

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Revalidation of the Custody Rating Scale for Men Offenders

2023 N° R-472

Cat. No.: PS83-3/472E-PDF

ISBN: 978-0-660-69234-0

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.

Revalidation of the Custody Rating Scale for Men Offenders

Laura McKendy

Andrew Woodard

&

Leslie Anne Keown

Correctional Service of Canada

2023

Executive Summary

Key words: *Custody Rating Scale; Offender Security Level; Offender Case Management*

The Custody Rating Scale (CRS) is an instrument employed by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) to assist in determining an offender's initial security classification. The CRS is comprised of two subscales, Institutional Adjustment and Security Risk, with scores in turn informing a CRS designation of minimum, medium, or maximum security. As per [*Commissioner's Directive 705-7*](#), the CRS is used in conjunction with structured professional assessment of an offender's institutional adjustment, escape risk, and public safety risk to determine an appropriate Offender Security Level (OSL).

As part of a series of revalidation studies, the present analysis examines the validity of the CRS for men offenders admitted to federal custody on a Warrant of Committal (WOC; $N = 23,007$) or following a revocation of conditional release ($N = 6,240$) between 2013/2014 and 2018/2019. Results indicate that a higher CRS designation was associated with a greater likelihood of involvement in an institutional incident and receipt of an institutional charge. However, the strength of the relationship was greater for the WOC group relative to the revocation group. A similar pattern was found in regards to OSL and institutional outcomes.

Area Under the Curve (AUC) values exceeded the threshold of 'acceptable' predictive accuracy with respect to the WOC group, but not the revocation group, in the case of both the CRS and OSL. The predictive accuracy reported for the WOC group was higher than that reported in prior analyses of men offenders (e.g., Gobeil, 2011), which may be due to the present analytical separation of admissions versus readmissions. Overall, results affirm the predictive ability of the CRS for men offenders at initial intake and suggest efficacy in use of professional judgement, as evidenced by the similar predictive ability of the CRS and OSL.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction.....	1
Method	2
Data.....	2
Measures	3
Analytic Strategy	5
Results.....	6
Profile Information.....	6
Custody Rating Scale Distribution.....	7
Offender Security Level.....	7
Institutional Outcomes	8
Discussion	14
Conclusion	15
References.....	16
Appendix A: Additional Tables	17

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Sentence Information of Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	6
Table 2. <i>Distribution of CRS Subscales and CRS Designation for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	8
Table 3. <i>Institutional Outcomes by CRS Designation for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	10
Table 4. <i>Institutional Outcomes by OSL for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	10
Table 5. <i>Association between CRS Subscales and CRS Designation and Institutional Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	11
Table 6. <i>Association between OSL and Institutional Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	11
Table 7. <i>ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of the CRS for Institutional Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	12
Table 8. <i>ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of OSL for Institutional Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	12
Table 9. <i>Institutional Outcomes by CRS-OSL Group for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	13
Table 10. <i>Release Outcomes by Institutional Adjustment for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019 with a Conditional Release.</i>	17
Table 11. <i>Release Outcomes by Security Risk for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	17
Table 12. <i>Release Outcomes by CRS for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	18
Table 13. <i>Association between the CRS and Release Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	18
Table 14. <i>ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of the CRS for Release Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	18
Table 15. <i>Return to Custody by OSL for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	19
Table 16. <i>Association between OSL and Release Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.</i>	19
Table 17. <i>ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of OSL for Release Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st,</i>	

2013 and March 31st, 2019. 19

Introduction

The Custody Rating Scale (CRS) is an objective security classification rating tool employed by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) to help determine an offender's security level at intake. The CRS includes two subscales, Institutional Adjustment and Security Risk, with scores together informing a security classification designation of minimum, medium, or maximum. The CRS is used in conjunction with structured professional assessment of an offender's institutional adjustment, escape risk, and public safety risk to determine an appropriate Offender Security Level (OSL; see [*Commissioner's Directive 705-7*](#)).

The Ministry Secretariat of the Solicitor General of Canada designed and developed the CRS to enhance consistency in the security classification of federal offenders across Canada (Research Division, Ministry Secretariat, 1987). In 1989, the CRS was pilot tested as an objective instrument to inform initial security level in the Quebec and Pacific regions (Porporino et al., 1989). The instrument was subsequently nationally implemented as a component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process in 1994.

A national validation study was completed in 1996 (Luciani, Motiuk & Nafekh, 1996). This study determined the efficacy of the CRS as evidenced by psychometric and operational criteria. Specifically, concordance between the CRS and actual security classification (OSL) was 74%. Convergent validity was highlighted by significant correlations between the CRS and other instruments, such as the Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale. It was also determined that the CRS was predictive of institutional and post-release outcomes, with a higher CRS designation corresponding with poorer outcomes.

The most recent validation study for men offenders affirmed the appropriateness of the CRS to inform security classification at intake (Gobeil, 2011). This study drew on a dataset of Indigenous and non-Indigenous men admitted to federal custody between 2008 and 2009. With respect to predictive validity, the study found that CRS designations were predictive of involvement in minor and major institutional incidents, conviction of serious institutional charges, and receipt of discretionary release. These findings were true for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous men.

As noted by Gobeil (2011), periodic revalidation of the CRS remains necessary given the dynamic nature of the offender population. As part of a series of validation studies, the present study examines the predictive validity of the CRS for men offenders admitted to federal custody between 2013/2014 and 2018/2019. Results pertaining to the concordance between the CRS and OSL, conceptual congruence across intake measures, as well as predictive validity for other offender subgroups are presented in separate reports.

Method

Data

A dataset of all federal admissions between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019 included 38,952 men. Cases included both Warrant of Committal (WOC) admissions (i.e., offenders entering federal custody on a new federal sentence) as well as readmissions tied to conditional release revocation. For consistency purposes, the same exclusionary process was applied to all analyses using the men's dataset. Exclusions were made based on case factors that could present limits to analysis ($N = 965$); specifically, cases involving offenders under provincial jurisdiction or who had a court ordered release, were transferred to a foreign country, or who died prior to sentence completion were excluded. Cases with missing data on the CRS or on key variables needed to examine convergent validity and discordance patterns (i.e., Dynamic Need, Static Risk, Motivation, Criminal Risk Index) were also excluded ($N = 7,325$).¹ Duplicate cases within the WOC and revocation groups were removed (i.e., a unique offender could only appear once per group), resulting in a total of 23,007 unique offenders in the WOC group and 6,240 unique offenders in the revocation group. Missing value analyses confirmed that cases with missing data were not meaningfully different from cases without missing data and the removal of cases with missing data did not impact results. Analyses were conducted separately for the WOC and revocation groups, given that the two groups are at distinct sentence stages and may have certain profile differences.

¹ Cases marked by missing data included legacy cases within the revocation dataset that involved original admissions that occurred prior to the development of the current OIA process, cases subject to a [Compressed Offender Intake Assessment \(COIA\)](#), as well as cases affected by other factors influencing administrative data.

Measures

Custody Rating Scale

The CRS includes two independently scored subscales, namely Institutional Adjustment (five items) and Security Risk (seven items). The CRS designation is based on the scores of the two subscales in conjunction with established cut-off values for minimum, medium and maximum groups:

Minimum security	0 to 85 on the Institutional Adjustment dimension and 0 to 63 on the Security Risk dimension.
Medium security	Between 86 and 94 on the Institutional Adjustment dimension and between 0 and 133 on the Security Risk dimension; or between 0 and 85 on the Institutional Adjustment dimension and between 64 and 133 on the Security Risk dimension.
Maximum security	95 or greater on the Institutional Adjustment dimension or 134 or greater on the Security Risk dimension.

- i. The **Institutional Adjustment** subscale of the CRS includes items that are tied to institutional behaviour/involvement in incidents:
 1. Previous institutional incidents
 2. Escape history
 3. Street stability
 4. Alcohol/drug use
 5. Age at sentencing

- ii. The **Security Risk** subscale of CRS includes items tied to public safety risk:
 1. Prior conviction count
 2. Most severe outstanding charge
 3. Current offence severity
 4. Sentence length
 5. Street stability
 6. Prior conditional releases
 7. Age at first federal admission

Offender Security Level

Offender Security Level (OSL) refers to an offender's actual security classification as minimum, medium, or maximum. OSL is indicative of the institutional security level at which the offender is housed. The CRS is one component of the initial OSL decision-making process. In an Assessment for Decision report, the Parole Officer must also undertake a professional assessment of institutional adjustment, escape risk, and public safety risk and assign ratings of low, moderate, or high in each case. Based on results of the CRS and structured professional judgement, the Parole Officers puts forth an OSL recommendation. The Institutional Head or District Director determines the final OSL decision except in situations where case factors mandate a higher level of authorization (see [Commissioner's Directive 705-7](#)). As per [Commissioner's Directive 710-6](#), a Security Classification Review and Assessment for Decision must be completed at least once every two years for offenders classified as maximum or medium security (and following certain case milestones in the case of Indigenous offenders). The CRS is not used to inform security reassessment; instead, the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS) or Security Reclassification Scale for Women (SRS-W) is used.

Outcome Measures

- i. **Institutional incidents:** Institutional incidents are recorded in the Offender Management System (OMS) and are categorized by type of incident. The presence of 'any incident' reflects an offender's involvement in at least one security or behavioural incident during the sentence for which the CRS was applied and following CRS administration. Only incidents with a role qualifier of 'instigator' or 'victim' were included. The specific incident types of assault, behaviour related, and contraband were also analyzed separately.
- ii. **Institutional charges:** Disciplinary charges are recoded in OMS and are categorized as minor or serious. The variable 'any charge' pertains to an offender's receipt of any serious or minor disciplinary charge during the sentence for which the CRS was applied and following CRS administration. Only charges resulting in an outcome of 'guilty' were included. Serious and minor charges were also analyzed as separate outcomes.

Additional outcomes tied to release were explored in line with previous validation studies (Luciani,

Motiuk, Nafekh, 1996; Grant & Luciani, 1998; Gobeil, 2011). Post-release outcomes, however, were not used for validation purposes given that the CRS is tied to institutional behaviour and is not intended to predict community behaviour.

- i. Release suspension:** In cases in which an offender was released from federal custody on the sentence for which the CRS was applied, release suspension reflects the presence of at least one suspension of the offender's conditional release. A suspension of an offender's conditional release may occur: (a) when a breach of release conditions has occurred; (b) to prevent a breach of conditions; or (c) to protect society (see: [*Commissioner's Directive 715-2*](#)).
- ii. Release revocation:** In cases in which an offender was released from federal custody on the sentence for which the CRS was applied, release revocation reflects the presence of at least one revocation, with or without a new offence, tied to the offender's conditional release. As per the [*Corrections and Conditional Release Act*](#) (CCRA), the Parole Board of Canada has the authority to revoke an offender's conditional release.
- iii. Release revocation with offence:** In cases in which an offender was released from federal custody on the sentence for which the CRS was applied, release revocation with offence reflects the presence of at least one revocation in which the offender incurred a new criminal offence.

Analytic Strategy

Descriptive statistics were computed to understand the characteristics of the WOC and revocation admission groups. This included analyses of sentence information and CRS and OSL distributions. The association between the CRS and institutional outcomes was examined to consider whether a higher CRS corresponded with a greater likelihood of negative institutional events. The level of predictive accuracy of the CRS with respect to institutional outcomes was also examined using Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves. Institutional outcomes were also explored in relation to OSL. Release outcomes were examined for the purpose of consistency with prior validation studies; however, given that the CRS pertains to the institutional environment and is not intended to predict release outcomes, results from this analysis are largely contained in the Appendix.

Results

Profile Information

A majority of offenders in both the WOC and revocation groups were serving their first federal sentence, though offenders in the WOC group were less likely to be federal recidivists (28% versus 41%; see Table 1). A small percentage of offenders were serving an indeterminate sentence (i.e., 4% in the WOC group and 1% in the revocation group). Among those serving determinate sentences, average sentence length was shorter for the WOC group compared to the revocation group (i.e., 3.6 years compared to 4.7 years). In terms of major index offence, offenders in the WOC group were most often serving time for a drug offence (22%), a sexual offence (18%), assault or robbery (14% in both cases). Offenders in the revocation group were most often serving time for robbery (26%), assault (17%), a drug offence (15%), or a property offence (15%).

Table 1. *Sentence Information of Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Characteristic	Warrant of Committal Admissions		Revocation Admissions	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Sentence Number				
First	16570	72.0%	3692	59.2%
Second Or Higher	6437	28.0%	2548	40.8%
Sentence Length				
Four Years or Less	15654	68.0%	3461	55.5%
Over Four Years to Six Years	3942	17.1%	1411	22.6%
Over Six Years to 10 Years	1972	8.6%	888	14.2%
Over Ten Years	506	2.2%	405	6.5%
Indeterminate	933	4.1%	75	1.2%
Major Index Offence				
Assault	3195	13.9%	1075	17.2%
Drug Offence	4949	21.5%	956	15.3%
Homicide Related	2057	8.9%	432	6.9%
Other Non-Violent Offence	1908	8.3%	444	7.1%
Other Violent Offence	1349	5.9%	287	4.6%
Property Offence	2266	9.8%	927	14.9%
Robbery	3099	13.5%	1635	26.2%
Sexual Offence	4159	18.1%	484	7.8%
Missing	25	0.1%	-	-

Custody Rating Scale Distribution

Institutional Adjustment

In terms of the Institutional Adjustment subscale of the CRS, the distribution was similar for the WOC and revocation groups. A majority of offenders had low Institutional Adjustment (82% for the WOC group, and 78% for the revocation group; see Table 2). A small subset had high Institutional Adjustment (14% and 16%). Relatively few offenders had medium Institutional Adjustment (4% and 6%).

Security Risk

Scores on the Security Risk subscale fell mainly in the low and medium categories (high ratings were uncommon; see Table 2). A majority of offenders in both the WOC and revocation groups had medium Security Risk, however, the percentage was higher in the revocation group (i.e., 80% versus 62%) due to a smaller percentage of offenders in the revocation group having a low rating (i.e., 16% versus 34%). The percentage of offenders with high Security Risk was 4% for both groups.

Custody Rating Scale

A majority of offenders in both the WOC and revocation groups had a medium designation on the CRS, however the percentage was higher for the revocation group (68%) compared to the WOC group (54%; see Table 2). This corresponded with a greater percentage of offenders in the WOC group having a minimum designation (31%, compared to 14% for the revocation group). The percentage of offenders with a maximum designation was 15% and 18% for the WOC and revocation groups respectively.

Offender Security Level

The OSL distribution was 27% minimum, 63% medium, and 10% maximum for the WOC group, and 10% minimum, 78% medium, and 12% maximum for the revocation group (see Table 2). Security decreases were slightly more common (i.e., 14% and 16% in the WOC and revocation groups respectively) than security increases (i.e., 12% and 15%).

Table 2. *Distribution of CRS Subscales and CRS Designation for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Rating	Warrant of Committal Admissions		Revocation Admissions	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Institutional Adjustment				
Low	18958	82.4%	4894	78.4%
Medium	862	3.7%	351	5.6%
High	3187	13.9%	995	15.9%
Security Risk Score				
Low	7716	33.5%	990	15.9%
Medium	14275	62.0%	4977	79.8%
High	1016	4.4%	273	4.4%
Custody Rating Scale				
Minimum	7190	31.3%	881	14.1%
Medium	12319	53.5%	4246	68.0%
Maximum	3498	15.2%	1113	17.8%
Offender Security Level				
Minimum	6311	27.4%	629	10.1%
Medium	14497	63.0%	4857	77.8%
Maximum	2199	9.6%	754	12.1%

Institutional Outcomes

Within the WOC group, 59% of offenders were involved in at least one institutional security or behavioural incident. Incident subtypes included assault (25%), behaviour related (31%), and contraband (35%). Offenders in the revocation group were somewhat less likely to be involved in incidents (i.e., 45% overall, 14% for assault, 22% for behaviour related, and 24% for contraband). Escape incidents were uncommon; in total, 0.7% of the WOC group, and 1.4% of the revocation were involved in an escape incident. With respect to charges, 52% of offenders in the WOC group received at least one charge (44% received a minor charge, 32% received a serious charge). As in the case of incidents, offenders in the revocation group were less likely to receive a charge (i.e., 39% overall, 29% for minor and 22% for serious). More favourable outcomes for offenders in the revocation group may be tied to the larger proportion of sentence served at the time of readmission.

The CRS was associated with both institutional outcomes (incidents and charges), with the overall CRS designation having a stronger association than the Institutional Adjustment and Security Risk

components independently. Specifically, a higher CRS score was associated with a greater likelihood of involvement in an incident and receipt of a charge (minor or serious). The strength of the association was greater in relation to the WOC group relative to the revocation group. OSL was similar to CRS with respect to the association with institutional outcomes for the WOC group, which is unsurprising given the high degree of CRS-OSL concordance for this group (see Table 3 to Table 6). A higher CRS score was also associated with a greater likelihood of return to custody following conditional release (see Appendix A). The association was slightly stronger with respect to OSL versus CRS.

Table 3. *Institutional Outcomes by CRS Designation for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Outcome	Custody Rating Scale Designation					
	Warrant of Committal Admissions			Revocation Admissions		
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Minimum	Medium	Maximum
Any Incident	2532 35.2%	7851 63.7%	3173 90.7%	257 29.2%	1899 44.7%	664 59.7%
Any Minor Charge	1677 23.3%	5959 48.4%	2490 71.2%	148 16.8%	1221 28.8%	453 40.7%
Any Serious Charge	691 9.6%	4376 35.5%	2225 63.6%	86 9.8%	928 21.9%	382 34.3%
Any Charge	1962 27.3%	7203 58.5%	2894 82.7%	197 22.4%	1640 38.6%	591 53.1%

Table 4. *Institutional Outcomes by OSL for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Outcome	Offender Security Level					
	Warrant of Committal Admissions			Revocation Admissions		
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Minimum	Medium	Maximum
Any Incident	1906 30.2%	9599 66.2%	2051 93.3%	201 32.0%	2151 44.3%	468 62.1%
Any Minor Charge	1336 21.2%	7163 49.4%	1627 74.0%	146 23.2%	1374 28.3%	302 40.1%
Any Serious Charge	342 5.4%	5496 37.9%	1454 66.1%	52 8.3%	1074 22.1%	270 35.8%
Any Charge	1486 23.5%	8714 60.1%	1859 84.5%	168 26.7%	1861 38.3%	399 52.9%

Table 5. Association between CRS Subscales and CRS Designation and Institutional Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.

Institutional Outcome	Association (ϕ_c)					
	Warrant of Committal Admissions			Revocation Admissions		
	IA	SR	CRS	IA	SR	CRS
Any Incident	.283	.310	.376	.138	.137	.173
Any Minor Charge	.252	.268	.322	.105	.121	.148
Any Serious Charge	.324	.300	.382	.125	.138	.166
Any Charge	.285	.319	.378	.120	.152	.177

Note. IA = Institutional Adjustment; SR = Security Risk; CRS = Custody Rating Scale

Table 6. Association between OSL and Institutional Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.

Institutional Outcome	Association (ϕ_c)	
	Warrant of Committal Admissions	Revocation Admissions
	Any Incident	0.392
Any Minor Charge	0.317	.095
Any Serious Charge	0.389	.155
Any Charge	0.382	.128

The Area Under the Curve (AUC) values were examined to assess the predictive ability of the CRS and OSL in relation to institutional outcomes (see Table 7 and Table 8). With respect to the WOC group, AUC values for any incident, any minor charge, and any charge fell above the threshold of ‘acceptable’ predictive accuracy as per established guidelines (i.e., 0.60 or greater; Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000). The AUC value for any serious charge was higher, exceeding the threshold for ‘good’ predictive accuracy (i.e., 0.70). Predictive accuracy was similar for OSL relative to CRS for the WOC group. Across outcomes, predictive accuracy was lower for the revocation group in the case of both the CRS and OSL.

Table 7. *ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of the CRS for Institutional Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Outcomes	ROC Analyses					
	Warrant of Committal			Revocation Admissions		
	AUC	SD	95% CI	AUC	SD	95% CI
Any Incident	.698	.003	.692 - .704	.582	.006	.571 - .594
Any Charge	.697	.003	.691 - .703	.586	.006	.574 - .598
Any Minor Charge	.669	.003	.663 - .675	.577	.007	.565 - .590
Any Serious Charge	.712	.003	.706 - .718	.595	.007	.581 - .608

Note. AUC = Area Under the Curve; SD = Standard Deviation; CI = Confidence Interval

Table 8. *ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of OSL for Institutional Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Outcomes	ROC Analyses					
	Warrant of Committal			Revocation Admissions		
	AUC	SD	95% CI	AUC	SD	95% CI
Any Incident	.696	.003	.691 - .702	.561	.005	.550 - .571
Any Charge	.688	.003	.683 - .694	.555	.005	.544 - .565
Any Minor Charge	.657	.003	.651 - .663	.541	.006	.530 - .553
Any Serious Charge	.706	.003	.700 - .711	.578	.006	.566 - .590

Note. AUC = Area Under the Curve; SD = Standard Deviation; CI = Confidence Interval

When examining the CRS-OSL concordant/discordant groups, those with a security level decrease to minimum were more likely than concordant minimum security offenders to have negative institutional events, though less likely than concordant medium security offenders (see Table 9). Specifically, the percentage of offenders involved in incidents was 27% for the concordant minimum group, 38% for the minimum security decrease group, and 68% for the medium concordant group. This indicates that, while offenders with a security decrease to minimum tended not to fair as well as offenders with a CRS of minimum, they tended to fair better than those who remained at a medium security level. Offenders who had a security level increase to medium were considerably more likely than concordant minimum security offenders to be involved in incidents and incur charges, though were less likely than concordant medium security offenders. Offenders who had a security level increase to maximum fared very similarly to concordant maximum security offenders. However, offenders who had a security decrease from maximum to medium

faired similarly to the maximum concordant group. These patterns could indicate that professional judgement in security level decision-making is exercised most effectively in regards to security decreases from medium to minimum and security increases from medium to maximum.

Table 9. *Institutional Outcomes by CRS-OSL Group for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Outcome	Minimum		Medium		Maximum		
	Concordant	Security Decrease	Security Increase	Concordant	Security Decrease	Security Increase	Concordant
Any Incident	27%	38%	49%	68%	87%	91%	93%
Any Charge	20%	32%	40%	63%	80%	86%	85%

Discussion

The current study of men offenders admitted to federal custody between 2013/2014 and 2018/2019 revealed that CRS designations were associated with institutional outcomes for new admissions. As established in previous studies, a higher CRS was associated with a greater likelihood of involvement in incidents and receipt of charges. The overall CRS designation proved to have a stronger association with institutional outcomes than the two subscales independently. With respect to predictive accuracy, AUC values fell above the threshold of 'acceptable' or 'good' predictive accuracy for the WOC group. Similar patterns of association and predictive accuracy were observed for OSL. This is unsurprising, given the degree of concordance between the CRS and OSL, and suggests general efficacy in the use of professional judgement.

An important caveat is that the CRS had a weaker association and limited predictive accuracy when it came to the revocation group. Previous studies have not differentiated between the validity of the CRS for initial versus revocation admissions. The separation of WOC and revocation groups could explain the higher predictive accuracy of CRS for the WOC group in the current study, relative to the most recent prior analysis for men offenders (i.e., Gobeil, 2011).

The present study is not without limitations. The analytical approach does not take into account how institutional environments may shape access to interventions and likelihood of involvement in incidents. However, it is not possible to remove social context from behavioural outcomes and therefore develop an outcome that would not be impacted by the nature of the environment. In addition, involvement in incidents and receipt of charges as measures of institutional performance do not provide a complete picture of an offender's adjustment in custody; such measures also do not capture levels of severity in adjustment difficulties or allow room for change over time.

Conclusion

The CRS tool is a key component of the initial security classification process for federal offenders. Standardized approaches to decision-making can ensure that the same points of consideration are incorporated across diverse cases and by distinct staff, while a level of structured professional assessment complements the tool's objectivity. The present analysis highlights that, for men offenders admitted to federal custody on a new sentence, the CRS is predictive of institutional outcomes in a manner that would be theoretically expected (i.e., a higher CRS score is associated with a greater likelihood of negative institutional events). The study also highlights the importance of structured professional judgement in decision-making. The effective use of discretion in terms of discordant security level decisions was evident by the similar predictive ability of the CRS and OSL.

References

- Gobeil, R. (2011). *The Custody Rating Scale as applied to male offenders (Research Report R-256)*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Grant, B. & Luciani, F. (1998). *Security classification using the Custody Rating Scale*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Hosmer, D.W. & Lemehow, S. (2000). *Applied logistic regression (section edition)*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Luciani, F. P., Motiuk, L. L., & Nafekh, M. (1996). *An operational review of the Custody Rating Scale: Reliability, validity and practical utility*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Porporino, F. J., Luciani, F., Motiuk, L., Johnston, M., & Mainwaring, B. (1989). *Pilot implementation of a Custody Rating Scale: Interim report*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Research Division, Ministry Secretariat. (1987). *Development of a security classification model for Canadian federal offenders*. Ottawa, ON: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Appendix A: Additional Tables

Table 10. *Release Outcomes by Institutional Adjustment for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019 with a Conditional Release.*

Release Outcome	Institutional Adjustment					
	Warrant of Committal Admissions with a Conditional Release			Revocation Admissions with a Conditional Release		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Suspension	6583	503	1773	2660	235	701
	37.3%	65.4%	70.2%	55.4%	68.1%	73.5%
Revocation	5776	414	1501	1323	121	376
	32.7%	53.8%	59.5%	27.5%	35.1%	39.4%
Revocation with Offence	817	59	219	228	21	76
	4.6%	7.7%	8.7%	4.7%	6.1%	8.0%

Table 11. *Release Outcomes by Security Risk for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Release Outcome	Security Risk					
	Warrant of Committal Admissions with a Conditional Release			Revocation Admissions with a Conditional Release		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Suspension	1985	6834	40	430	3032	134
	26.1%	51.6%	34.8%	43.6%	62.1%	58.0%
Revocation	1741	5916	34	151	1558	111
	22.9%	44.7%	29.6%	15.3%	31.9%	48.1%
Revocation with Offence	192	898	5	27	279	19
	2.5%	6.8%	4.3%	2.7%	5.7%	8.2%

Table 12. *Release Outcomes by CRS for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Release Outcome	Custody Rating Scale					
	Warrant of Committal Admissions with a Conditional Release			Revocation Admissions with a Conditional Release		
	Min.	Med.	Max.	Min.	Med.	Max.
Suspension	1659	5612	1588	359	2509	728
	23.4%	48.4%	70.0%	40.9%	60.0%	69.7%
Revocation	1477	4875	1339	132	1254	434
	20.8%	42.0%	59.1%	15.1%	30.0%	41.6%
Revocation with Offence	161	735	199	25	217	83
	2.3%	6.3%	8.8%	2.9%	5.2%	8.0%

Table 13. *Association between the CRS and Release Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Release Outcome	Association (ϕ_c)					
	Warrant of Committal Admissions with a Conditional Release			Revocation Admissions with a Conditional Release		
	IA	SR	CRS	IA	SR	CRS
Suspension	.235	.248	.303	.141	.138	.167
Revocation	.193	.217	.258	.098	.155	.162

Note. IA = Institutional Adjustment; SR = Security Risk; CRS = Custody Rating Scale

Table 14. *ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of the CRS for Release Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Outcomes	ROC Analyses					
	Warrant of Committal			Revocation Admissions		
	AUC	SD	95% CI	AUC	SD	95% CI
Suspension	.602	.003	.595 - .608	.565	.006	.553 - .576
Revocation	.637	.003	.631 - .644	.583	.006	.571 - .596

Note. AUC = Area Under the Curve; SD = Standard Deviation; CI = Confidence Interval

Table 15. *Return to Custody by OSL for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Release Outcome	Offender Security Level					
	Warrant of Committal Admissions with a Conditional Release			Revocation Admissions with a Conditional Release		
	Min.	Med.	Max.	Min.	Med.	Max.
Suspension	1085	6923	851	239	2808	549
	17.3%	51.1%	74.8%	38.3%	59.1%	75.5%
Revocation	1087	5891	713	109	1395	316
	17.4%	43.4%	62.7%	17.5%	29.4%	43.5%
Revocation with Offence	130	859	106	13	259	53
	2.1%	6.3%	9.3%	2.1%	5.5%	7.3%

Table 16. *Association between OSL and Release Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted to Federal Custody on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Release Outcome	Association (ϕ_c)	
	Warrant of Committal Admissions with a Conditional Release	Revocation Admissions with a Conditional Release
Suspension	0.347	.178
Revocation	0.277	.135

Table 17. *ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of OSL for Release Outcomes for Men Offenders Admitted on a Warrant of Committal or Revocation to Federal Custody Between April 1st, 2013 and March 31st, 2019.*

Outcomes	ROC Analyses					
	Warrant of Committal			Revocation Admissions		
	AUC	SD	95% CI	AUC	SD	95% CI
Suspension	.612	.003	.606 - .618	.569	.005	.559 - .580
Revocation	.639	.003	.633 - .645	.561	.006	.550 - .573

Note. AUC = Area Under the Curve; SD = Standard Deviation; CI = Confidence Interval