. As already identified, STG affiliated White men were more likely to have identified needs with associates, attitudes, and employment/education (see Table E2). Table E5 shows the post-release information for White

---

<sup>41</sup> White men in the community were affiliated with the following STGs: 56% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, 30% street gangs, 4% prison gangs, 4% white supremacist groups, 3% Indigenous gangs, and 4% all other STGs.

offenders. Non-discretionary releases (statutory releases or long-term supervision orders) were more common for the STG and matched groups compared to general community group (58% STG and 60% matched versus 46% general group). STG affiliated White men were more likely than the general population groups to have residency conditions (18% versus 12%). About one-quarter of all study groups had four face-to-face contacts per month with their parole officer (23% to 28%). Table E6 shows the findings for post-release outcomes. The proportion with release suspensions across the three groups were similar (29% to 34%), although highest in the matched group. The pattern was similar for returns to custody, although the STG affiliated group was suspended and returned to custody the fastest.

### ***Black men***

Black offenders accounted for 15% of the STG<sup>42</sup> and matched groups compared to 5% of the general men offender's community population. All results for this sub-population are presented in Appendix F. As shown in Table F1, almost two-thirds (62%) of the STG and matched groups were in the Ontario region compared to 54% of Black men in the community. The STG and matched groups were less likely than Black offenders in the general population to be serving less than four years (39% STG and 40% matched versus 52% general group). STG affiliated Black men were least likely to have committed a violent offence (49% STG versus 56% general group and 66% matched). Comparable proportions of the three groups were serving their first federal sentence (79% to 80%) and the STG group was slightly less likely to be released from minimum security (23% STG versus 30% matched and 45% general group). Table F2 presents the criminogenic risk and need information for all Black men in the community. STG affiliated Black men were higher static risk and dynamic need, and were more likely to have a high CRI (33% STG versus 18% general group and 22% matched) and a low reintegration potential (22% STG versus 11% general group and 13% matched). STG affiliated Black men were more likely to have associates, attitudes, and employment/education identified than those in the other two groups (see Table F2). Post-release information for Black offenders in the study is presented in Table F5. Non-discretionary releases (statutory releases or long-term supervision orders) were more common for the STG and matched groups compared to general community group (73% versus 53%). Comparing the STG and general population groups, residency

---

<sup>42</sup> Black men in the community were affiliated with the following STGs: 96% street gangs, 2% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, 2% all other STGs.



conditions were most common for Black offenders in the STG affiliated group (27% versus 15%) as was four face-to-face contacts per month with their parole officer (38% versus 25%). Table F6 shows the findings for post-release outcomes. STG affiliated Black men offenders were most likely to be suspended or returned to custody, although Black men in the matched comparison group were suspended and returned to custody faster than the STG affiliated group.

### ***Asian men***

A smaller proportion of offenders in the community cohort were identified as Asian: 7% of the STG<sup>43</sup> and matched groups and 5% of the general community population. All tables are in Appendix G. Asian men in the STG and matched comparison groups were more likely to be in the Pacific region (39% versus 23%). The STG and the matched group were less likely to be serving less than four years (29% STG and 33% matched versus 52% general group), while the STG group was least likely to be on their first federal sentence (75% STG versus 84% matched and 90% general group). Regardless of study group, smaller proportions of Asian men were considered high static risk or dynamic needs (see Table G2); associates, attitudes, and employment/education continue to be the most prominent criminogenic need areas for the STG group in this sub-population. Tables G5 and G6 shows post-release information. Over half (54%) of the STG and matched groups were on non-discretionary releases compared to one-third of Asian men in the community. Examination of post-release outcomes shows that Asian STG affiliated men were more likely than Asian men in the community population to have a release suspension (28% versus 17%), although the matched comparison group was suspended and returned to custody the fastest (see Table G6).

### ***Men from all other ethnocultural groups***

All other ethnocultural groups represent 20% of the STG<sup>44</sup> and matched groups and 19% of the general community population. Tables for this sub-population are in Appendix H. STG men compared to the general community population were less likely to be serving less than four years, to have committed a violent offence, or to be on their first federal sentence (see Table H1). STG affiliated offenders were more likely than the general community population to have a high

---

<sup>43</sup> Asian men in the community were affiliated with the following STGs: 58% street gangs, 22% Asian gangs, 9% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, 6% prison gangs, and 5% all other STGs.

<sup>44</sup> Men from other ethnocultural groups in the community were affiliated with the following STGs: 55% street gangs, 27% outlaw motorcycle gangs/traditional organized crime, 13% Indigenous gangs, and 5% all other STGs.

CRI (31% versus 16%) and a low reintegration potential (20% versus 11%), as shown in Table H2. Associates, attitudes, and employment/education continued to be the predominant needs among STG affiliated offenders. Post-release indicators in Table H5 shows that STG affiliated offenders are more likely than the general community population to be on non-discretionary release (78% versus 57%) or to have a residency condition (21% versus 13%). STG affiliated men were more likely to have a suspension or return to custody, but they were in the community longer than the other two groups before experiencing these outcomes (see Table H6).

## Discussion

The purpose of this report was to compare the characteristics and behaviours of STG affiliated offenders to a matched comparison group of non-affiliated offenders and to the general offender population, both in-custody and in the community. Comparisons across the study groups focused on demographics, sentence and offence information, and criminogenic risk and need information as well as indicators of in-custody institutional experiences and post-release outcomes. Findings for men and women offenders were examined separately, and additional sub-analyses for men across ethnocultural groups were undertaken.

For men offenders, comparing the STG affiliated and non-affiliated matched groups with the general men offender population showed unique differences, particularly with respect to the variables used to create the matched comparison group (ethnocultural group, gender, region under CSC jurisdiction during the study period, age categories, and sentence length). For instance, regardless of whether it was the in-custody or community cohorts, STG affiliated men offenders and the men's matched group were more likely to be younger, to be in the Prairie region at the time of the study, or to be Indigenous or Black, but were less likely to be serving a short sentence (less than four years). Similar findings were found for the women's STG affiliated and matched comparison groups in comparison to the general women offender population, although the proportion of Indigenous offenders was even higher for STG affiliated women and the matched comparison group (90% versus 37% for the general women's population).

Differences between all three men's groups were evident when examining sentence and offence information. Although about three-quarters of all men in custody had committed violent offences, the proportion of those in the matched group was slightly higher (79% versus 71% to 72%). Among the men's community population, this pattern was even more prominent, with about half of STG affiliated men in the community having committed violent offences compared to 58% for the general offender population and 64% of the non-STG affiliated comparison group. For both the men's in-custody and community groups, the differences in violent offending appears to be explained by the proportion of the matched and general population groups who committed sex related offences. For women offenders, among the in-custody study groups, STG affiliated women and the women in the matched comparison group were more likely to have committed violent offences than the general women offender population, while the findings for

women in the community were similar to the men's study groups; the women's matched comparison group had a higher proportion who committed violent offences (54% compared to 40% and 48%), which seemed to be attributed to the proportion of women in the matched group who committed robbery offences. Although the study groups were matched on sentence length information, there was still variability with respect to the nature of their offending. Regardless of study group (STG, matched, or general population) or gender (men or women), offenders in the STG affiliated group were more likely to be serving a second or subsequent federal sentence, indicating longer involvement in criminal activity and a more entrenched criminal lifestyle.

Examining indicators of criminogenic risk and need (e.g., static factor rating, dynamic factor rating, CRI) distinct differences across all three study groups were evident, regardless of whether the offenders were in-custody or in the community. For men, the STG affiliated group was rated as having a higher risk/need profile than the other two groups, as well as having a lower reintegration potential and less likely to be engaged in their correctional plan. A greater proportion of STG affiliated men were classified as maximum security during the study period or prior to release compared to the other two study groups. For women (in-custody and in the community), static risk ratings were similar across all study groups. The STG affiliated women's group had similar dynamic need ratings to the matched women's comparison group but higher dynamic need than the general women offender population. In addition, women's CRI ratings for the STG affiliated group compared to the other two groups showed similar patterns to the men, in that STG affiliated women were more likely to have a high CRI. As with the men's study groups, STG affiliated women were also more likely to be classified as maximum security during the study period or prior to release and to have a low reintegration potential, particularly among the in-custody population.

Further exploration of the need domain areas for the study groups indicated that STG affiliated offenders compared to the other two groups were more likely to have needs related to associates and attitudes, regardless of gender or custodial status (in-custody/community). An identified need for education/employment was more likely for both men and women STG affiliated offenders in custody and STG men offenders in the community than the two comparison groups. The need domain of associates (i.e. having social networks that support criminal behaviour and beliefs), is most prominent for STG affiliated offenders. Previous research has affirmed that having an identified need related to criminal associates is related to

returns to custody on release (Stewart, et al., 2017), although Stewart and colleagues did not specifically examine this association for STG affiliated versus non-affiliated offenders. Criminal associates has long been considered one of the central eight factors related to criminal risk and offending (Bonta & Andrews, 2016; Fortune & Heffernan, 2018). Wooditch and colleagues (2013) found that positive changes in offender social networks (e.g., reduced interactions with family engaged in criminal activity) reduced the likelihood of recidivism for their study sample. These findings suggest that decreasing the level of need related to associates for STG affiliated may enhance community reintegration. Future research may be able to explore whether STG affiliated offenders show reduced need in the associates domain over the course of their sentence and what factors may support that reduction, as well as determining the impact this has on community reintegration in Canada.

Understanding that STG affiliated offenders have unique criminogenic risk/need profiles compared to the broader offender population is an important finding, which validates the results of previous CSC-specific studies (Nafekh & Stys, 2004; Scott, 2012). However, neither past nor current research have explored whether there have been changes in the criminogenic risk/need profile of the STG affiliated offender population over time or at the individual STG affiliated offender level throughout the offender's sentence. As the proportion of STG affiliated offenders increases among correctional populations (e.g., 11% of federal men and 4% of federal women offenders were STG affiliated as of May 2020; Farrell MacDonald, 2022), future research comparing the risk/need profiles of the STG population over time would be beneficial, as would a cyclical updating of the prevalence of STG affiliated offenders in the federal offender population.

Findings for the in-custody populations concerning institutional experience indicators showed similar patterns for both men and women. Overall, STG affiliated offenders were more likely than the two comparison groups to have guilty disciplinary charges or institutional incidents, and for men to have positive urinalysis tests. Moreover, administrative impacts were also evident, with STG affiliated offenders more likely to have filed grievances than the comparison groups, and for STG affiliated women, to have a history of institutional transfers. Prior research has indicated that gang-affiliations were associated with institutional misconduct and that STG affiliated individuals were more likely to be involved in violent and/or drug related incidents (Cunningham & Sorensen, 2007; Gaes, et al., 2002; Griffin & Hepburn, 2006). Recent

CSC research showed that indicators of institutional experience varied across STG subgroup (Farrell MacDonald, Smeth, Cram, & Derkzen, in press) and across the involvement level of the offender (actively engaged versus inactive; Cram & Farrell MacDonald, in pressa; in pressb). Although beyond the scope of the current research, future research may explore the timing of these institutional indicators in relation to when offenders become STG affiliated (prior to or during their sentence) and explore whether there are differences across involvement level in the STG (actively engaged or inactive).

Descriptive information for correctional program assignment and completion were also examined as part of the institutional experience indicators. Although STG affiliated men offenders were more likely to be assigned to programming than the men's comparison groups, a comparable proportion of men offenders in the three study groups completed moderate or high intensity programming. For women, comparable proportions were assigned to correctional programming, with a higher proportion of STG affiliated women offenders completing moderate or high intensity programming. CSC's current model of programming had a staggered implementation period for men offenders from 2010 to 2017, while the current women's programming was implemented nationally in 2010. Past research has indicated a positive impact of these correctional programs on offender reintegration during release (CSC 2020; Derkzen, Harris, & Wardrop, 2017; Harris, Thompson, & Derkzen, 2015; Stewart & Wilton, 2014); however, the specific impact for STG affiliated offenders has not been examined. Prior research in CSC that specifically examined the impact of correctional programming for STG versus non-STG offenders showed positive results related to institutional misconduct and returns to custody (Di Placido et al., 2006); however, the correctional programming offered pre-dated the current correctional programming model offered by CSC and the findings were not generalizable to the broader CSC population as the programming occurred at a regional treatment centre (specializing in aiding offenders with mental health concerns). It is also important to note that in February 2018, CSC changed the program referral criteria for moderate and high intensity programming for both men and women (CSC, 2021a). It would be beneficial for future research to examine the impact of CSC's current correctional program interventions for STG affiliated offenders and focusing on correctional program participation using the program referral criteria established in 2018.

Education and employment referrals and participation information for all study groups

showed that STG affiliated offenders were most likely to be referred for education and employment initiatives, particularly compared to the general population. In addition, the STG group was least likely to be referred to CORCAN employment programs. However, among offenders referred to both education and employment, comparable proportions across all groups participated in these opportunities. Education participation was higher among all groups than employment participation (two-thirds participated in education compared to about one-quarter who participated in employment), yet it was beyond the scope of this research to examine the specific types of education or employment initiatives or to determine what barriers may have existed to participation. Additional research to examine the impact of education and employment initiatives, in addition to the impact of correctional programming, would be of interest due to the high need in education and employment areas among the STG population.

The community cohorts for men and women's populations showed a number of similarities. First, the STG and matched comparison groups were more likely than offenders in the general population to be released on a non-discretionary release (i.e., on statutory release or a long term supervision order). In addition, STG affiliated offenders, both men and women, were less likely to be on the first release of their sentence and more likely to have a residency condition during release. These three factors indicates a population that may need additional supports related to their reintegration. In a 2021 Senate Committee report, an Ontario initiative called *Break Away* was highlighted as a potential community based intervention for STG affiliated offenders on release (St. Leonard's Society, 2017); the Committee recommended that CSC explore funding this program nationally (Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights, 2021). In 2016-2017, the St. Leonard's Society in Ontario delivered this peer mentor program in three federal institutions for offenders serving life sentences who wished to disaffiliate from STGs (St. Leonard's Society, 2017), although empirical research examining the impact of this initiative has not been completed to date.

Consistent with previous CSC research (Nafekh & Stys, 2004; Stys & Ruddell, 2013), post-release outcomes examined in the study demonstrated that both men and women STG affiliated offenders were more likely to have poorer outcomes. For instance, STG affiliated offenders were more likely to have a suspension of their release, and although they had comparable rates of returns to custody (with or without an offence) to the comparison groups, STG affiliated offenders were in the community for shorter periods of time, on average, before

experiencing a release suspension or a return to custody. Recent CSC research has also found that there were differences with respect to post-release outcomes across STG type (Farrell MacDonald et al., in press) and by STG involvement status (Cram & Farrell MacDonald, in pressa; in pressb). Pyrooz and colleagues (2021) have also identified the importance in examining gang status (current versus former) to be an important predictor of overall recidivism, whereby current gang affiliated offenders were more likely to be reconvicted or reincarcerated compared to former gang affiliated and non-affiliated offenders. Recently, researchers have identified the importance of understanding the impacts of social groups and networks, such as STGs, on the reintegration of individual offenders and have highlighted additional challenges for this sub-population (e.g., conflicting norms between the STG and the broader society, the need to develop strong pro-social networks) related to long-term desistance from STG activities and crime (Pyrooz et al., 2021; Tamatea, 2018).

Sub-analysis findings across men's ethnocultural groups (Indigenous, White, Black, Asian, and all other ethnocultural groups) demonstrated similar data patterns to the broader study groups. STG affiliated offenders were more likely than either the matched ethnocultural comparison groups or the general ethnocultural sub-populations to be higher risk/need, to be classified as maximum security during the study period/prior to release, to have institutional charges or incidents, or to have release suspensions. However, it is also important to note that ethnocultural offenders were over-represented among STG affiliated offenders in this study, particularly for Indigenous offenders (47% of STG affiliated men in-custody and 90% of women offenders in-custody). Although this over-representation is evident in the broader Canadian population, with previous estimates that about one-quarter of gang affiliated Canadians were Black, about one-fifth were Indigenous, and that regional variation was evident in the ethnocultural group composition of STG affiliated Canadians (Centre for Public Safety & Criminal Justice Research, 2012; Hemmati, 2006). For instance, a greater proportion of South and East Asian Canadians were STG affiliated in British Columbia while a greater proportion of STG affiliated Canadians in Ontario and Nova Scotia were Black (Centre for Public Safety & Criminal Justice Research, 2012; Hemmati, 2006). The interplay of marginalization factors (e.g., colonialism, racism, and discrimination) as well as social history factors may need to be explored for ethnocultural offenders who are STG affiliated to understand why these offenders became affiliated and how best to support their disaffiliation, which would be particularly relevant for



Indigenous offenders. CSC's currently developing a national strategy for STG affiliated offenders, with supports and interventions for Indigenous offenders having a prominent focus. It is also important that any examination of intervention impacts would need to consider the role of cultural interventions and supports for these STG affiliated offenders. Although comprising a very small proportion of STG affiliated offenders and predominantly centralized in the Ontario region, Black men offenders accounted for 13% of in-custody and 15% of community STG affiliated men offenders; future research may want to monitor this sub-group within the STG affiliated population as CSC is in the process of developing a national Black Offender Strategy.

As with any study, there are certain limitations that need to be considered. First, due to the timing of the study (FY2014-2015 to FY2018-2019) and the complexity and fluidity of STGs, the findings of the study may not reflect the current STG population within CSC in 2022. This further emphasizes the importance of on-going, cyclical examination of the STG sub-population within CSC jurisdiction. Second, this is a cross-sectional study (reflective of a single point in time) and, therefore, inferences made related to the impact of interventions or changes over time should not be undertaken based on the current data. Finally, CSC is currently involved in reviewing *Commissioner's Directive 568-3* (CSC, 2016) related to the identification and management of STGs. If substantial changes are made to this directive related to the identification or definition of STG affiliated offenders, then the replicability of this research may be diminished.

## **Conclusions**

Overall, this study provides a comprehensive examination of STG affiliated offenders compared to both matched comparison groups and the general offender population for both men and women offenders. As evidenced by past and recent research, the STG sub-population has a unique criminogenic profile and presents distinct intervention and management needs compared to the broader federal population. Future research would further inform the Service's management and support of STG affiliated offenders. In particular, research undertaken on a cyclical basis to examine STG prevalence and changing criminogenic risk/need profiles as well as an examination of the impacts of CSC's correctional programs and interventions with this sub-population would be beneficial.

## References

- Alleyne, E., & Wood, J. L. (2010). Gang involvement: psychological and behavioral characteristics of gang members, peripheral youth, and nongang youth. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 36, 423-436.
- Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2016). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Routledge (6th ed.). Cincinnati, OH, US: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Blackwell, B., Payne, B., & Prevost, J. (2011). Measuring electronic monitoring tools: The influence of vendor type and vendor data, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36 (1), 17-28. Retrieved from: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12103-010-9100-4>
- California Department of Correction and Rehabilitation. (2019, November 8). *CDCR implementing its new gang management reforms*. News Releases. Retrieved from: <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/news/2012/11/08/cdcr-implementing-its-new-gang-management-reforms/>.
- Centre for Public Safety and Criminal Justice Research. (2012). *Youth gangs fact sheet*. Abbotsford, BC: Author. Retrieved from: <https://cjr.ufv.ca/youth-gangs-2/>
- Connecticut Department of Correction. (2000). Department of correction inmate classification. *OLR Research Report*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2000/rpt/2000-R-0257.htm>
- Connecticut Department of Correction. (2013). *Security risk groups*. Administrative Directive 6.14. Retrieved from: <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/DOC/Pdf/Ad/ad0614pdf.pdf?la=en>.
- Connecticut Department of Correction. (2020). *Security risk group/gang management unit*. Department of Correction. Retrieved from: <https://portal.ct.gov/DOC/Org/Security-Risk-Groups-Unit>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2016). *Commissioner's Directive 568-3: Identification and management of Security Threat Groups*. Retrieved from: <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/568-3-cd-eng.shtml#s2a>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2017a). *Commissioner's Directive 720: Education programs and services for inmates*. Retrieved from: <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/005006-0001-en.shtml>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2017b). *Commissioner's Directive 735: Employment and employability program*. Retrieved from: <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/735-cd-eng.shtml>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2019a). *Commissioner's Directive 715-1: Community supervision*. Retrieved from: <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/715-1-cd->

[en.shtml](#).

- Correctional Service of Canada. (2019b). *Correctional programs*. Retrieved from: <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/002/002-0001-en.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2020). *Evaluation report: Evaluation of correctional reintegration programs*. Retrieved from: [https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/005/009/005009-0003-en.shtml#\\_Toc46219257](https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/005/009/005009-0003-en.shtml#_Toc46219257)
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2021a). *Guidelines 726-2: National correctional program referral guidelines*. Retrieved from: <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/726-2-gl-en.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2021b). *Working with offenders*. Retrieved from: <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/offenders/index-en.shtml>
- Cram, S., & Farrell MacDonald, S. (in pressa). Examining involvement status of Security Threat Group affiliated men offenders (RIB 21-24). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Cram, S., & Farrell MacDonald, S. (in pressb). Federal women offenders' involvement in Security Threat Groups (STGs; RIB 21-23). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Criminal Sanctions Agency. (2017). *Exit programme helps prisoners to desist from organized crime*. Retrieved from <https://www.rikosseuraamus.fi/en/index/topical/pressreleasesandnews/Pressreleasesandnews2017/exitprogrammehelpsprisonerstodesistfromorganisedcrime.html>.
- Cunningham, M. D., & Sorensen, J. R. (2007). Predictive factors for violent misconduct in close custody. *The Prison Journal*, 87(2), 241-253. doi: [10.1177/0032885507303752](https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885507303752)
- Decker, S. H., Melde, C., Pyrooz, D. C. (2013). What do we know about gangs and gang members and where do we go from here? *Justice Quarterly*, 30(3), 369-402.
- Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services. (n.d.). *DPSCS involvement in gang identification and violence prevention efforts of Maryland*. Publications. Retrieved from: [https://dpscs.maryland.gov/publicinfo/publications/gang\\_task\\_force.shtml](https://dpscs.maryland.gov/publicinfo/publications/gang_task_force.shtml).
- Derkzen, D., Harris, A., & Wardrop, K. (2017). *Assessment of Aboriginal Women Offender Correctional Programming (AWOCP) outcomes (R-391)*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Di Placido, C., Simon, T. L., Witte, T. D., Gu, D., & Wong, S. C. (2006). Treatment of gang members can reduce recidivism and institutional misconduct. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30(1), 93-114. doi: [10.1007/s10979-006-9003-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9003-6).
- Farrell MacDonald, S. (2022). *Federal offenders affiliated with Security Threat Groups (STGs;*

RIB 20-09). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

- Farrell MacDonald, S., Smeth, A., Cram, S., & Derkzen, D. (in press). Comparing characteristics, institutional adjustment, and post-release outcomes of Security Threat Groups (STGs; R-451). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Fortune, C-A., & Heffernan, R. (2019). The psychology of criminal conduct: A consideration of strengths, weaknesses and future direction. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 25(6), 659-674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2018.1560445>.
- Fischer, D. R. (2002). *Arizona department of corrections: Security threat group (STG) program evaluation* (Final Report). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Gaes, G. G., Wallace, S., Gilman, E., Klein-Saffran, J., & Suppa, S. (2002). The influence of prison gang affiliation on violence and other prison misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 82(3), 359-385. doi: [10.1177/003288550208200304](https://doi.org/10.1177/003288550208200304)
- Gaseau, M. (2002). States that take a case by case approach to gang management. Retrieved from: <http://www.corrections.com/articles/9549-states-take-a-case-by-case-approach-to-gang-management>.
- Georgia Department of Corrections. (n.d.). *Security threat groups (gangs) unit*. Retrieved from: <http://www.dcor.state.ga.us/STG>.
- Government of South Africa. (2005, May 27). White paper on corrections in South Africa. *White Papers*. Retrieved from: [https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis\\_document/202001/whitepaperoncorrectionsinsouth-africa.pdf](https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/202001/whitepaperoncorrectionsinsouth-africa.pdf).
- Griffin, M., & Hepburn, J.R. (2006). The effect of gang affiliation on violent misconduct among inmates during the early years of confinement. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 33(4), 419-466. doi: [10.1177/0093854806288038](https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854806288038).
- Harris, A., Thompson, J., & Derkzen, D. (2015). *Assessment of Women Offender Correctional Programming (WOCP) outcomes* (R-374). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Hemmati, T. (2006). *The nature of Canadian urban gangs and their use of firearms: A review of the literature and police survey*. Ottawa, ON: Department of Justice.
- Idaho Department of Correction. (2012). *IMSI staff help inmates leave gangs*. Retrieved from: [https://www.idoc.idaho.gov/content/story/front\\_news/imsi\\_staff\\_help\\_inmates\\_leave\\_gangs](https://www.idoc.idaho.gov/content/story/front_news/imsi_staff_help_inmates_leave_gangs).
- Indiana Department of Correction. (2014). High risk offenders. *Policy and Administrative Procedures*. Retrieved from: <https://www.in.gov/idoc/files/02-03->

[115 High Risk Offenders 12-1-2014.pdf](#).

- Internal Affairs Division. (2010). Security threat group: Threat assessment. *Tennessee Department of Correction*. Retrieved from: [https://www.gangenforcement.com/uploads/2/9/4/1/29411337/stg\\_threat\\_assessment\\_tn\\_major\\_groups\\_apr\\_2010\\_les.pdf](https://www.gangenforcement.com/uploads/2/9/4/1/29411337/stg_threat_assessment_tn_major_groups_apr_2010_les.pdf).
- Kansas Department of Corrections. (2021). Policy memorandum. *Internal Management Policy & Procedure*. Retrieved from: <https://www.doc.ks.gov/kdoc-policies/AdultIMPP/chapter-12/12-136/view>.
- MacKenzie, A., & Johnson, S. L. (2003). *A profile of women gang members in Canada* (R-138). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Michel, S., & Stys, Y. (2015). *Criminal organizations: An examination of gang management practices inside Canadian institutions* (R-347). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Michigan Department of Corrections. (2015). *Policy Directive: Security threat groups*. Retrieved from: [https://www.michigan.gov/documents/corrections/04\\_04\\_113\\_482417\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/corrections/04_04_113_482417_7.pdf).
- Michigan Department of Corrections. (2021). *Policy Directive 04-04-113: Security Threat Groups*. Retrieved from: <https://www.michigan.gov/corrections/-/media/Project/Websites/corrections/Files/Policy-Directives/PDs-04-Institutional-Operations/PD-0404-Security-and-Transport/04-04-113-Security-Threat-Groups.pdf?rev=71449c344e2b4e6e996a8b9033a98713>.
- Ministry of the Solicitor General. (n.d.). *Guns, gangs and violence reduction strategy*. Policing. Retrieved from: [https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/police\\_serv/GunsandGangsInitiative/guns\\_and\\_gangs.html](https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/police_serv/GunsandGangsInitiative/guns_and_gangs.html).
- Minnesota Department of Corrections. (2019). Security threat groups 301.110. *Policies, Directives, Instructions Manual*. Retrieved from: [http://www.doc.state.mn.us/DocPolicy2/html/DPW\\_Display\\_TOC.asp?Opt=301.110.htm](http://www.doc.state.mn.us/DocPolicy2/html/DPW_Display_TOC.asp?Opt=301.110.htm)
- Mississippi Department of Corrections. (n.d.) *Corrections investigation division*. Divisions. Retrieved from: <https://www.mdoc.ms.gov/Divisions/Pages/Investigation-Division.aspx>.
- Motz, R., Labrecque, R. M., & Smith, P. (2021). Gang affiliation, restrictive housing, and institutional misconduct: Disciplinary segregation suppress or intensify gang member rule violations? *Crime and Justice*, 44(1), 49-65.
- Nafekh, M., & Stys, Y. (2004). *A profile and examination of gang affiliation within the federally sentenced offender population* (R-154). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

- New South Wales Department of Communities and Justice. (n.d.). *Security Threat Group – Intervention Program*. Programs and Services. Retrieved from: <https://www.correctiveservices.justice.nsw.gov.au/Pages/CorrectiveServices/programs/behaviour-management/security-threat-group-intervention-program.aspx>.
- New Zealand Ara Poutama Oatearoa. (2019). *Annual Report 2018/2019*. Annual Reports. Retrieved from: [https://www.corrections.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/38852/Annual\\_Report\\_2018\\_2019\\_Web\\_Version\\_Final.pdf](https://www.corrections.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/38852/Annual_Report_2018_2019_Web_Version_Final.pdf).
- New Zealand Ara Poutama Oatearoa. (2020). *2019/20 Annual report*. Department of Corrections. Retrieved from: [https://www.corrections.govt.nz/resources/strategic\\_reports/annual-reports/annual\\_report\\_2019\\_2020](https://www.corrections.govt.nz/resources/strategic_reports/annual-reports/annual_report_2019_2020).
- Nevada Department of Corrections. (2013). *Identification of inmates affiliated with security threat groups and disruptive groups (temporary)*. Administrative regulations 446. Retrieved from: [https://doc.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/docnv.gov/content/About/Administrative\\_Regulations/AR%20446%20-%20031913.pdf](https://doc.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/docnv.gov/content/About/Administrative_Regulations/AR%20446%20-%20031913.pdf).
- Nevett, J. (2020, March 12). How Europe deals with terror offenders when they are freed from jail. *BBC News*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-51560046>.
- Northcott, P. (2018). Just the facts - Gangs. *Gazette, Vol. 80(3)*. Retrieved from: <https://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/en/gazette/gangs>.
- Northcott, P. (2021). *Just the facts – Organized crime. Gazette, Latest stories*. Retrieved from: <https://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/en/gazette/just-the-facts-organized-crime>.
- Office of Inspector General. (2015). *Florida department of corrections*. Annual Report FY2014-2015. <http://www.dc.state.fl.us/ig/IGannual/igannual14-15.pdf>.
- Ohio Department of Rehabilitation & Correction. (2021). *Annual report 2021*. Annual Reports. Retrieved from: <https://drc.ohio.gov/Portals/0/ODRC%20Annual%20Report%202021.pdf>.
- Oklahoma Corrections. (2021). Security – 040119. *Policy Statements*. Retrieved from: <https://oklahoma.gov/content/dam/ok/en/doc/documents/policy/section-04/op040119.pdf>.
- Petersilia, J. (2006). *Understanding California Corrections: A policy research program report*. Berkeley, CA: California Policy Research Center.
- Pyrooz, D.C., Clark, K.J., Tostlebe, J.J., Decker, S.H., & Orrick, E. (2021). Gang affiliation and prisoner re-entry: Discrete-time variation in recidivism by current, former, and non-gang status. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 58(2), 192-234.

- Pyrooz, D.C., & Mitchell, M.M. (2018). The hardest time: Gang members in total institutions. In B.M. Huebner, & N.A. Frost (Eds.), *Handbook on the consequences of sentencing and punishment decisions* (pp.361-378) Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Pyrooz, D., & Mitchell, M. (2020). The use of restrictive housing on gang and non-gang affiliated inmates in U.S. prisons: Findings from a national survey of correctional agencies. *Justice Quarterly*, 37(4), 590-615.
- Radicalisation Awareness Network. (2017). Preventing radicalisation to terrorism and violent extremism. *Prison and Probation Interventions*. Retrieved from: [https://www.dbh-online.de/sites/default/files/prison-and-probation-interventions\\_en.pdf](https://www.dbh-online.de/sites/default/files/prison-and-probation-interventions_en.pdf).
- SAS Institute Inc. (2013). SAS/ACCESS® 9.4 Interface. Cary, NC: Author.
- Scott, T-L. (2012). *Women gang inmates* (R-272). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Security Magazine. (2020). *Delaware's department of corrections opens intelligence operations center*. Retrieved from <https://www.securitymagazine.com/articles/93344-delawares-department-of-corrections-opens-intelligence-operations-center>
- St. John, P. (2015). California agrees to move thousands of inmates out of solitary confinement. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-california-will-move-thousands-of-inmates-out-of-solitary-20150901-story.html>
- St. Leonard's Society. (2017). *Lifeline annual report 2016*. Retrieved from: <https://stleonards.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/PeerLife-2017.pdf>
- Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights. (2021). *Human rights of federally sentenced persons*. Retrieved from: <https://sencanada.ca/en/info-page/parl-43-2/ridr-federally-sentenced-persons/#collapse-thereport>.
- State of Alabama Department of Corrections. (2020). Procedures for inmate rule violations. *Administrative Regulation 403*. Retrieved from: <http://www.doc.state.al.us/docs/AdminRegs/ar403.pdf>.
- State of California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2018). Notice of change to regulations. *No. 18-01*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/regulations/wp-content/uploads/sites/171/2019/06/Proposed-Regulations-Noticed-to-the-Public-1-19-2018.pdf>.
- State of Connecticut Department of Correction (2013). Security risk groups. *Administrative Directive, 6.14*. Retrieved from: <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/DOC/Pdf/Ad/ad0614pdf.pdf?la=en>.
- State of Connecticut Department of Correction (2020). *Security risk group/Gang management unit*. Retrieved from: <https://portal.ct.gov/DOC/Org/Security-Risk-Groups-Unit>.

- State of Montana Department of Corrections. (2013). Security threat group and street gang identification and management. *Policy No. DOC 3.1.24*. Retrieved from: <https://cor.mt.gov/DataStatsContractsPoliciesProcedures/DataDocumentsandLinks/DOCPolicies/Chapter3/3.1.24-Security-Threat-Group-and-Street-Gang-Identification-and-Management.pdf>.
- State of Vermont Department of Corrections. (2017). Security threat groups. *Security and Supervision Directives #427*. Retrieved from: <https://doc.vermont.gov/sites/correct/files/documents/policy/correctional/427-security-threat-groups.pdf>.
- State of Washington Department of Corrections. (2008). Security threat group member validation and tracking DOC 400.310. *Policy*. Retrieved from: <https://doc.wa.gov/information/policies/files/400310.pdf>.
- Stewart, L.A., Wardrop, K., Wilton, G., Thompson, J., Derkzen, D., & Motiuk, L. (2017). *Reliability and validity of the dynamic factors identification and analysis-revised (R-395)*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Stewart, L. A., & Wilton, G. (2014). *Outcomes of federal Aboriginal offenders in correctional programs: Follow-up from the ICPM evaluation (R-328)*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Stys, Y., & Ruddell, R. (2013). Organized crime offenders in Canada: Risk, reform and recidivism. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 52(2), 75-97.  
doi:[10.1080/10509674.2012.734370](https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2012.734370)
- Sutton, T. (2017). The lives of female gang members: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 37, 142-152.
- Tamatea, A.J. (2018). "I know our people": Exploring community approaches to gang member reintegration approaches II. *Practice: The New Zealand Corrections Journal*, 6(1), 66-72. Retrieved from: [https://www.corrections.govt.nz/resources/research/journal/volume\\_6\\_issue\\_1\\_july\\_2018/i\\_know\\_our\\_people\\_exploring\\_community\\_approaches\\_to\\_gang\\_member\\_reintegration\\_ii](https://www.corrections.govt.nz/resources/research/journal/volume_6_issue_1_july_2018/i_know_our_people_exploring_community_approaches_to_gang_member_reintegration_ii)
- Winterdyk, J., & Ruddell, R. (2010). Managing prison gangs: Results from a survey of U.S. prison systems. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 730-736.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.047>.
- Wooditch, A., Tang, L., & Taxman, Fe. (2013). Which criminogenic need changes are most important in promoting desistance from crime and substance use? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(3). 276-299. doi: [10.1177/0093854813503543](https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813503543).
- Texas Department of Criminal Justice. (2007). *Security threat groups: On the inside*. Retrieved



from:

[https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/Security\\_Threat\\_Groups\\_GRAD\\_English.pdf](https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/Security_Threat_Groups_GRAD_English.pdf).

Texas Department of Criminal Justice. (2014). *Administrative segregation*. Huntsville, TX:

Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Retrieved from:

<https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/2089812/texas-adseg-programming.pdf>.

Texas Department of Corrections (2022). *Correctional Institutions Division: Security Threat Group management office*. Retrieved from:

[https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/divisions/cid/stgmo\\_GRAD.html](https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/divisions/cid/stgmo_GRAD.html)

Violence Prevention Network. (n.d.). *Deradicalisation*. Retrieved from: <https://violence-prevention-network.de/menschen/justizvollzug-bewaehrungshilfe/?lang=en>.

Yle Uutiset. (2019). *Finnish prisons to establish gang wings*. Retrieved from:

[https://yle.fi/uutiset/osasto/news/finnish\\_prisons\\_to\\_establish\\_gang\\_wings/11108050](https://yle.fi/uutiset/osasto/news/finnish_prisons_to_establish_gang_wings/11108050).

## Appendix A: Overview of Other Correctional Jurisdictions Information

Table A1

Breakdown of STG practices across other correctional jurisdictions

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
Gangs					
	<b>Alabama, United States (US)</b>	Sanctions against possession of STG paraphernalia, drawings, graffiti (i.e., those that include known STG symbols/signs).			State of Alabama Department of Corrections, 2020.
	<b>Alaska, US</b>	Offender identified as a leader, enforcer, or recruiter of STF is placed on restrictive housing status/administration segregation.			State of Alaska Dept. of Corrections, 2012.
	<b>Arizona, US</b>	STG members are transferred the Special Management Unit in a super-maximum facility. Members who refuse to disaffiliate go to a maximum custody level. STG members are ineligible for custody level reductions, restoration time credits, Parole Class III time, and emergency escorted leave.	Former STG members must complete conflict resolution training within one year of reducing custody level.	Renounced STG members must debrief correctional department staff regarding STG structure, activity, and membership. Validated by a Hearing committee. Offenders must debrief staff on their STG.	Arizona Department of Corrections, 2019; Arizona Department of Corrections, 2020; Fischer, 2002; Pyrooz & Mitchel, 2018.
	<b>California, US</b>	STG status identified at intake using STG Identification, Prevention, and Management strategy.	Step-Down program is a 24 month long initiative that includes enhanced programming and privileges, social interactions,	See Step-Down program; offenders must also debrief staff on their STG.	California Department of Correction and Rehabilitation, 2019;

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	California, US (continued)		graduated housing, individualized behaviour goals, with required and elective rehabilitative components. Monitoring of progress by institutional classification committee. Final step, offenders are placed in general population and monitored for 12 months for continued or emerging links to gangs.		Pyrooz & Mitchel, 2018.
	Connecticut, US	<p>Security Risk Group (SRG)/Gang management unit collects, evaluates, and disseminates security-related gang intelligence linked to SRGs amongst the offender population. The unit works with local law enforcement, state police, and federal authorities. Offenders' SRG membership is assessed through a point system, where activities are assigned a point value. After reaching specific threshold, offender is reviewed for designation as a SRG Member and enter into the appropriate phase of the SRG Member program.</p> <p>Once classified as a member of an SRG, a review is conducted on the offender every 6 months to determine if the classification is still necessary.</p>	As part of the SRG Member Phase Program, identified SRG members, after successful completion of a structured 5 phase program, may be reintegrated into General Population.	Offenders must also debrief staff on their STG.	<p>Connecticut Department of Correction, n.d.;</p> <p>Connecticut Department of Correction, 2000;</p> <p>Connecticut Department of Correction, 2013;</p> <p>Pyrooz &amp; Mitchel, 2018.</p>

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>Connecticut, US (continued)</b>	<p>Offenders can be considered for renunciation of the SRG status after a minimum of 9 months with the completion of required programs. Offenders can also appeal the classification decision. SRG members are classified as level 3 or higher. If the facility does not have this unit, they are placed on restrictive status and arrange a transfer to a facility with an SRG unit.</p>			
	<b>Delaware, US</b>	<p>Intelligence Operations Center (IOC) consists of 12 employees who collect and analyze information regarding offenders' gang-related affiliations and activities. Information is used for housing, identifying programming needs, investigations, and shared with local law enforcement agencies. The IOC operates outside of the institutions.</p>			Security Magazine, 2020.
	<b>Florida, US</b>	<p>The Inspector General's Security Threat Intelligence Unit collects, analyzes, and distributes intelligence concerning gang activity. Information is used for decisions on housing and is shared with local, state and federal law enforcement.</p>			<p>Offenders must also debrief staff on their STG.</p> <p>Office of Inspector General, 2015; Pyrooz &amp; Mitchel, 2018.</p>

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>Georgia, US</b>	The STG (Gangs) Unit maintains and supervises the department's STG program and coordinating the sharing of STG related intelligence.			Georgia Department of Corrections, n.d.
	<b>Idaho, US</b>		A 24-week step-down program at the Idaho Maximum Security Institution. Offenders must renounce gang affiliation to participate. After being approved for the program, the offender is moved to a cell with another step down program member.		Idaho Department of Corrections, 2012.
	<b>Illinois, US</b>			Offenders are expected to debrief staff on their STG.	Pyrooz & Mitchel, 2018.
	<b>Indiana, US</b>	If the offender is considered as a primary figure (i.e. high ranking or highly influential), they are classified by the STG coordinator as a high-risk offender.  The STG coordinator monitors relationships between identified members, organization of housing assignments, relationship between drug confiscation and the STG members, recording what was found in cell searches of identified members (i.e. hit lists, suspicious mail, debtors list),		Offenders are expected to debrief staff on their STG	Indiana Department of Correction, 2014; Pyrooz & Mitchel, 2018.

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>Indiana, US (continued)</b>	<p>monitoring of visitors, cross-visiting of offenders from other facilities, and monitoring telephone calls.</p> <p>If the offender's behaviour changes for a period of 6 months they may be removed from the high-risk offender list with justification provided by the STG coordinator</p>			
	<b>Kansas, US</b>	<p>Security Management Unit is for STG members who are experiencing STG related behavior problems, as documented by disciplinary reports, staff reports, or EAI reports regarding activities.</p>	<p>The Special Management Transition Program lasts a minimum of 12 months and consists of assignments and activities designed to transition STG offenders back into the general prison population. Progress through the stages is based on the offender meeting specific goals as approved by the Program Management Committee.</p>		<p>Kansas Department of Corrections, 2021.</p>
	<b>Maryland, US</b>	<p>Intelligence Coordinating Unit improved information sharing between local law enforcement and other stakeholders concerning gangs and gang-related activities.</p>		<p>Offenders are expected to debrief staff on their STG.</p>	<p>Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, n.d; Pyrooz &amp; Mitchel, 2018.</p>

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>Michigan, US</b>	When offenders are managed within the institution, they are designated as either STG I or STG II. STG I is an offender verified as STG-affiliated through intelligence, information and/or activity. STG II are STG-affiliated offenders who pose a greater threat to safety and security, by holding a position of authority, enforcer or recruiter. There are different security and management implications depending on the designation. Offenders can appeal the designation.			Michigan Department of Corrections, 2015.
	<b>Minnesota, US</b>	Suspected and verified STG members are identified and monitored in order to suppress activities and influence of STGs. Sanctions against possession of STG paraphernalia, drawings, graffiti (i.e., those that include known STG symbols/signs).			Minnesota Department of Corrections, 2019.
	<b>Mississippi, US</b>	Through the Security Threat Group Management Unit (STGMU), Security Threat Group Coordinators identify, validate, and constantly monitor/track offenders involved in gang activities and	The STGMU aims to reduce gang activity and assaults. The ultimate goal of this program is for the offender to disaffiliate. Programs are available to assist the offender to achieving their goal.	Offenders are expected to debrief staff on their STG.	Mississippi Department of Corrections, n.d; Pyrooz & Mitchel, 2018.

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>Mississippi, US (continued)</b>	pose a threat to the safety and security of the institution and other offenders. Information is used for decisions on housing placements and shared with other law enforcement agencies.			
	<b>Montana, US</b>	At intake, offenders are assessed for indications of STG affiliation (e.g., tattoos, alias, region they are from). STG coordinators and managers identify, validate, and monitor STG members. Information is used for housing and classification decisions.			State of Montana Department of Corrections, 2013.
	<b>Nevada, US</b>	Staff identify and validate suspected STG affiliates. STG status is advisory, it does not require specific actions other than increase security awareness.			Nevada Department of Corrections, 2013.
	<b>Ohio, US</b>	STG affiliated offenders are automatically classified and housed in Level 3. Identification of STG status may be based on STG paraphernalia, attempts to recruit or intimidate, and/or convicted of gang-related offences,			Ohio Department of Rehabilitation & Corrections, 2021.



STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>Oklahoma, US</b>	Office of the Inspector General Security Threats Intelligence division collect and analyze information, and identify STGs and members.			Oklahoma Corrections, 2021.
	<b>Tennessee, US</b>	A 10-point confirmation system is used to determine STG status based on self-admission, STG paraphernalia, tattoos, etc.			Internal Affairs Division, 2010.
	<b>Texas, US</b>	The Security Threat Group Management Office is responsible for identifying, monitoring, and managing STG affiliates who may pose a threat to the safety and security of the staff, general public and other offenders.	Offender must inform a STG officer, in written form, that they want to renounce their statutes as a STG member. In order to participate in the Gang Renouncement and Disassociation Program, offenders must meet the eligibility criteria.	See GRAD program.	Texas Department of Criminal Justice, 2007. Texas Department of Criminal Justice, n.d.
	<b>Vermont, US</b>	Identifies and monitors STG members to prevent them from engaging in gang-related behaviours and activities.		STG members who wish to disaffiliate are supported by Department of Corrections (not specified how).	State of Vermont Department of Corrections, 2017.
	<b>Washington State, US</b>	Headquarters Security Threat Group Coordinator maintain a centralized STG database. Offenders are assessed as STG affiliated based on specific criteria.		Offenders who wish to disaffiliate must submit a request and participate in debriefing process. STG coordinator is responsible for conducting the debrief.	State of Washington Department of Correction, 2008.
	<b>Wyoming, US</b>			Offenders are expected to debrief staff on their STG.	Pyrooz & Mitchel, 2018.

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>Finland</b>	Gang members segregated onto specialized units or 'gang wings'.	The Exit Programme is aimed to assist offenders in gangs or criminal organizations to desist from crime and leave the gang.	See Exit Programme.	Criminal Sanctions Agency, 2017; Yle Uutiset, 2019.
	<b>South Africa</b>	In 2005, introduced Unit Management, which is not specific to gang affiliates or associates, but entails dividing the prison population into smaller, more manageable groups – this also allows for increased direct supervision.			Government of South Africa, 2005.
	<b>New South Wales, Australia</b>		Institutional Violence Intervention Unit (IVIU) is a 22-bed unit within Lithgow maximum-security institution, includes programming to target STG offenders specific needs and risk factors. The ultimate goal is to reintegrate the offender into the general prison population.		New South Wales Department of Communities and Justice, n.d.
	<b>New Zealand</b>	Individualized gang management plans at men's prisons, which take in account the unique gang-related risks at each institution and how they will be addressed by looking at gang membership and composition of prison population.	Indicates that there are programmes, but unclear what they entail.	Offer tattoo removal program. Gang-affiliated offenders are actively encouraged to disaffiliate by staff.	New Zealand Ara Poutama Oatearoa, 2019. New Zealand Ara Poutama Oatearoa, 2020.

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>New Zealand (continued)</b>	Gang-related paraphernalia, insignia and colours are banned and offenders are separated who are known to engage in such activity.			
	<b>Ontario, Canada</b>	Website mentions that there is a ‘Guns and Gangs’ unit that they fund, but policies and procedures are unclear.			Ministry of the Solicitor General, n.d.
<b>Radicalized offenders</b>					
	<b>New South Wales (NSW), AU</b>	<p>NSW has refurbished the Goulburn Correctional Centre to include two new high-security centres to deal with violent extremist and terrorist offenders.</p> <p>A dedicated security team gathers intelligence on radicalized offenders by working with NSW police force and other intelligence organizations within and outside of Australia.</p> <p>A specialized unit has been formed that deals with radicalized offenders that have been released into the community but subject to long-term supervision order under the <i>Terrorist Act 2017</i>.</p>	Although there is an indication that there is programming in place to encourage deradicalization, but there is not specifics about what it entails.		NSW Department of Communities and Justice, 2019.

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
	<b>France</b>	<p>If possible, radicalized offenders are moved to a specific wing within the institution and segregated from the rest of the population to prevent the radicalization of other offenders. These wings are high-security with staff that are trained to deal with radicalized offenders.</p> <p>There are four deradicalization centres in France.</p>		<p>Social workers work with the offenders to attempt to work on the deradicalization process.</p> <p>The deradicalization centres are staffed by psychologists, spiritual advisors (i.e. Imams) and are under the supervision of tutors.</p>	Nevett, 2020.
	<b>Netherlands</b>		<p>The Dutch method of preventing terrorism and countering extremism has just been increasing the capabilities of the probation service.</p>	<p>Main tasks involve promoting behavioural change and start the process of reintegration into society.</p> <p>Probation officers are internationally trained on deradicalization processes and only trained probation officers to supervise radicalized offenders.</p>	<p>Nevett, 2020.</p> <p>Radicalisation Awareness Network, 2017.</p>
	<b>Germany</b>			<p>Germany is working with a civil society group to improve deradicalization programs within its correctional system.</p>	Violence Prevention Network, n.d.

STG Type	Jurisdiction	Category of Practices			Reference
		Management	Program/Intervention	Disaffiliation	
<b>Other jurisdictions examined but no information was available</b>					
<b>Canada:</b> Alberta, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Nunavut, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, and Yukon.					
<b>Europe:</b> England and Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Sweden, Norway					
<b>Australia:</b> Northern Territory, Queensland, Tasmania, South Australia, Victoria, and Western Territory					
<b>United States:</b> Remaining 25 states.					

## Appendix B: Descriptive Characteristics for Men Offenders

Table B1

Demographics, Sentence, and Offence Information comparisons between STG men offenders, matched non-STG men offenders, and general non-STG men offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 15,701)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 18,975)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
Average Age at Study <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	34 (9.6)	35 (10.5)	40 (13.2)	38 (11.8)	38 (11.9)	43 (14.5)
Median Age at Study (matched)	32	32	38	35	36	41
Region at Study (matched)						
<i>Atlantic</i>	4 (104)	4 (104)	10 (1,602)	3 (45)	3 (45)	11 (2,192)
<i>Quebec</i>	15 (346)	15 (346)	22 (3,473)	22 (353)	22 (353)	27 (5,050)
<i>Ontario</i>	17 (398)	17 (398)	26 (4,119)	28 (453)	28 (453)	25 (4,705)
<i>Prairies</i>	47 (1,081)	47 (1,081)	27 (4,221)	30 (475)	30 (475)	24 (4,523)
<i>Pacific</i>	16 (370)	16 (370)	15 (2,286)	17 (264)	17 (264)	13 (2,506)
Ethnocultural Group (matched)						
<i>Indigenous</i>	47 (1,085)	47 (1,085)	25 (3,881)	25 (398)	25 (398)	15 (2,822)
<i>White</i>	23 (536)	23 (536)	51 (7,979)	33 (527)	33 (527)	56 (10,567)
<i>Black</i>	13 (299)	13 (299)	6 (1,011)	15 (237)	15 (237)	5 (965)
<i>Asian</i>	5 (116)	5 (116)	4 (629)	7 (109)	7 (109)	5 (1,052)
<i>All other ethnocultural groups</i>	11 (263)	11 (263)	14 (2,201)	20 (319)	20 (319)	19 (3,570)

Indicator	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 15,701)	STG Offenders (N = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 1,590)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 18,975)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Average Determinate Sentence Length <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> ) (matched)	6 (4.0)	5 (4.2)	4 (4.0)	5 (3.8)	5 (4.0)	4 (3.7)
Sentence Length – Categories						
<i>Less than 4 years</i>	34 (783)	34 (789)	46 (7,154)	41 (658)	41 (644)	59 (11,281)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	37 (850)	37 (856)	28 (4,409)	45 (715)	46 (740)	27 (5,036)
<i>10 years or more/ Indeterminate</i>	29 (666)	29 (654)	26 (4,138)	14 (217)	13 (206)	14 (2,659)
Region at Admission						
<i>Atlantic</i>	3 (76)	4 (97)	10 (1,534)	3 (44)	3 (54)	12 (2,249)
<i>Quebec</i>	13 (288)	13 (300)	20 (3,226)	22 (354)	22 (348)	26 (4,969)
<i>Ontario</i>	19 (448)	22 (498)	29 (4,605)	30 (470)	30 (474)	25 (4,838)
<i>Prairies</i>	56 (1,284)	51 (1,173)	31 (4,804)	35 (559)	33 (529)	27 (5,038)
<i>Pacific</i>	9 (203)	10 (230)	10 (1,510)	10 (163)	12 (185)	10 (1,878)
Offence Type – Most Serious Offence (MSO)						
<i>Homicide Related</i>	27 (603)	26 (599)	22 (3,465)	13 (205)	13 (207)	14 (2,645)
<i>Sex Related</i>	2 (49)	15 (331)	17 (2,694)	2 (24)	16 (251)	18 (3,406)
<i>Robbery</i>	16 (368)	16 (365)	14 (2,124)	13 (201)	17 (261)	11 (2,024)
<i>Drug Related</i>	14 (318)	11 (251)	14 (2,245)	32 (508)	21 (341)	26 (4,960)
<i>Assault</i>	20 (449)	14 (323)	12 (1,931)	14 (227)	11 (176)	9 (1,722)
<i>Other Violent</i>	8 (190)	7 (162)	6 (974)	8 (135)	8 (128)	7 (1,316)
<i>Property</i>	5 (114)	6 (136)	8 (1,284)	5 (80)	7 (10)	9 (1,661)

Indicator	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 15,701)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 18,975)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
<i>Other Non-Violent</i>	8 (178)	4 (98)	5 (788)	13 (210)	7 (114)	6 (1,228)
Violent Offence – MSO	72 (1,658)	79 (1,778)	71 (11,163)	50 (792)	64 (1,019)	58 (11,063)
First Federal Sentence	56 (1,293)	73 (1,671)	66 (10,406)	64 (1,014)	76 (1,211)	78 (14,730)
First Term of Sentence	75 (1,715)	78 (1,787)	79 (12,406)	76 (1,202)	79 (1,250)	85 (16,222)
Offender Security Level at Snapshot						
<i>Minimum</i>	7 (172)	16 (362)	19 (2,976)	33 (533)	45 (711)	52 (9,866)
<i>Medium</i>	60 (1,383)	61 (1,415)	62 (9,689)	53 (834)	47 (749)	38 (7,161)
<i>Maximum</i>	29 (660)	17 (383)	12 (1,904)	12 (195)	6 (89)	3 (597)
<i>Not rated</i>	4 (84)	6 (139)	7 (1,132)	2 (27)	3 (41)	7 (1,352)
Offender Security Level at Admission						
<i>Minimum</i>	3 (63)	10 (238)	16 (2,529)	13 (215)	25 (390)	37 (7,009)
<i>Medium</i>	62 (1,435)	65 (1,488)	62 (9,800)	73 (1,159)	66 (1,056)	52 (9,902)
<i>Maximum/SHU</i>	35 (799)	25 (570)	21 (3,327)	13 (203)	7 (111)	5 (882)
<i>Not rated</i>	0.1 (*)	0.1 (*)	0.3 (45)	1 (13)	2 (33)	6 (1,182)
Marital Status						
<i>Common-law/Married</i>	43 (984)	31 (720)	30 (4,677)	51 (815)	40 (636)	38 (7,266)
<i>Single</i>	47 (1,085)	54 (1,249)	50 (7,895)	37 (595)	45 (722)	44 (8,343)
<i>Divorced/Separated/Widowed</i>	2 (45)	5 (107)	8 (1,257)	4 (68)	6 (102)	10 (1,910)
<i>Not specified</i>	8 (185)	10 (223)	12 (1,872)	7 (112)	8 (130)	8 (1,456)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.



Table B2

Criminogenic Risk and Need Information comparisons between STG men offenders, matched non-STG men offenders, and general non-STG men offender population – In Custody and Community cohorts

Indicators	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 15,701)	STG Offenders (N = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 1,590)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 18,975)
% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
<b>Substance Use Severity (CASA)</b>						
<i>None</i>	13 (305)	12 (277)	14 (2,135)	27 (427)	21 (339)	20 (3,850)
<i>Low</i>	27 (624)	23 (537)	24 (3,806)	32 (507)	29 (458)	27 (5,190)
<i>Moderate</i>	13 (309)	14 (313)	12 (1,880)	10 (159)	11 (174)	10 (1,910)
<i>Substantial to Severe</i>	27 (632)	31 (708)	25 (3,881)	16 (254)	23 (365)	16 (3,058)
<i>Not Rated</i>	19 (429)	20 (464)	25 (3,999)	15 (243)	16 (254)	26 (4,967)
<b>Static Factor Rating - Intake</b>						
<i>Low</i>	3 (60)	5 (111)	6 (865)	9 (138)	12 (195)	19 (3,666)
<i>Moderate</i>	26 (597)	31 (717)	30 (4,725)	41 (649)	42 (671)	42 (7,912)
<i>High</i>	71 (1,640)	64 (1,469)	64 (10,084)	50 (803)	46 (724)	39 (7,394)
<b>Static Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low</i>	2 (54)	4 (92)	5 (779)	20 (310)	24 (379)	33 (6,324)
<i>Moderate</i>	26 (596)	32 (711)	31 (4,619)	44 (699)	45 (719)	42 (7,906)
<i>High</i>	71 (1,625)	64 (1,409)	64 (9,635)	37 (581)	31 (492)	25 (581)
<b>Dynamic Factor Rating – Intake</b>						
<i>Low</i>	1 (19)	1 (26)	2 (374)	5 (82)	8 (134)	13 (2,388)
<i>Moderate</i>	14 (330)	22 (501)	23 (3,656)	29 (461)	37 (584)	39 (7,367)

Indicators	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 2,299)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 15,701)	STG Offenders (N = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 1,590)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 18,975)
% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
<i>High</i>	85 (1,948)	77 (1,770)	74 (11,643)	66 (1,047)	55 (872)	48 (9,217)
Dynamic Factor Rating – Study						
<i>Low</i>	1 (29)	2 (42)	3 (417)	21 (333)	23 (370)	31 (5,841)
<i>Moderate</i>	22 (509)	31 (695)	31 (4,668)	41 (645)	44 (694)	40 (7,677)
<i>High</i>	76 (1,736)	67 (1,473)	66 (9,930)	38 (612)	33 (526)	29 (5,457)
Criminal Risk Index (CRI)						
<i>Low (1-7)</i>	8 (194)	18 (420)	20 (3,081)	16 (251)	27 (428)	26 (4,905)
<i>Moderate (8-17)</i>	32 (728)	38 (863)	38 (6,000)	38 (599)	36 (577)	35 (6,556)
<i>High (18+)</i>	57 (1,302)	40 (930)	35 (5,541)	37 (587)	26 (409)	17 (3,298)
<i>No Rating/COIA</i>	3 (75)	4 (86)	7 (1,079)	10 (153)	11 (176)	22 (4,215)
Reintegration Potential – Study						
<i>Low</i>	62 (1,409)	48 (1,061)	45 (6,783)	24 (377)	14 (231)	12 (2,268)
<i>Moderate</i>	35 (788)	43 (939)	43 (6,371)	51 (812)	51 (804)	42 (7,920)
<i>High</i>	3 (77)	9 (209)	12 (1,834)	25 (401)	35 (555)	46 (8,787)
Responsivity	22 (497)	26 (592)	23 (3,557)	12 (197)	16 (255)	16 (2,969)
Engagement	60 (1,383)	72 (1,660)	72 (11,224)	75 (1,192)	80 (1,272)	84 (15,831)
Motivation Level - Study						
<i>Low</i>	25 (573)	17 (370)	20 (2,925)	12 (191)	9 (143)	7 (1,293)
<i>Moderate</i>	65 (1,468)	66 (1,454)	63 (9,412)	50 (801)	47 (743)	43 (8,132)
<i>High</i>	10 (232)	17 (385)	18 (2,646)	38 (598)	44 (704)	50 (9,550)

Indicators	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 15,701)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 18,975)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
<b>Accountability Level</b>						
<i>Low</i>	34 (705)	26 (532)	26 (3,564)	22 (288)	18 (247)	15 (2,438)
<i>Moderate</i>	62 (1,299)	67 (1,373)	65 (8,991)	67 (898)	65 (865)	61 (9,977)
<i>High</i>	4 (88)	7 (144)	9 (1,263)	11 (154)	17 (228)	24 (4,012)
<b>DFIA-R Domain Areas: Moderate to High Need</b>						
<i>Associates</i>	92 (1,904)	71 (1,469)	64 (8,718)	92 (1,259)	65 (906)	56 (9,110)
<i>Attitudes</i>	91 (1,875)	77 (1,602)	77 (10,425)	90 (1,229)	72 (1,004)	64 (10,327)
<i>Community Functioning</i>	36 (740)	38 (797)	31 (4,277)	25 (338)	24 (334)	18 (2,914)
<i>Employment/Education</i>	78 (1,614)	71 (1,485)	58 (7,937)	66 (900)	55 (774)	43 (6,922)
<i>Marital/Family</i>	35 (723)	44 (922)	41 (5,576)	21 (294)	31 (439)	27 (4,405)
<i>Personal/Emotional Orientation</i>	82 (1,681)	88 (1,840)	85 (11,580)	61 (836)	74 (1,033)	68 (10,971)
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	65 (1,340)	74 (1,543)	70 (9,507)	45 (615)	58 (807)	54 (8,684)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table B3

Additional OIA indicators compared across STG men offenders, matched non-STG men offenders, and general non-STG men offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 15,701)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 18,976)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
<b>Employment/Education</b>						
Education level less than grade 10	51 (1,179)	48 (1,106)	42 (6,646)	45 (716)	37 (590)	32 (5,987)
Education level less than high school	73 (1,678)	70 (1,617)	62 (9,707)	65 (1,037)	58 (928)	48 (9,144)
Unemployed at arrest	74 (1,706)	67 (1,532)	59 (9,325)	57 (905)	49 (783)	41 (7,721)
Unstable job history	82 (1,881)	72 (1,661)	62 (9,780)	62 (985)	56 (889)	42 (7,896)
<b>Marital/Family</b>						
Lacked childhood family ties	39 (905)	36 (815)	29 (4,531)	25 (392)	24 (375)	17 (3,240)
Negative parental relationships in childhood	54 (1,247)	52 (1,188)	46 (7,249)	37 (592)	38 (603)	30 (5,761)
Experienced childhood abuse	36 (821)	40 (927)	34 (5,281)	24 (382)	27 (422)	22 (4,161)
Unknown	19 (386)	16 (367)	21 (3,307)	23 (368)	22 (343)	32 (6,132)
Witnessed family violence in childhood	42 (969)	41 (931)	32 (5,094)	27 (428)	27 (427)	21 (3,939)
Family members criminal activity	38 (883)	30 (697)	22 (3,429)	26 (406)	18 (287)	13 (2,484)
Victims of intimate partner violence	11 (245)	15 (347)	12 (1,934)	7 (115)	10 (161)	9 (1,611)

Indicator	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 15,701)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 18,976)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
Perpetrated intimate partner violence	34 (790)	38 (882)	36 (5,703)	24 (373)	28 (450)	24 (4,534)
No parental responsibilities	42 (959)	43 (981)	42 (6,517)	36 (565)	37 (584)	31 (5,936)
<b>Community Related</b>						
Unstable accommodation	43 (977)	41 (948)	36 (5,640)	28 (442)	26 (410)	19 (3,682)
Financial problems	69 (1,587)	68 (1,562)	61 (9,503)	56 (1,590)	51 (811)	42 (7,993)
Used social assistance	49 (1,131)	56 (1,285)	53 (8,363)	39 (621)	45 (714)	37 (7,077)
<b>Associates</b>						
Criminal acquaintances	92 (2,112)	72 (1,657)	62 (9,652)	85 (1,358)	61 (974)	46 (8,638)
Criminal friends	83 (1,914)	55 (1,265)	44 (6,929)	71 (1,126)	42 (664)	29 (5,573)
Suspected gang association	68 (1,566)	10 (238)	6 (981)	64 (1,019)	9 (140)	4 (781)
Resides in a high crime area	51 (1,173)	36 (830)	24 (3,833)	37 (585)	24 (387)	14 (2,640)
Has a criminal partner	16 (369)	11 (252)	10 (1,606)	14 (215)	10 (156)	8 (1,455)
<b>Attitudes</b>						
Supports instrumental violence	74 (1,691)	56 (1,275)	48 (7,527)	56 (895)	40 (636)	28 (5,310)
Negative towards criminal justice/ correctional system	79 (1,810)	64 (1,461)	58 (9,170)	67 (1,066)	51 (817)	40 (7,543)
<b>Personal/Emotional Orientation</b>						
Unaware of consequences/Ability to link actions-conseq. limited	64 (1,481)	68 (1,566)	61 (9,520)	53 (844)	56 (885)	46 (8,704)

Indicator	Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 2,299)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 15,701)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,590)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 18,976)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
Impulsive	77 (1,766)	77 (1,764)	70 (10,936)	56 (896)	59 (945)	48 (9,066)
Engaged in thrill-seeking behaviour	51 (1,170)	42 (963)	33 (5,201)	39 (613)	29 (462)	22 (4,183)
Manipulative towards others	48 (1,091)	44 (1,000)	45 (7,007)	42 (660)	33 (530)	31 (5,930)
Aggressive towards others	61 (1,395)	48 (1,108)	40 (6,224)	36 (578)	29 (458)	21 (3,884)
Low frustration tolerance	51 (1,170)	47 (1,070)	42 (6,654)	32 (502)	30 (472)	24 (4,589)
Hostile/Interprets neutral situations as hostile	34 (771)	26 (595)	24 (3,749)	18 (291)	14 (291)	12 (2,197)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group.

## Appendix C: Descriptive Characteristics for Women Offenders

Table C1

Demographics, Sentence, and Offence Information comparisons between STG women offenders, matched non-STG women offenders, and general non-STG women offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	Women Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	Matched <sup>45</sup> Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 951)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,693)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Average Age at Study <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	29 (6.2)	30 (5.9)	36 (10.8)	35 (9.4)	37 (9.8)	41 (13.1)
Median Age at Study (matched)	27	29	34	34	35	38
Region at Study (matched)						
<i>Atlantic</i>	5 (*)	5 (*)	13 (125)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (201)
<i>Quebec</i>	7 (*)	7 (*)	13 (128)	8 (*)	8 (*)	17 (287)
<i>Ontario</i>	15 (6)	15 (6)	27 (253)	23 (12)	21 (11)	27 (464)
<i>Prairies</i>	44 (18)	44 (18)	36 (340)	52 (27)	54 (28)	30 (509)
<i>Pacific</i>	29 (12)	29 (12)	11 (105)	17 (9)	17 (9)	14 (232)
Ethnocultural group (matched)						
<i>Indigenous</i>	90 (37)	90 (37)	37 (350)	67 (35)	67 (35)	23 (384)
<i>White</i>	7 (*)	7 (*)	42 (404)	13 (10)	13 (10)	51 (868)
<i>All other ethnocultural groups</i>	3 (*)	3 (*)	21 (197)	20 (7)	20 (7)	26 (441)

<sup>45</sup> Matched on: Gender, Community/In custody, ethnocultural group, Region at Study, Age Categories (30 years or younger, 31 to 49 years, 50 years or more), Sentence Length Categories. Release type is also a matching variable for community cohort.

Indicator	Women Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 41)	Matched <sup>45</sup> Non-STG Offenders (N = 41)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 951)	STG Offenders (N = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 52)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 1,693)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Average Determinate Sentence Length <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	4 (1.9)	4 (2.0)	3 (2.1)	3 (1.7)	3 (1.6)	3 (2.2)
Sentence Length – Categories (matched)						
<i>Less than 4 years</i>	51 (21)	51 (21)	63 (597)	63 (33)	67 (35)	70 (1,180)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	34 (14)	34 (14)	21 (204)	29 (15)	27 (14)	21 (363)
<i>10 years or more/ Indeterminate</i>	15 (6)	15 (6)	16 (150)	8 (*)	6 (*)	9 (150)
Region of Admission						
<i>Atlantic</i>	2 (*)	2 (*)	13 (122)	2 (*)	0 (0)	13 (216)
<i>Quebec</i>	0 (0)	8 (*)	11 (108)	8 (*)	8 (*)	16 (281)
<i>Ontario</i>	5 (*)	15 (6)	28 (263)	17 (9)	23 (12)	28 (470)
<i>Prairies</i>	71 (29)	60 (24)	41 (384)	62 (32)	54 (28)	32 (539)
<i>Pacific</i>	22 (9)	15 (6)	7 (70)	11 (6)	15 (8)	11 (187)
Offence Type – Most Serious Offence (MSO)						
<i>Homicide Related</i>	20 (8)	31 (12)	22 (203)	4 (*)	13 (7)	13 (221)
<i>Robbery</i>	12 (5)	15 (6)	14 (130)	12 (6)	21 (11)	10 (159)
<i>Drug Related</i>	22 (9)	19 (7)	28 (259)	23 (12)	29 (15)	38 (646)
<i>Assault</i>	25 (10)	10 (*)	11 (102)	23 (12)	4 (*)	6 (106)
<i>All Other Violent</i>	12 (5)	12 (5)	11 (101)	10 (5)	15 (8)	11 (190)
<i>Non-Violent</i>	9 (*)	12 (5)	14 (140)	28 (15)	17 (9)	22 (371)
Violent Offence – MSO	68 (28)	67 (26)	57 (534)	48 (25)	54 (28)	40 (672)



Indicator	Women Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	Matched <sup>45</sup> Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 951)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	General Population Non- STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,693)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
First Federal Sentence	76 (31)	85 (35)	84 (803)	71 (37)	85 (44)	90 (1,528)
First Term of Sentence	80 (33)	73 (29)	80 (749)	77 (40)	81 (42)	90 (1,520)
Offender Security Level at Snapshot						
<i>Minimum</i>	7 (*)	29 (12)	28 (263)	40 (21)	59 (31)	67 (1,134)
<i>Medium</i>	54 (22)	56 (23)	53 (503)	40 (21)	33 (17)	24 (412)
<i>Maximum</i>	37 (15)	10 (*)	9 (84)	16 (8)	2 (*)	2 (30)
<i>Not rated</i>	2 (*)	5 (*)	10 (101)	4 (*)	6 (*)	7 (117)
Offender Security Level at Admission						
<i>Minimum</i>	15 (6)	20 (8)	30 (283)	25 (13)	42 (22)	52 (887)
<i>Medium</i>	61 (25)	58 (24)	54 (514)	62 (32)	44 (23)	37 (634)
<i>Maximum</i>	24 (10)	20 (8)	16 (151)	11 (6)	10 (6)	4 (62)
<i>Not rated</i>	0 (0)	2 (*)	0.3 (*)	2 (*)	4 (*)	7 (110)
Marital Status						
<i>Common-law/Married</i>	12 (5)	15 (6)	27 (252)	17 (9)	27 (14)	31 (528)
<i>Single</i>	78 (32)	83 (32)	59 (559)	71 (37)	67 (35)	50 (851)
<i>Divorced/Separated/Widowed</i>	5 (*)	2 (*)	11 (110)	12 (6)	6 (*)	15 (248)
<i>Not specified</i>	5 (*)	0 (0)	3 (30)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (66)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table C2

Criminogenic Risk and Need Information comparisons between STG women offenders, matched non-STG women offenders, and general non-STG women offender population – In Custody and Community cohorts

Indicators	Women Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 41)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 951)	STG Offenders (N = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 52)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 1,693)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<b>Substance Use Severity (CASA)</b>						
<i>None</i>	3 (*)	0 (0)	12 (110)	10 (5)	17 (9)	21 (348)
<i>Low</i>	7 (*)	22 (9)	16 (157)	29 (15)	13 (7)	23 (398)
<i>Moderate</i>	12 (5)	7 (*)	14 (133)	17 (9)	8 (*)	11 (182)
<i>Substantial to Severe</i>	71 (29)	66 (27)	52 (496)	42 (22)	54 (28)	33 (560)
<i>Not Rated</i>	7 (*)	5 (*)	6 (55)	2 (*)	8 (*)	12 (205)
<b>Static Factor Rating - Intake</b>						
<i>Low</i>	12 (5)	12 (5)	20 (185)	23 (12)	29 (15)	45 (755)
<i>Moderate</i>	46 (19)	40 (16)	46 (436)	42 (22)	42 (22)	40 (678)
<i>High</i>	42 (17)	48 (19)	34 (327)	35 (18)	29 (15)	15 (260)
<b>Static Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low</i>	12 (5)	15 (6)	18 (160)	29 (15)	35 (18)	54 (916)
<i>Moderate</i>	49 (20)	48 (19)	47 (417)	44 (23)	42 (22)	36 (612)
<i>High</i>	39 (16)	37 (15)	35 (317)	27 (14)	23 (12)	10 (165)
<b>Dynamic Factor Rating – Intake</b>						
<i>Low</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (60)	6 (*)	10 (5)	19 (322)

Women Offenders						
Indicators	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 41)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 951)	STG Offenders (N = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 52)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 1,693)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<i>Moderate</i>	7 (*)	17 (7)	30 (285)	33 (17)	38 (20)	40 (673)
<i>High</i>	93 (38)	83 (33)	64 (603)	61 (32)	52 (27)	41 (698)
Dynamic Factor Rating – Study						
<i>Low</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (58)	21 (11)	29 (15)	37 (632)
<i>Moderate</i>	32 (13)	35 (14)	37 (329)	46 (24)	38 (20)	39 (657)
<i>High</i>	68 (28)	65 (26)	56 (498)	33 (17)	33 (17)	24 (404)
Criminal Risk Index (CRI)						
<i>Low (1-8)</i>	17 (7)	42 (17)	36 (340)	23 (12)	17 (9)	33 (554)
<i>Moderate (9-18)</i>	29 (12)	27 (11)	39 (374)	31 (16)	44 (23)	25 (428)
<i>High (19+)</i>	42 (17)	24 (10)	16 (157)	31 (16)	10 (5)	7 (111)
<i>No Rating/COIA</i>	12 (5)	7 (*)	9 (80)	15 (8)	29 (15)	35 (600)
Reintegration Potential – Study						
<i>Low</i>	37 (15)	28 (11)	24 (209)	13 (7)	10 (5)	5 (80)
<i>Moderate</i>	63 (26)	57 (23)	63 (555)	58 (30)	63 (33)	46 (778)
<i>High</i>	0 (0)	15 (6)	13 (120)	29 (15)	27 (14)	49 (835)
Responsivity	34 (14)	50 (20)	36 (343)	25 (13)	31 (16)	23 (397)
Engagement	90 (37)	88 (35)	87 (826)	88 (46)	90 (47)	94 (1,589)
Motivation Level - Study						
<i>Low</i>	3 (*)	10 (*)	10 (90)	6 (*)	2 (*)	2 (27)

Women Offenders						
Indicators	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 41)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 951)	STG Offenders (N = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 52)	General Population Non- STG Offenders (N = 1,693)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<i>Moderate</i>	68 (28)	50 (20)	52 (459)	48 (25)	23 (12)	28 (479)
<i>High</i>	29 (12)	40 (16)	38 (334)	46 (24)	75 (39)	70 (1,187)
Accountability Level						
<i>Low</i>	8 (*)	14 (5)	12 (99)	16 (7)	9 (*)	6 (90)
<i>Moderate</i>	71 (27)	58 (21)	59 (474)	60 (27)	61 (26)	52 (788)
<i>High</i>	21 (8)	28 (10)	29 (234)	24 (11)	30 (13)	42 (624)
DFIA-R Domain Areas: Moderate to High Need						
<i>Associates</i>	100 (39)	92 (36)	75 (677)	90 (43)	67 (33)	58 (902)
<i>Attitudes</i>	79 (31)	64 (25)	57 (513)	63 (30)	51 (25)	41 (636)
<i>Community Functioning</i>	79 (31)	77 (30)	50 (454)	42 (20)	45 (22)	32 (495)
<i>Employment/Education</i>	85 (33)	79 (31)	61 (553)	60 (29)	61 (30)	46 (713)
<i>Marital/Family</i>	87 (34)	87 (34)	69 (626)	60 (29)	63 (31)	51 (793)
<i>Personal/Emotional Orientation</i>	90 (35)	90 (35)	88 (793)	77 (37)	92 (45)	78 (1,215)
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	95 (37)	95 (37)	79 (715)	71 (34)	71 (35)	60 (930)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table C3

Additional dynamic need domain indicators compared across STG women offenders, matched non-STG women offenders, and general non-STG women offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	Women Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 951)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,693)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
<b>Employment/Education</b>						
Education level less than grade 10	59 (24)	54 (22)	38 (363)	33 (17)	37 (19)	24 (407)
Education level less than high school	66 (27)	61 (25)	53 (503)	54 (28)	44 (23)	35 (587)
Unemployed at arrest	81 (33)	78 (32)	65 (616)	65 (34)	56 (29)	42 (712)
Unstable job history	78 (32)	76 (31)	63 (599)	69 (36)	54 (28)	40 (676)
<b>Marital/Family</b>						
Lacked childhood family ties	49 (20)	46 (19)	37 (354)	40 (21)	39 (20)	23 (383)
Negative parental relationships in childhood	68 (28)	63 (26)	54 (509)	42 (22)	44 (23)	33 (560)
Experienced childhood abuse	61 (25)	59 (24)	48 (452)	48 (25)	40 (21)	29 (495)
Unknown	20 (8)	20 (8)	23 (216)	25 (13)	35 (18)	45 (759)
Witnessed family violence in childhood	59 (24)	59 (24)	44 (419)	50 (26)	40 (21)	26 (434)
Family members criminal activity	59 (24)	46 (19)	30 (284)	42 (22)	35 (18)	17 (280)
Victims of intimate partner violence	46 (19)	63 (26)	59 (562)	48 (25)	54 (28)	39 (666)

Indicator	Women Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 951)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,693)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Perpetrated intimate partner violence	24 (10)	24 (10)	27 (254)	27 (14)	12 (6)	15 (245)
No parental responsibilities	51 (21)	49 (20)	39 (369)	37 (19)	27 (14)	25 (414)
<b>Community Related</b>						
Unstable accommodation	61 (25)	59 (24)	47 (446)	37 (19)	44 (23)	26 (436)
Financial problems	68 (28)	78 (32)	62 (592)	60 (31)	54 (28)	40 (684)
Used social assistance	54 (22)	73 (30)	65 (616)	58 (30)	52 (27)	44 (737)
<b>Associates</b>						
Criminal acquaintances	83 (34)	71 (29)	61 (577)	75 (39)	48 (25)	39 (662)
Criminal friends	76 (31)	54 (22)	45 (432)	62 (32)	42 (22)	27 (450)
Suspected gang association	71 (29)	12 (5)	6 (57)	67 (35)	2 (*)	4 (68)
Resides in a high crime area	63 (26)	54 (22)	35 (26)	56 (29)	27 (14)	18 (299)
Has a criminal partner	42 (17)	34 (14)	33 (317)	35 (18)	27 (14)	21 (361)
<b>Attitudes</b>						
Supports instrumental violence	49 (20)	29 (12)	29 (276)	31 (16)	19 (10)	12 (197)
Negative towards criminal justice/ correctional system	39 (16)	42 (17)	31 (298)	46 (24)	27 (14)	16 (276)
<b>Personal/Emotional Orientation</b>						
Unaware of consequences/Ability to link actions-conseq. limited	66 (27)	68 (28)	56 (530)	52 (27)	56 (29)	41 (689)

Indicator	Women Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 41)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 951)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 52)	General Population Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,693)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
Impulsive	76 (31)	66 (27)	64 (610)	60 (31)	56 (29)	41 (686)
Engaged in thrill-seeking behaviour	42 (17)	22 (9)	31 (299)	40 (21)	27 (14)	18 (306)
Manipulative towards others	42 (17)	29 (12)	37 (347)	39 (20)	40 (21)	21 (362)
Aggressive towards others	54 (22)	39 (16)	27 (254)	29 (15)	19 (10)	13 (214)
Low frustration tolerance	54 (22)	34 (14)	38 (364)	33 (17)	46 (24)	21 (353)
Hostile/Interprets neutral situations as hostile	27 (11)	29 (12)	22 (211)	19 (10)	19 (10)	10 (175)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

## Appendix D: Study Results for Indigenous Men Offenders

Table D1

Demographics, Sentence, and Offence Information comparisons between STG Indigenous men offenders, matched non-STG Indigenous men offenders, and general non-STG Indigenous men offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	Indigenous Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	General Population (N = 3,881)	STG Offenders (N = 398)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 398)	General Population (N = 2,822)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Average Age at Study <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	32 (8.5)	33 (9.8)	38 (12.1)	35 (9.5)	35 (10.1)	41 (13.1)
Region at Study (matched)						
<i>Atlantic</i>	3 (30)	3 (30)	6 (248)	1 (*)	1 (*)	7 (194)
<i>Quebec</i>	5 (54)	5 (54)	13 (500)	5 (22)	5 (22)	13 (357)
<i>Ontario</i>	5 (56)	5 (56)	16 (627)	8 (32)	8 (32)	17 (480)
<i>Prairies</i>	72 (784)	72 (784)	46 (1,803)	66 (262)	66 (262)	44 (1,248)
<i>Pacific</i>	15 (161)	15 (161)	18 (703)	20 (80)	20 (80)	19 (543)
Sentence Length – Categories						
<i>Less than 4 years</i>	38 (412)	38 (415)	47 (1,824)	48 (193)	49 (197)	59 (1,674)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	36 (391)	37 (395)	28 (1,068)	42 (166)	42 (166)	27 (748)
<i>10 years or more/Indeterminate</i>	26 (282)	25 (275)	25 (989)	10 (39)	9 (35)	14 (400)
Violent Offence – MSO	78 (844)	82 (886)	77 (3,005)	70 (280)	70 (278)	71 (1,999)
First Federal Sentence	56 (605)	74 (807)	63 (2,427)	56 (222)	71 (282)	71 (1,989)



Indicator	Indigenous Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,085)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 1,085)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 3,881)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 398)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 398)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 2,822)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Offender Security Level at Snapshot						
<i>Minimum</i>	6 (65)	17 (180)	17 (659)	23 (90)	39 (157)	47 (1,333)
<i>Medium</i>	58 (633)	61 (665)	64 (2,480)	59 (236)	53 (211)	43 (1,218)
<i>Maximum</i>	31 (340)	16 (172)	13 (217)	16 (63)	5 (18)	4 (106)
<i>Not rated</i>	4 (47)	6 (68)	6 (225)	2 (9)	3 (12)	6 (165)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table D2

Criminogenic Risk and Need Information comparisons between STG Indigenous men offenders, matched non-STG Indigenous men offenders, and general non-STG Indigenous men offender population – In Custody and Community cohorts

Indicators	Indigenous Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	General Population (N = 3,881)	STG Offenders (N = 398)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 398)	General Population (N = 2,822)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<b>Substance Use Severity (CASA)</b>						
<i>None or Low</i>	32 (342)	23 (255)	26 (1,021)	41 (164)	31 (122)	34 (947)
<i>Moderate to Severe</i>	59 (644)	61 (661)	52 (2,015)	49 (196)	55 (218)	42 (1,190)
<i>Not Rated</i>	9 (99)	16 (169)	22 (845)	10 (38)	14 (58)	24 (685)
<b>Static Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	28 (300)	37 (383)	31 (1,178)	48 (191)	63 (252)	65 (1,827)
<i>High</i>	72 (771)	63 (658)	69 (2,581)	52 (207)	37 (146)	35 (995)
<b>Dynamic Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	21 (223)	32 (328)	28 (1,070)	46 (185)	60 (237)	62 (1,738)
<i>High</i>	79 (847)	68 (712)	72 (2,685)	54 (213)	40 (161)	38 (1,084)
<b>Criminal Risk Index (CRI)</b>						
<i>Low (1-7)/ Moderate (8-17)</i>	32 (342)	50 (541)	47 (1,830)	34 (137)	55 (218)	56 (1,592)
<i>High (18+)</i>	66 (718)	47 (508)	48 (1,843)	61 (243)	39 (156)	29 (808)
<i>No Rating/COIA</i>	2 (25)	3 (36)	5 (208)	5 (18)	6 (24)	15 (422)
<b>Reintegration Potential – Study</b>						
<i>Low</i>	67 (722)	53 (546)	55 (2,057)	37 (146)	19 (76)	18 (518)

Indicators	Indigenous Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	General Population (N = 3,881)	STG Offenders (N = 398)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 398)	General Population (N = 2,822)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<i>Moderate/High</i>	33 (348)	47 (494)	45 (1,697)	63 (252)	81 (322)	82 (2,304)
Engagement	64 (692)	74 (803)	72 (2,795)	83 (332)	86 (341)	89 (2,513)
DFIA-R Domain Areas: Moderate to High Need						
<i>Associates</i>	90 (884)	71 (704)	69 (2,344)	86 (311)	65 (238)	62 (1,485)
<i>Attitudes</i>	87 (863)	72 (714)	77 (2,598)	88 (316)	68 (247)	67 (1,614)
<i>Community Functioning</i>	43 (426)	46 (463)	43 (1,462)	36 (130)	39 (143)	31 (736)
<i>Employment/Education</i>	90 (884)	82 (818)	74 (2,509)	84 (303)	75 (274)	62 (1,487)
<i>Marital/Family</i>	47 (461)	51 (509)	54 (1,823)	39 (141)	49 (177)	46 (1,103)
<i>Personal/Emotional Orientation</i>	89 (882)	93 (933)	92 (3,135)	81 (294)	90 (329)	85 (2,035)
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	85 (838)	89 (888)	87 (2,948)	76 (275)	84 (305)	78 (1,877)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table D3

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG Indigenous Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Indigenous Men Offenders, and the General Indigenous Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Indigenous Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	General Population (N = 3,881)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Guilty Disciplinary Charges	66 (721)	53 (572)	52 (2,006)
<i>Average Number - Charges M (SD)</i>	6 (11.6)	4 (10.9)	4 (12.2)
Random Urinalysis			
<i>Positive Tests</i>	30 (221)	20 (143)	20 (516)
<i>Refusals</i>	29 (215)	18 (129)	18 (465)
Institutional Incidents	88 (950)	71 (766)	71 (2,747)
<i>Average Number of Incidents M (SD)</i>	11 (14.7)	7 (16.6)	8 (18.4)
Transfers	67 (726)	64 (726)	72 (2,804)
<i>Average Number - Transfers M (SD)</i>	3 (4.2)	2 (3.7)	3 (4.5)
Grievances	69 (754)	57 (623)	61 (2,375)
<i>Average Number - Grievances M (SD)</i>	8 (34.8)	6 (24.2)	10 (59.3)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation.

Table D4

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG Indigenous Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Indigenous Men Offenders, and the General Indigenous Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Indigenous Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	Matched STG Offenders (N = 1,085)	Non- General Population (N = 3,881)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Programming Assignment	84 (908)	79 (856)	80 (3,105)
<i>Completed any programming</i>	75 (812)	70 (760)	72 (2,804)
<i>Completed Moderate or High</i>	61 (658)	58 (628)	58 (2,266)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table D5

*Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG Indigenous Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Indigenous Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Indigenous Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Indigenous Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 398)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 398)	General Population (N = 2,822)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Release Type (matched)			
<i>Discretionary Release</i>	14 (55)	14 (55)	38 (1,071)
<i>Non-discretionary Release</i>	86 (343)	86 (343)	62 (1,751)
Residency Condition	36 (145)	25 (99)	23 (638)
Frequency of Contact			
<i>Four face-to-face contacts (Level A)</i>	47 (187)	39 (154)	32 (910)
<i>Two face-to-face contacts (Level B)</i>	34 (137)	46 (183)	45 (1,265)
<i>One face-to-face contacts per month (Level C) or less (Levels D, E, &amp; I)</i>	18 (70)	15 (61)	23 (642)
<i>Unspecified</i>	1 (*)	0 (0)	0.2 (5)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table D6

*Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG Indigenous Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Indigenous Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Indigenous Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Indigenous Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 398)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 398)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 2,822)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Suspension of Release	57 (226)	54 (214)	43 (1,211)
Days to First Suspension <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	136 (197.2)	214 (412.2)	320 (744.2)
General Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach Terms of Release/Prevent Breach</i>	79 (178)	76 (162)	74 (892)
<i>Protect Society</i>	21 (48)	24 (52)	26 (322)
Specific Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach of Conditions</i>	34 (77)	34 (73)	37 (453)
<i>Fail to Report</i>	33 (75)	24 (51)	18 (217)
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i>	21 (48)	25 (54)	24 (295)
Any Return to Custody	26 (105)	18 (73)	13 (376)
Any New Offence	7 (26)	5 (19)	2 (63)
Days to Return <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	265 (149.5)	292 (215.7)	320 (380.1)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation.

## Appendix E: Study Results for White Men Offenders

Table E1

Demographics, Sentence, and Offence Information comparisons between STG White men offenders, matched non-STG White men offenders, and general non-STG White men offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	White Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 536)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 536)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 7,979)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 527)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 527)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 10,566)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Average Age at Study <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	40 (11.0)	40 (12.0)	43 (13.6)	44 (13.2)	43 (13.0)	46 (15.0)
Region at Study (matched)						
<i>Atlantic</i>	7 (38)	7 (38)	13 (1,053)	5 (24)	5 (24)	14 (1,434)
<i>Quebec</i>	30 (160)	30 (160)	29 (2,335)	34 (181)	34 (181)	34 (3,619)
<i>Ontario</i>	16 (85)	16 (85)	24 (1,859)	27 (141)	27 (141)	21 (2,259)
<i>Prairies</i>	27 (145)	27 (145)	20 (1,599)	18 (96)	18 (96)	19 (2,011)
<i>Pacific</i>	20 (108)	20 (108)	14 (1,133)	16 (85)	16 (85)	12 (1,243)
Sentence Length – Categories						
<i>Less than 4 years</i>	27 (147)	27 (147)	43 (3,459)	33 (174)	27 (142)	56 (5,970)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	39 (208)	39 (208)	28 (2,193)	44 (231)	50 (264)	26 (2,712)
<i>10 years or more/Indeterminate</i>	34 (181)	34 (181)	29 (2,327)	23 (122)	23 (121)	18 (1,884)
Violent Offence – MSO	64 (345)	75 (401)	70 (5,587)	44 (230)	66 (347)	60 (6,325)
First Federal Sentence	41 (219)	63 (340)	62 (4,975)	56 (293)	74 (390)	76 (8,066)

Indicator	White Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 536)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 536)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 7,979)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 527)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 527)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 10,566)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Offender Security Level at Snapshot						
<i>Minimum</i>	10 (55)	17 (92)	20 (1,583)	42 (220)	52 (272)	53 (5,617)
<i>Medium</i>	63 (339)	63 (338)	62 (4,978)	45 (238)	39 (207)	36 (3,828)
<i>Maximum</i>	25 (131)	15 (82)	11 (879)	11 (58)	5 (28)	3 (308)
<i>Not rated</i>	2 (11)	4 (24)	7 (539)	2 (11)	4 (20)	8 (813)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation.



Table E2

Criminogenic Risk and Need Information comparisons between STG White men offenders, matched non-STG White men offenders, and general non-STG White men offender population – In Custody and Community cohorts

Indicators	White Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 536)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 536)	General Population (N = 7,979)	STG Offenders (N = 527)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 527)	General Population (N = 10,566)
% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
<b>Substance Use Severity (CASA)</b>						
<i>None or Low</i>	41 (222)	40 (218)	38 (3,007)	59 (308)	47 (246)	46 (4,830)
<i>Moderate to Severe</i>	33 (176)	36 (192)	34 (2,727)	19 (102)	33 (175)	25 (2,623)
<i>Not Rated</i>	26 (138)	24 (126)	28 (2,245)	22 (117)	20 (106)	29 (3,113)
<b>Static Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	26 (138)	33 (172)	35 (2,660)	69 (365)	71 (376)	76 (8,019)
<i>High</i>	74 (397)	67 (251)	65 (5,007)	31 (162)	29 (151)	24 (2,547)
<b>Dynamic Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	26 (137)	33 (174)	33 (2,545)	69 (365)	71 (374)	72 (7,589)
<i>High</i>	74 (398)	67 (348)	67 (5,117)	31 (162)	29 (153)	28 (2,977)
<b>Criminal Risk Index (CRI)</b>						
<i>Low (1-7)/ Moderate (8-17)</i>	41 (220)	57 (306)	58 (4,629)	57 (301)	61 (322)	60 (6,325)
<i>High (18+)</i>	53 (284)	37 (200)	33 (2,663)	30 (156)	23 (123)	16 (1,701)
<i>No Rating/COIA</i>	6 (32)	6 (30)	9 (687)	13 (70)	16 (82)	24 (2,540)
<b>Reintegration Potential – Study</b>						
<i>Low</i>	58 (313)	44 (228)	44 (3,342)	20 (103)	13 (68)	11 (1,200)

Indicators	White Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 536)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 536)	General Population (N = 7,979)	STG Offenders (N = 527)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 527)	General Population (N = 10,566)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<i>Moderate/High</i>	42 (222)	56 (294)	56 (4,300)	80 (424)	87 (459)	89 (9,366)
Engagement	61 (326)	70 (377)	67 (5,312)	87 (457)	91 (477)	90 (9,535)
DFIA-R Domain Areas: Moderate to High Need						
<i>Associates</i>	94 (430)	63 (291)	61 (4,052)	94 (382)	57 (243)	53 (4,547)
<i>Attitudes</i>	95 (435)	79 (361)	76 (5,059)	91 (372)	71 (302)	63 (5,459)
<i>Community Functioning</i>	30 (139)	36 (164)	28 (1,844)	21 (84)	17 (74)	16 (1,365)
<i>Employment/Education</i>	60 (275)	57 (261)	51 (3,373)	50 (202)	41 (173)	37 (3,206)
<i>Marital/Family</i>	28 (129)	43 (199)	38 (2,516)	16 (64)	28 (120)	26 (2,228)
<i>Personal/Emotional Orientation</i>	71 (324)	86 (396)	84 (5,571)	50 (204)	72 (306)	68 (5,851)
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	59 (272)	71 (328)	70 (4,680)	39 (158)	59 (253)	54 (4,713)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table E3

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG White Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG White Men Offenders, and the General White Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	White Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 536)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 536)	General Population (N = 7,979)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Guilty Disciplinary Charges	60 (321)	54 (290)	47 (3,714)
<i>Average Number - Charges M (SD)</i>	7 (15.3)	5 (13.4)	4 (12.6)
Random Urinalysis			
<i>Positive Tests</i>	30 (116)	20 (78)	18 (969)
<i>Refusals</i>	31 (123)	22 (85)	19 (1,027)
Institutional Incidents	78 (420)	71 (379)	72 (725)
<i>Average Number of Incidents M (SD)</i>	11 (18.2)	9 (37.3)	7 (15.0)
Transfers	87 (466)	82 (441)	66 (5,273)
<i>Average Number - Transfers M (SD)</i>	3 (4.3)	3 (4.2)	3 (4.1)
Grievances	82 (440)	72 (388)	66 (5,248)
<i>Average Number - Grievances M (SD)</i>	19 (52.6)	14 (37.3)	16 (153.5)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation.

Table E4

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG White Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG White Men Offenders, and the General White Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	White Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 536)	Matched STG Offenders (N = 536)	Non- General Population (N = 7,979)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Programming Assignment	82 (437)	80 (431)	77 (6,135)
<i>Completed any programming</i>	75 (402)	75 (400)	71 (5,658)
<i>Completed Moderate or High</i>	56 (299)	61 (325)	56 (4,468)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table E5

*Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG White Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG White Men Offenders, and Non-STG General White Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	White Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 527)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 527)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 10,566)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Release Type (matched)			
<i>Discretionary Release</i>	42 (220)	40 (210)	54 (5,738)
<i>Non-discretionary Release</i>	58 (307)	60 (317)	46 (4,828)
Residency Condition	18 (95)	14 (74)	12 (1,244)
Frequency of Contact			
<i>Four face-to-face contacts (Level A)</i>	27 (140)	28 (145)	23 (2,476)
<i>Two face-to-face contacts (Level B)</i>	41 (216)	41 (218)	42 (4,427)
<i>One face-to-face contacts per month (Level C) or less (Levels D, E, &amp; I)</i>	31 (168)	30 (163)	34 (3,643)
<i>Unspecified</i>	1 (*)	1 (*)	1 (20)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table E6

Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG White Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG White Men Offenders, and Non-STG General White Men Offender Population (Community only)

Indicators	White Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 527)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 527)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 10,566)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Suspension of Release	30 (159)	34 (177)	29 (3,029)
Days to First Suspension <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	426 (908.1)	532 (1,246.3)	483 (1092.0)
General Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach Terms of Release/Prevent Breach</i>	60 (95)	65 (114)	65 (1,962)
<i>Protect Society</i>	40 (65)	35 (61)	35 (1,060)
Specific Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach of Conditions</i>	32 (51)	38 (67)	37 (1,122)
<i>Fail to Report</i>	18 (29)	15 (26)	10 (306)
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i>	33 (52)	24 (43)	28 (838)
Any Return to Custody	6 (30)	11 (59)	8 (839)
Any New Offence	1 (*)	2 (9)	1 (95)
Days to Return <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	303 (175.3)	425 (365.4)	361 (403.1)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

## Appendix F: Study Results for Black Men Offenders

Table F1

Demographics, Sentence, and Offence Information comparisons between STG Black men offenders, matched non-STG Black men offenders, and general non-STG Black men offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	Black Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 299)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 1,011)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 237)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 237)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 965)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Average Age at Study <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	32 (6.9)	33 (8.1)	36 (11.2)	33 (7.1)	34 (8.3)	37 (12.0)
Region at Study (matched)						
<i>Atlantic</i>	6 (17)	6 (17)	10 (102)	2 (6)	2 (6)	10 (99)
<i>Quebec</i>	29 (88)	29 (88)	21 (124)	24 (56)	24 (56)	17 (166)
<i>Ontario</i>	49 (147)	49 (147)	49 (496)	62 (148)	62 (148)	54 (524)
<i>Prairies</i>	7 (20)	7 (20)	12 (124)	6 (14)	6 (14)	14 (132)
<i>Pacific</i>	9 (27)	9 (27)	71 (7)	5 (13)	5 (13)	5 (44)
Sentence Length – Categories						
<i>Less than 4 years</i>	23 (70)	23 (70)	34 (345)	39 (92)	40 (95)	52 (508)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	38 (112)	39 (117)	34 (347)	53 (125)	52 (123)	36 (248)
<i>10 years or more/Indeterminate</i>	39 (117)	38 (112)	32 (319)	8 (20)	8 (19)	12 (99)
Violent Offence – MSO	75 (224)	78 (233)	75 (755)	49 (115)	66 (157)	56 (541)
First Federal Sentence	65 (194)	72 (214)	74 (745)	79 (187)	82 (195)	80 (775)

Indicator	Black Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 299)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 1,011)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 237)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 237)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 965)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Offender Security Level at Snapshot						
<i>Minimum</i>	4 (13)	10 (30)	15 (151)	23 (54)	30 (72)	45 (432)
<i>Medium</i>	65 (193)	63 (188)	61 (618)	63 (150)	61 (144)	47 (455)
<i>Maximum</i>	28 (85)	23 (68)	17 (169)	12 (28)	8 (20)	5 (49)
<i>Not rated</i>	3 (8)	4 (13)	7 (73)	2 (5)	1 (*)	3 (29)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table F2

Criminogenic Risk and Need Information comparisons between STG Black men offenders, matched non-STG Black men offenders, and general non-STG Black men offender population – In Custody and Community cohorts

Indicators	Black Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 299)	General Population (N = 1,011)	STG Offenders (N = 237)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 237)	General Population (N = 965)
% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
<b>Substance Use Severity (CASA)</b>						
<i>None or Low</i>	59 (176)	60 (178)	60 (608)	85 (200)	74 (174)	68 (661)
<i>Moderate to Severe</i>	7 (22)	15 (44)	15 (156)	6 (15)	12 (29)	11 (104)
<i>Not Rated</i>	34 (101)	26 (77)	24 (247)	9 (22)	14 (34)	21 (200)
<b>Static Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	21 (63)	27 (79)	35 (337)	58 (137)	62 (148)	72 (699)
<i>High</i>	79 (236)	73 (215)	65 (638)	42 (100)	38 (89)	28 (266)
<b>Dynamic Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	21 (62)	30 (88)	37 (362)	57 (136)	68 (162)	75 (721)
<i>High</i>	79 (237)	70 (206)	63 (612)	43 (101)	32 (75)	25 (244)
<b>Criminal Risk Index (CRI)</b>						
<i>Low (1-7)/ Moderate (8-17)</i>	51 (152)	62 (185)	65 (658)	58 (138)	69 (164)	65 (623)
<i>High (18+)</i>	47 (141)	37 (110)	31 (312)	33 (79)	22 (52)	18 (174)
<i>No Rating/COIA</i>	2 (6)	1 (*)	4 (41)	8 (20)	9 (21)	17 (168)
<b>Reintegration Potential – Study</b>						
<i>Low</i>	65 (194)	55 (163)	47 (456)	22 (53)	13 (30)	11 (108)



Indicators	Black Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 299)	General Population (N = 1,011)	STG Offenders (N = 237)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 237)	General Population (N = 965)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<i>Moderate/High</i>	35 (105)	45 (131)	53 (517)	78 (184)	87 (207)	89 (857)
Engagement	54 (161)	60 (179)	62 (628)	80 (189)	83 (197)	88 (847)
DFIA-R Domain Areas: Moderate to High Need						
<i>Associates</i>	99 (271)	80 (218)	73 (658)	96 (215)	74 (162)	70 (612)
<i>Attitudes</i>	98 (370)	89 (241)	84 (763)	92 (208)	85 (187)	77 (671)
<i>Community Functioning</i>	29 (80)	30 (82)	28 (251)	20 (46)	23 (50)	19 (165)
<i>Employment/Education</i>	78 (215)	73 (197)	63 (559)	72 (161)	62 (135)	50 (436)
<i>Marital/Family</i>	17 (46)	32 (86)	33 (301)	13 (30)	21 (45)	19 (163)
<i>Personal/Emotional Orientation</i>	75 (207)	82 (222)	80 (720)	58 (131)	63 (138)	58 (509)
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	25 (68)	42 (114)	41 (371)	16 (36)	31 (67)	26 (229)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table F3

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG Black Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Black Men Offenders, and the General Black Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Black Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 299)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 299)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 1,011)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Guilty Disciplinary Charges	77 (231)	56 (168)	50 (508)
<i>Average Number - Charges M (SD)</i>	11 (15.4)	6 (13.8)	6 (18.5)
Random Urinalysis			
<i>Positive Tests</i>	42 (100)	25 (50)	21 (141)
<i>Refusals</i>	29 (68)	18 (37)	17 (118)
Institutional Incidents	84 (250)	80 (240)	72 (725)
<i>Average Number of Incidents M (SD)</i>	11 (15.4)	10 (23.1)	8 (19.8)
Transfers	95 (285)	91 (272)	83 (844)
<i>Average Number - Transfers M (SD)</i>	3 (2.9)	3 (2.9)	3 (3.5)
Grievances	79 (235)	73 (217)	65 (656)
<i>Average Number - Grievances M (SD)</i>	11 (20.5)	12 (29.1)	17 (115.2)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation.

Table F4

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG Black Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Black Men Offenders, and the General Black Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Black Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 299)	Matched STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 299)	Non- General Population ( <i>N</i> = 1,011)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Programming Assignment	83 (248)	80 (239)	74 (748)
<i>Completed any programming</i>	79 (235)	75 (223)	68 (689)
<i>Completed Moderate or High</i>	56 (168)	57 (170)	52 (527)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table F5

*Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG Black Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Black Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Black Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Black Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 237)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 237)	General Population (N = 965)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Release Type (matched)			
<i>Discretionary Release</i>	27 (65)	27 (65)	46 (444)
<i>Non-discretionary Release</i>	73 (172)	73 (172)	53 (521)
Residency Condition	27 (65)	24 (56)	15 (149)
Frequency of Contact			
<i>Four face-to-face contacts (Level A)</i>	38 (90)	31 (74)	25 (243)
<i>Two face-to-face contacts (Level B)</i>	46 (110)	47 (111)	46 (443)
<i>One face-to-face contacts per month (Level C) or less (Levels D, E, &amp; I)</i>	15 (36)	21 (49)	28 (272)
<i>Unspecified</i>	1 (*)	1 (*)	1 (7)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table F6

Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG Black Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Black Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Black Men Offender Population (Community only)

Indicators	Black Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 237)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 237)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 965)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Suspension of Release	47 (111)	33 (79)	31 (299)
Days to First Suspension <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	262 (265.4)	252 (200.4)	346 (637.7)
General Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach Terms of Release/Prevent Breach</i>	50 (55)	59 (47)	61 (183)
<i>Protect Society</i>	50 (56)	41 (32)	39 (116)
Specific Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach of Conditions</i>	28 (31)	22 (17)	26 (78)
<i>Fail to Report</i>	5 (5)	8 (6)	6 (17)
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i>	34 (38)	32 (25)	34 (101)
Any Return to Custody	10 (24)	5 (12)	7 (67)
Any New Offence	1 (*)	1 (*)	1 (9)
Days to Return <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	480 (311.4)	437 (211.4)	400 (244.2)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

## Appendix G: Study Results for Asian Men Offenders

Table G1

Demographics, Sentence, and Offence Information comparisons between STG Asian men offenders, matched non-STG Asian men offenders, and general non-STG Asian men offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	Asian Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 116)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 116)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 629)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 109)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 109)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 1,052)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Average Age at Study <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	33 (8.0)	34 (8.8)	39 (12.5)	37 (10.0)	39 (12.1)	40 (12.0)
Region at Study (matched)						
<i>Atlantic</i>	3 (*)	3 (*)	3 (21)	1 (*)	1 (*)	1 (12)
<i>Quebec</i>	12 (14)	12 (14)	13 (83)	11 (12)	11 (12)	13 (387)
<i>Ontario</i>	28 (32)	28 (32)	37 (235)	30 (33)	30 (33)	37 (387)
<i>Prairies</i>	22 (25)	22 (25)	22 (140)	19 (21)	19 (21)	26 (273)
<i>Pacific</i>	35 (41)	35 (41)	23 (150)	39 (42)	39 (42)	23 (246)
Sentence Length – Categories						
<i>Less than 4 years</i>	27 (31)	27 (31)	37 (233)	29 (32)	33 (36)	52 (546)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	35 (41)	35 (41)	31 (194)	54 (59)	51 (56)	36 (383)
<i>10 years or more/Indeterminate</i>	38 (44)	38 (44)	32 (202)	17 (18)	16 (17)	12 (123)
Violent Offence – MSO	61 (71)	72 (84)	65 (409)	37 (40)	45 (49)	37 (392)
First Federal Sentence	70 (81)	78 (90)	85 (534)	75 (82)	84 (40)	90 (950)

Indicator	Asian Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 116)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 116)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 629)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 109)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 109)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 1,052)
% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	
Offender Security Level at Snapshot						
<i>Minimum</i>	17 (20)	21 (24)	25 (160)	54 (59)	57 (62)	66 (700)
<i>Medium</i>	58 (67)	55 (64)	59 (368)	34 (37)	35 (39)	27 (282)
<i>Maximum</i>	21 (24)	18 (21)	9 (54)	11 (12)	4 (*)	2 (18)
<i>Not rated</i>	4 (5)	6 (7)	7 (47)	1 (*)	4 (*)	5 (52)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table G2

Criminogenic Risk and Need Information comparisons between STG Asian men offenders, matched non-STG Asian men offenders, and general non-STG Asian men offender population – In Custody and Community cohorts

Indicators	Asian Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 116)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 116)	General Population (N = 629)	STG Offenders (N = 109)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 109)	General Population (N = 1,052)
% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
<b>Substance Use Severity (CASA)</b>						
<i>None or Low</i>	52 (60)	45 (52)	51 (322)	58 (63)	67 (73)	64 (673)
<i>Moderate to Severe</i>	15 (18)	21 (25)	20 (127)	16 (17)	10 (11)	11 (*)
<i>Not Rated</i>	33 (38)	34 (39)	29 (180)	26 (29)	23 (25)	25 (266)
<b>Static Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	37 (42)	44 (48)	48 (287)	80 (87)	88 (96)	91 (953)
<i>High</i>	63 (70)	56 (61)	52 (307)	20 (22)	12 (13)	9 (99)
<b>Dynamic Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	41 (46)	41 (45)	50 (297)	81 (88)	79 (86)	87 (916)
<i>High</i>	59 (66)	59 (64)	50 (297)	19 (21)	21 (23)	13 (136)
<b>Criminal Risk Index (CRI)</b>						
<i>Low (1-7)/ Moderate (8-17)</i>	65 (76)	74 (86)	83 (522)	80 (87)	79 (86)	66 (693)
<i>High (18+)</i>	32 (37)	24 (28)	14 (86)	10 (11)	8 (9)	6 (61)
<i>No Rating/COIA</i>	3 (*)	2 (*)	3 (21)	10 (11)	13 (14)	28 (298)
<b>Reintegration Potential – Study</b>						
<i>Low</i>	41 (46)	36 (39)	28 (166)	9 (10)	7 (8)	3 (35)

Indicators	Asian Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 116)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 116)	General Population (N = 629)	STG Offenders (N = 109)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 109)	General Population (N = 1,052)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<i>Moderate/High</i>	59 (67)	64 (70)	72 (426)	91 (99)	93 (101)	97 (1,017)
Engagement	62 (72)	68 (79)	67 (423)	88 (96)	95 (103)	93 (976)
DFIA-R Domain Areas: Moderate to High Need						
<i>Associates</i>	96 (96)	71 (77)	61 (349)	95 (92)	70 (68)	61 (585)
<i>Attitudes</i>	93 (93)	83 (90)	77 (440)	93 (90)	68 (66)	62 (592)
<i>Community Functioning</i>	24 (24)	22 (24)	23 (131)	14 (14)	13 (12)	12 (116)
<i>Employment/Education</i>	66 (66)	21 (55)	53 (301)	55 (53)	48 (46)	44 (419)
<i>Marital/Family</i>	20 (20)	37 (40)	31 (177)	11 (11)	20 (19)	12 (116)
<i>Personal/Emotional Orientation</i>	80 (80)	88 (95)	80 (458)	52 (50)	53 (51)	49 (470)
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	37 (37)	49 (53)	44 (249)	32 (32)	26 (25)	24 (232)

Note. Note. STG = Security Threat Group. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.



Table G3

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG Asian Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Asian Men Offenders, and the General Asian Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Asian Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 116)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 116)	General Population (N = 629)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Guilty Disciplinary Charges	59 (68)	46 (53)	40 (252)
<i>Average Number - Charges M (SD)</i>	5 (12.1)	3 (8.1)	2 (6.9)
Random Urinalysis			
<i>Positive Tests</i>	30 (26)	13 (10)	12 (48)
<i>Refusals</i>	22 (19)	6 (5)	10 (40)
Institutional Incidents	84 (97)	66 (77)	60 (378)
<i>Average Number of Incidents M (SD)</i>	7 (10.5)	5 (9.1)	4 (8.5)
Transfers	85 (99)	83 (96)	79 (498)
<i>Average Number - Transfers M (SD)</i>	3 (3.4)	2 (3.4)	2 (2.9)
Grievances	68 (79)	63 (73)	56 (352)
<i>Average Number - Grievances M (SD)</i>	12 (25.1)	20 (150.5)	10 (70.4)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation.

Table G4

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG Asian Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Asian Men Offenders, and the General Asian Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Asian Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 116)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 116)	General Population (N = 629)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Programming Assignment	69 (80)	65 (75)	60 (379)
<i>Completed any programming</i>	66 (77)	60 (70)	55 (348)
<i>Completed Moderate or High</i>	52 (60)	44 (51)	43 (269)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table G5

*Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG Asian Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Asian Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Asian Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Asian Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 109)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 109)	General Population (N = 1,052)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Release Type (matched)			
<i>Discretionary Release</i>	46 (50)	46 (50)	67 (706)
<i>Non-discretionary Release</i>	54 (59)	54 (59)	33 (346)
Residency Condition	15 (16)	8 (9)	5 (57)
Frequency of Contact			
<i>Four face-to-face contacts (Level A)</i>	17 (18)	17 (18)	12 (121)
<i>Two face-to-face contacts (Level B)</i>	51 (56)	42 (46)	43 (457)
<i>One face-to-face contacts per month (Level C) or less (Levels D, E, &amp; I)</i>	32 (35)	40 (44)	44 (470)
<i>Unspecified</i>	0 (0)	1 (*)	1 (*)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table G6

Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG Asian Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Asian Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Asian Men Offender Population (Community only)

Indicators	Asian Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 109)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 109)	General Population (N = 1,052)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Suspension of Release	28 (30)	22 (24)	17 (183)
Days to First Suspension <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	319 (332.3)	283 (269.2)	357 (508.6)
General Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach Terms of Release/Prevent Breach</i>	77 (23)	62 (15)	67 (122)
<i>Protect Society</i>	23 (7)	38 (9)	33 (61)
Specific Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach of Conditions</i>	40 (12)	42 (10)	34 (62)
<i>Fail to Report</i>	7 (*)	13 (*)	9 (16)
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i>	30 (9)	38 (9)	32 (58)
Any Return to Custody	6 (6)	4 (*)	4 (41)
Any New Offence	0 (0)	1 (*)	1 (6)
Days to Return <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	367 (203.7)	270 (90.2)	349 (219.2)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

## Appendix H: Study Results for Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders

Table H1

Demographics, Sentence, and Offence Information comparisons between STG Other Ethnocultural men offenders, matched non-STG Other Ethnocultural men offenders, and general non-STG Other Ethnocultural men offender population – In custody and Community cohorts

Indicator	Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 263)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 263)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 2,201)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 319)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 319)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 3,570)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Average Age at Study <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	31 (7.8)	33 (9.4)	37 (12.5)	35 (11.0)	37 (12.1)	40 (13.5)
Region at Study (matched)						
<i>Atlantic</i>	6 (15)	6 (15)	8 (178)	2 (12)	2 (12)	13 (453)
<i>Quebec</i>	11 (30)	11 (30)	15 (337)	26 (82)	26 (82)	22 (774)
<i>Ontario</i>	30 (78)	30 (78)	41 (902)	31 (99)	31 (99)	29 (1,054)
<i>Prairies</i>	41 (107)	41 (107)	25 (555)	26 (82)	26 (82)	24 (859)
<i>Pacific</i>	12 (33)	12 (33)	10 (229)	14 (44)	14 (44)	12 (430)
Sentence Length – Categories						
<i>Less than 4 years</i>	47 (123)	48 (126)	59 (1,293)	52 (167)	54 (174)	72 (2,583)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	37 (98)	36 (95)	27 (607)	42 (133)	41 (131)	24 (845)
<i>10 years or more/Indeterminate</i>	16 (42)	16 (42)	14 (301)	6 (19)	5 (14)	4 (142)
Violent Offence – MSO	66 (174)	66 (174)	64 (1,407)	40 (127)	59 (188)	51 (1,806)
First Federal Sentence	74 (194)	84 (220)	78 (1,725)	72 (230)	79 (252)	83 (2,950)

Indicator	Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 263)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 263)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 2,201)	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 319)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 319)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 3,570)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Offender Security Level at Snapshot						
<i>Minimum</i>	7 (19)	14 (36)	19 (423)	34 (110)	46 (148)	50 (1,784)
<i>Medium</i>	57 (151)	61 (160)	57 (1,245)	54 (174)	46 (148)	39 (1,378)
<i>Maximum</i>	30 (80)	15 (40)	13 (285)	11 (34)	6 (19)	3 (116)
<i>Not rated</i>	5 (13)	10 (27)	11 (248)	1 (*)	2 (*)	8 (292)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.

Table H2

Criminogenic Risk and Need Information comparisons between STG Other Ethnocultural men offenders, matched non-STG Other Ethnocultural men offenders, and general non-STG Other Ethnocultural men offender population – In Custody and Community cohorts

Indicators	Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 263)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 263)	General Population (N = 2,201)	STG Offenders (N = 319)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 319)	General Population (N = 3,570)
% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
<b>Substance Use Severity (CASA)</b>						
<i>None or Low</i>	49 (129)	42 (111)	45 (983)	62 (199)	57 (182)	54 (1,929)
<i>Moderate to Severe</i>	31 (81)	38 (99)	33 (736)	26 (83)	33 (106)	26 (938)
<i>Not Rated</i>	20 (53)	20 (53)	22 (482)	12 (37)	10 (31)	20 (703)
<b>Static Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	41 (107)	49 (121)	46 (936)	72 (229)	71 (226)	77 (2,732)
<i>High</i>	59 (151)	51 (124)	54 (1,102)	28 (90)	29 (93)	23 (838)
<b>Dynamic Factor Rating – Study</b>						
<i>Low/Moderate</i>	27 (70)	42 (102)	40 (811)	64 (204)	64 (205)	72 (2,554)
<i>High</i>	73 (188)	58 (143)	60 (1,219)	36 (115)	36 (114)	28 (1,016)
<b>Criminal Risk Index (CRI)</b>						
<i>Low (1-7)/ Moderate (8-17)</i>	50 (132)	63 (165)	66 (1,442)	59 (187)	67 (215)	62 (2,229)
<i>High (18+)</i>	46 (122)	32 (84)	29 (637)	31 (98)	22 (69)	16 (554)
<i>No Rating/COIA</i>	3 (9)	5 (14)	5 (122)	10 (34)	11 (35)	22 (787)
<b>Reintegration Potential – Study</b>						
<i>Low</i>	52 (134)	35 (85)	38 (762)	20 (65)	15 (49)	11 (407)

Indicators	Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders					
	In Custody Cohort			Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 263)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 263)	General Population (N = 2,201)	STG Offenders (N = 319)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 319)	General Population (N = 3,570)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<i>Moderate/High</i>	48 (123)	65 (159)	62 (1,265)	80 (254)	85 (270)	89 (3,163)
Engagement	59 (156)	64 (169)	63 (1,389)	80 (254)	88 (280)	90 (3,217)
DFIA-R Domain Areas: Moderate to High Need						
<i>Associates</i>	93 (223)	73 (179)	64 (1,315)	92 (259)	67 (195)	57 (1,881)
<i>Attitudes</i>	90 (214)	81 (196)	76 (1,565)	86 (243)	70 (202)	60 (1,991)
<i>Community Functioning</i>	30 (71)	26 (64)	29 (589)	23 (64)	19 (55)	16 (532)
<i>Employment/Education</i>	73 (174)	63 (154)	58 (1,185)	64 (181)	50 (146)	41 (1,374)
<i>Marital/Family</i>	28 (67)	36 (88)	37 (759)	17 (48)	27 (78)	24 (795)
<i>Personal/Emotional Orientation</i>	79 (188)	80 (194)	82 (1,696)	56 (157)	72 (209)	63 (2,106)
<i>Substance Abuse</i>	52 (125)	66 (160)	61 (1,259)	41 (115)	54 (157)	49 (1,633)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table H3

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders, and the General Other Ethnocultural Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 263)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 263)	General Population (N = 2,201)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Guilty Disciplinary Charges	58 (153)	48 (127)	41 (909)
<i>Average Number - Charges M (SD)</i>	4 (8.8)	2 (5.0)	2 (4.8)
Random Urinalysis			
<i>Positive Tests</i>	28 (45)	13 (20)	13 (161)
<i>Refusals</i>	25 (39)	18 (28)	12 (154)
Institutional Incidents	85 (223)	73 (193)	64 (1,399)
<i>Average Number of Incidents M (SD)</i>	8 (10.7)	5 (8.7)	4 (7.3)
Transfers	81 (212)	74 (194)	75 (1,643)
<i>Average Number - Transfers M (SD)</i>	2 (2.6)	2 (2.8)	2 (2.3)
Grievances	70 (185)	64 (167)	56 (1,232)
<i>Average Number - Grievances M (SD)</i>	7 (15.6)	5 (13.8)	5 (20.9)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation.

Table H4

*Comparison of Institutional Behaviour among STG Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders, and the General Other Ethnocultural Men Offender Population (In-Custody only)*

Indicators	Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders: In Custody Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 263)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 263)	General Population (N = 2,201)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Programming Assignment	82 (216)	68 (179)	67 (1,482)
<i>Completed any programming</i>	73 (192)	63 (165)	61 (1,347)
<i>Completed Moderate or High</i>	60 (159)	52 (138)	49 (1,072)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.



Table H5

*Comparison of Release Characteristics among STG Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Other Ethnocultural Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders (N = 319)	Matched Non-STG Offenders (N = 319)	General Population (N = 3,570)
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
Release Type (matched)			
<i>Discretionary Release</i>	22 (69)	22 (70)	43 (1,538)
<i>Non-discretionary Release</i>	78 (250)	78 (249)	57 (2,032)
Residency Condition	21 (67)	18 (58)	13 (458)
Frequency of Contact			
<i>Four face-to-face contacts (Level A)</i>	9 (27)	5 (16)	5 (173)
<i>Two face-to-face contacts (Level B)</i>	10 (31)	12 (35)	14 (483)
<i>One face-to-face contacts per month (Level C) or less (Levels D, E, &amp; I)</i>	3 (11)	5 (18)	10 (383)
<i>Unspecified</i>	78 (250)	78 (250)	71 (2,531)

Note. STG = Security Threat Group.

Table H6

*Comparison of Release Outcomes among STG Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders, Matched Non-STG Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders, and Non-STG General Other Ethnocultural Men Offender Population (Community only)*

Indicators	Other Ethnocultural Men Offenders: Community Cohort		
	STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 319)	Matched Non-STG Offenders ( <i>N</i> = 319)	General Population ( <i>N</i> = 3,570)
	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )	% ( <i>n</i> )
Suspension of Release	44 (140)	34 (107)	27 (959)
Days to First Suspension <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	257 (561.2)	225 (233.0)	229 (342.1)
General Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach Terms of Release/Prevent Breach</i>	65 (91)	64 (68)	68 (656)
<i>Protect Society</i>	35 (49)	36 (39)	32 (302)
Specific Reasons for Suspension			
<i>Breach of Conditions</i>	34 (48)	36 (39)	42 (404)
<i>Fail to Report</i>	15 (21)	12 (13)	11 (107)
<i>Increased Risk of Deteriorating Behaviour</i>	20 (28)	24 (26)	25 (241)
Any Return to Custody	17 (54)	13 (42)	9 (327)
Any New Offence	1 (*)	2 (7)	1 (38)
Days to Return <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	359 (578.6)	320 (190.5)	283 (176.9)

*Note.* STG = Security Threat Group. *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard deviation. \*Cell counts less than 5 were suppressed.