CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.

RESEARCH REPORT

Validation of the Custody Rating Scale for Black Men Offenders

Correctional Service Canada   Service correctionnel Canada

Canada

Validation of the Custody Rating Scale for Black 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; Black Offenders*

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).

Prior validation studies have examined the validity of the CRS for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders, however, the tool's validity for Black offenders has yet to be assessed. As part of a series of validation studies, the present analysis examines the validity of the CRS for Black men offenders admitted to federal custody on a Warrant of Committal (WOC; $N = 1,813$) or following a revocation of conditional release ($N = 428$) between 2013/2014 and 2018/2019.

For new admissions, results indicate a clear association between institutional outcomes and CRS designation and OSL classification. Specifically, a higher designation or rating was associated with a greater likelihood of involvement in a negative institutional event (incident or charge). With respect to the predictive accuracy of the CRS, Area Under the Curve (AUC) values reached the threshold for 'good' predictive accuracy in the case of receipt of a serious charge and receipt of any serious charge. AUC values for receipt of a minor charge and involvement in an incident exceeded the threshold of 'acceptable' predictive accuracy. Predictive accuracy was similar for OSL relative to CRS; AUC values exceeded the threshold of 'acceptable' predictive accuracy across all outcomes. In the case of readmissions, the strength of the association between CRS and institutional outcomes was weaker. Likewise, both the CRS and OSL had lower predictive accuracy for this group.

Overall, these results indicate that the CRS holds predictive validity for Black men offenders at initial intake. Therefore, the CRS is conceptually appropriate for use among this group. As predictive validity was lower for readmissions, further inquiry may be needed to examine the appropriateness of the tool for offenders readmitted to custody following a failed conditional release.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

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.

Since the national implementation of the CRS across CSC, a series of validation studies have examined the appropriateness of the tool's use in federal corrections. The first national validation study established the tool's convergent and predictive validity (Luciani, Motiuk & Nafekh, 1996). Subsequent validation studies have affirmed the validity of the tool for Indigenous and non-Indigenous men (Gobeil, 2011) and Indigenous and non-Indigenous women (Blanchette, Verbrugge & Wichmann, 2002; Barnum & Gobeil, 2012).

As the CRS has yet to be examined among Black offenders, the present study assesses the predictive validity of the CRS for Black 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 the predictive validity of the CRS 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. The present analysis examines men identified as Black, which included 1,813 men in the WOC group and 428 men in the revocation group.

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:

---

[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.

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

4

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

Among Black offenders admitted to federal custody between 2013/2014 to 2018/2019, a majority were serving their first federal sentence; federal recidivists accounted for 22% of the WOC group, and 30% of the revocation group. A majority of offenders in both groups were serving relatively short (i.e., less than four year) sentences, with a small percentage serving indeterminate sentences (i.e., 6% in the WOC group, and 0.5% in the revocation group). Within the WOC group, offenders were most often serving time for a drug offence (24%), followed by robbery (16%) and assault (16%). Within the revocation group, offenders were most often serving time for robbery (27%), followed by a drug offence (20%) and assault (19%; see Table 1).

Table 1. *Sentence Information of Black 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	
Sentence Number				
First	1409	77.7%	300	70.1%
Second Or Higher	404	22.3%	128	29.9%
Sentence Length				
Four Years or Less	1017	56.1%	204	47.7%
Over Four Years to Six Years	415	22.9%	108	25.2%
Over Six Years to 10 Years	212	11.7%	87	20.3%
Over Ten Years	63	3.5%	27	6.3%
Indeterminate	106	5.8%	†	†
Major Index Offence				
Assault	283	15.6%	81	18.9%
Drug Offence	429	23.7%	84	19.6%
Homicide Related	218	12.0%	35	8.2%
Other Non-Violent Offence	200	11.0%	39	9.1%
Other Violent Offence	124	6.8%	31	7.2%
Property Offence	56	3.1%	16	3.7%
Robbery	295	16.3%	117	27.3%
Sexual Offence	204	11.3%	25	5.8%
Missing	†	†	†	†

†Information supressed due to frequency fewer than 5.

Custody Rating Scale Distribution

Institutional Adjustment

The distribution of Institutional Adjustment ratings was similar for the WOC and revocation groups (see Table 2). Around three quarters of offenders in both groups had a low rating (i.e., 73% for the WOC group and 75% for the revocation group). A small percentage of offenders had a medium rating (i.e., 5% and 8%). Offenders in the WOC group were somewhat more likely to have a high rating (i.e., 23% versus 17%).

Security Risk

There was greater variation across the WOC and revocation groups when it came to Security Risk (see Table 2). While most offenders in both groups had a medium rating (i.e., 73% in the WOC group and 87% in the revocation group), offenders in the WOC group were more likely to have a low rating (i.e., 21% versus 10%). Relatively few offenders had a high rating (i.e., 6% and 3%).

Custody Rating Scale

With respect to the CRS designation, there was somewhat more heterogeneity in the WOC group relative to the revocation group (see Table 2). Offenders in the WOC group were more likely to have a minimum classification relative to the revocation group (i.e., 19% versus 9%) and were slightly more likely to have a maximum designation (i.e., 24% versus 19%). The percentage of offenders with a medium designation was 58% for the WOC group, and 72% among the revocation group.

Offender Security Level

The distribution for actual security classification, or OSL, also demonstrated greater heterogeneity within the WOC group relative to the revocation group, with somewhat less concentration of medium classifications (i.e., 65% versus 77%; see Table 2). Specifically, offenders in the WOC group were more likely to have a minimum classification (19% versus 9% for offenders in the revocation group), and slightly more likely to have maximum classification (17% versus 14%). Security decreases from the CRS designation were noted in 16% of cases for both the WOC and revocation groups, while security increases were evident in 9% of cases for the WOC group, and 11% of cases for the revocation group.

Table 2. *Distribution of CRS Subscales and CRS Designation for Black 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	
	N	%	*N*	%
Institutional Adjustment				
Low	1314	72.5%	321	75.0%
Medium	89	4.9%	35	8.2%
High	410	22.6%	72	16.8%
Security Risk Score				
Low	372	20.5%	42	9.8%
Medium	1328	73.2%	374	87.4%
High	113	6.2%	12	2.8%
Custody Rating Scale				
Minimum	334	18.4%	37	8.6%
Medium	1050	57.9%	310	72.4%
Maximum	429	23.7%	81	18.9%
Offender Security Level				
Minimum	338	18.6%	39	9.1%
Medium	1175	64.8%	328	76.6%
Maximum	300	16.5%	61	14.3%

Institutional Outcomes

The percentage of offenders involved in an institutional incident was 69% for the WOC group, and 43% for the revocation group. Among the WOC group, the percentage of offenders involved in incident subtypes was 34% for assault, 45% for behaviour related, and 43% for contraband related. The percentages for the revocation group were 12% for assault, 25% for behaviour related, and 21% for contraband related. The percentage of offenders who received an institutional charge was 61% for the WOC group (52% received a minor charge, 40% received a serious charge), and 40% for the revocation group (32% received a minor charge, 23% received a serious charge). More favourable outcomes for offenders in the revocation group may be tied to the larger proportion of sentence served at the time of readmission.

CRS designation was tied to institutional outcomes in that offenders with a higher designation were more likely to be involved in negative institutional events (incidents and charges). Among

the WOC group, the percentage of offenders involved in at least one institutional incident was 41%, 68% and 92% for offenders with a minimum, medium and maximum CRS designation respectively, and the percentage of offenders who received at least one institutional charge was 27%, 61% and 86% across the three security levels. While the same conceptual pattern was evident for the revocation group (i.e., a higher CRS corresponded with greater likelihood of involvement in a negative institutional event), the strength of the association was weaker. The CRS was also tied to release outcomes (suspension or revocation), but with a weaker association relative to institutional outcomes. OSL was generally very similar to CRS with respect to associations with institutional and release outcomes (see Table 3 to Table 6 and Appendix A).

Table 3. *Institutional Outcomes by CRS Designation for Black 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	136	713	396	12	121	50
	40.7%	67.9%	92.3%	32.4%	39.0%	61.7%
Any Minor Charge	78	538	327	5	93	40
	23.4%	51.2%	76.2%	13.5%	30.0%	49.4%
Any Serious Charge	34	389	293	†	67	32
	10.2%	37.0%	68.3%	†	21.6%	39.5%
Any Charge	91	643	370	5	117	47
	27.2%	61.2%	86.2%	13.5%	37.7%	58.0%

†Information supressed due to frequency fewer than 5.

Table 4. *Institutional Outcomes by OSL for Black 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	129	833	283	16	126	41
	38.2%	70.9%	94.3%	41.0%	38.4%	67.2%
Any Minor Charge	82	623	238	7	101	30
	24.3%	53.0%	79.3%	17.9%	30.8%	49.2%
Any Serious Charge	25	483	208	†	75	23
	7.4%	41.1%	69.3%	†	22.9%	37.7%
Any Charge	94	747	263	8	124	37
	27.8%	63.6%	87.7%	20.5%	37.8%	60.7%

†Information supressed due to frequency fewer than 5

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

| Institutional Outcome | Association (φc) | | | | | |
| | Warrant of Committal Admissions | | | Revocation Admissions | | |
	IA	SR	CRS	IA	SR	CRS
Any Incident	.292	.280	.358	.184	.080	.189
Any Minor	.300	.269	.341	.147	.141	.202
Any Serious	.364	.274	.387	.170	.176	.222
Any Charge	.337	.302	.389	.166	.176	.229

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

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

| Institutional Outcome | Association (φc) | |
	Warrant of Committal Admissions	Revocation Admissions
Any Incident	.364	.202
Any Minor	.328	.167
Any Serious	.378	.183
Any Charge	.371	.203

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). For the WOC group, the AUC value for any charge and any serious charge reached the threshold for 'good' predictive accuracy (i.e., 0.70; Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000), with the AUC value for any incident nearly reaching the threshold. The AUC value for any minor charge fell above the threshold of 'acceptable' predictive accuracy (i.e., 0.60). Predictive accuracy was similar for OSL relative to CRS for the WOC group; AUC values exceeded the threshold of 'acceptable' predictive accuracy across all outcomes. Across the four institutional 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 Black 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	.697	.011	.676 - .719	.582	.022	.538 - .625
Any Charge	.702	.011	.681 - .723	.605	.022	.563 - .647
Any Minor Charge	.674	.011	.653 - .696	.598	.023	.553 - .643
Any Serious Charge	.703	.011	.682 - .723	.618	.028	.570 - .667

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

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

| Outcomes | Area Under the Curve (AUC) | | | | | |
| | Warrant of Committal | | | Revocation Admissions | | |
	AUC	SD	95% CI	AUC	SD	95% CI
Any Incident	.691	.011	.670 - .712	.578	.022	.525 - .610
Any Charge	.684	.010	.663 - .704	.588	.021	.548 - .629
Any Minor Charge	.660	.010	.640 - .681	.576	.022	.532 - .619
Any Serious Charge	.689	.010	.670 - .708	.592	.023	.546 - .637

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

Discussion

The results of the present study indicate that the CRS holds predictive validity for Black men offenders admitted to federal custody on a new sentence. A higher CRS designation was associated with a greater likelihood of involvement in a negative institutional event, and the CRS held 'acceptable' to 'good' predictive accuracy with respect to institutional outcomes. Actual security classification, or OSL, produced conceptually similar patterns with respect to institutional outcomes. This reflects a relatively high degree of concordance between the CRS and OSL and suggests deviations from the CRS designation are not prompting conceptual discrepancies between security classification and institutional outcomes.

The association between the CRS and institutional outcomes was weaker, and the tool's predictive accuracy lower, when it came to readmissions, i.e., offenders readmitted to custody following a failed conditional release. Similar patterns were evident in relation to OSL. The current analysis does not shed light on the factors that may contribute to the lower predictive accuracy of the tool for readmissions, and further inquiry may be warranted to explore the appropriateness of the tool for readmissions.

Conclusion

Ongoing validation of the CRS is necessary to ensure that the tool is appropriate to use for diverse offender groups and within a dynamic offender population. The present study was the first to examine the predictive validity of the CRS tool for Black men offenders. Findings suggest the CRS holds predictive validity for Black men offenders at initial intake; thus, the CRS is conceptually appropriate for use among this group. However, predictive validity was lower for readmissions, suggesting the need to re-examine use of the CRS for offenders readmitted to custody following a failed conditional release.

References

Barnum, G., & Gobeil, R. (2012). *Revalidation of the Custody Rating Scale for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women offenders (Research Report R-273).* Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

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 9. *Release Outcomes by Institutional Adjustment for Black 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	378	35	172	144	15	50
	31.1%	44.9%	57.7%	45.4%	42.9%	70.4%
Revocation	321	25	128	60	6	27
	26.4%	32.1%	43.0%	18.9%	17.1%	38.0%
Revocation with Offence	31	†	15	7	†	†
	2.6%	†	5.0%	2.2%	†	†

Table 10. *Release Outcomes by Security Risk for Black 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	93	488	†	12	189	8
	25.3%	40.2%	†	29.3%	51.1%	66.7%
Revocation	70	403	†	†	84	5
	19.0%	33.2%	†	†	22.7%	41.7%
Revocation with Offence	7	41	†	†	11	†
	1.9%	3.4%	†	†	3.0%	†

†Information supressed due to frequency fewer than 5.

Table 11. *Release Outcomes by CRS for Black 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	71	355	159	11	143	55
	21.4%	36.0%	58.5%	30.6%	46.6%	68.8%
Revocation	57	301	116	†	60	30
	17.2%	30.5%	42.6%	†	19.5%	37.5%
Revocation with Offence	6	27	15	†	7	†
	1.8%	2.7%	5.5%	†	2.3%	†

†Information supressed due to frequency fewer than 5.

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

| Release Outcome | Association (φc) | | | | | |
| | Warrant of Committal Admissions with a Conditional Release | | | Revocation Admissions with a Conditional Release | | |
	IA	SR	CRS	IA	SR	CRS
Suspension	.217	.131	.237	.189	.142	.207
Revocation	.141	.134	.172	.174	.123	.196

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

Table 13. *ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of the CRS for Release Outcomes for Black 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	.557	.012	.532 - .581	.593	.021	.551 - .634
Revocation	.594	.013	.568 - .619	.606	.027	.553 - .658

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

Table 14. *Return to Custody by OSL for Black 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	42	440	103	10	154	45
	12.5%	40.3%	64.0%	25.6%	47.5%	75%
Revocation	51	352	71	†	66	24
	15.1%	32.2%	44.1%	†	20.4%	40.0%
Revocation with Offence	6	32	10	†	9	†
	1.8%	2.9%	6.2%	†	2.8%	†

†Information supressed due to frequency fewer than 5.

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

Release Outcome	Association (φc)	
	Warrant of Committal Admissions with a Conditional Release	Revocation Admissions with a Conditional Release
Suspension	.299	.243
Revocation	.183	.197

Table 16. *ROC Analyses: Predictive Ability of OSL for Release Outcomes for Black 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	.577	.011	.555 - .599	.601	.020	.562 - 640
Revocation	.594	.012	.571 - .617	.601	.025	.551 - .650

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