



Correctional Service  
Canada

Service correctionnel  
Canada



SAFETY, RESPECT  
AND DIGNITY  
FOR ALL

LA SÉCURITÉ,  
LA DIGNITÉ  
ET LE RESPECT  
POUR TOUS

*File #394-2-85*  
*Evaluation Report:*  
*Aboriginal Community Development*  
*Officers*

Evaluation Branch  
Policy Sector  
December 2009



## EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

### Evaluation Report Prepared by:

**Tamara Jensen,**

Evaluation Officer

Evaluation Branch, Policy

Correctional Service Canada

**Mark Nafekh**

Director

Evaluation Branch, Policy

Correctional Service Canada

### Evaluation Team Members:

Vanessa Anastasopoulos, Senior Evaluator

Dennis Batten, Senior Evaluator

Christopher Rastin, Evaluation Officer

Paul Verbrugge, Evaluation Officer

Amanda Nolan, Evaluation Analyst

Marcie McKay, Evaluation Analyst

Michael Henighan, Evaluation Analyst

Lindsey Pecaric, Evaluation Analyst

Brittany MacDonald, Evaluation Analyst

Elizabeth Loree, Evaluation Analyst

**Correctional Service Canada's  
Aboriginal Community Development Officers**

**SIGNATURES**

.....

**Lynn Garrow**  
Associate Assistant Commissioner  
Policy

.....

Date

.....

**Dr. Pamela M. Yates**  
Director General  
Evaluation Branch

.....

Date

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Introduction

The Aboriginal Community Development Officer (ACDO) initiative supports and promotes the involvement of Aboriginal communities in correctional activities and provides information about policy and procedures regarding Section 84 releases. Section 84 of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (CCRA, 1992) places a legal responsibility on Correctional Service Canada (CSC) to provide the Aboriginal community with the opportunity to participate in the release planning process. As such, the ACDO initiative is intended to serve as a bridge between the CSC and Aboriginal communities/organizations (Correctional Service Canada [CSC], 2006a).

The role of the ACDO is to liaise with Aboriginal communities and institutional staff, such as institutional parole officers, Native Liaison Officers, Elders, Aboriginal offenders, and community parole officers. The ACDO is also a source of knowledge and a facilitator of Section 84 processes and implementation, as well as CSC's first point of contact in many instances with Aboriginal communities. To encourage strong partnerships with area Parole Officers, most of the ACDO positions were originally located in the District Parole Offices. The table below shows the current locations of available ACDO Full time equivalents (FTE) and the position occupancies by region.

| Region   | Number of Available FTEs | Number of Occupied Positions ( <i>n</i> ) by Location   |
|----------|--------------------------|---|
| Pacific  | 4                        | New Westminster Parole Office (1)<br>Prince George Parole (1)<br>Fraser Valley / Abbotsford Parole Office (1)<br>Victoria Parole Office (1) |
| Prairies | 3                        | Saskatoon Parole (1)<br>Manitoba/Saskatchewan NW Ontario District Office (1)<br>Alberta NWT District Parole (1)                             |
| Ontario  | 3                        | Regional Headquarters (2)<br>Iqaluit District Parole (0)  |
| Quebec   | 1                        | East/West Quebec District (0)   |
| Atlantic | 1                        | Regional Headquarters (1)   |
| Total    | 12                       | (10)  |

### Evaluation Context

The Effective Corrections Evaluations were conducted between July 2008 and June 2009 as part of the mandated Treasury Board of Canada evaluation policy. The Effective Corrections Evaluations consist of five distinct evaluations – specifically the ACDO Initiative, Pathways Initiative, Community Employment Centres (CEC), Community Maintenance Program (CMP)

and Residential Alternatives (RA). The focus of the present report is on the Aboriginal Community Development Officer Initiative.

As outlined in *Commissioner's Directive 702: Aboriginal Offenders*,

Aboriginal Community Development Officers assist in the reintegration of Aboriginal offenders in Aboriginal communities, providing a bridge between CSC and the Aboriginal communities or organizations and facilitating the Section 84 process in conjunction with the Parole Officers.... support[ing] the Aboriginal communities in providing release plans to be incorporated into Parole Officer reports for submission to the National Parole Board (CSC, 2008a, s.51).

Recognizing the need for culturally appropriate programming for Aboriginal peoples, the purpose and scope of the ACDO initiative are aligned with the CSC Review Panel findings on the federal correctional system (CSC Review Panel, 2007) and a broader Government of Canada approach to addressing the needs of Aboriginal peoples (Aboriginal Horizontal Framework, 2005).

The *Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety* was published in December 2007, focusing on the operations, policies and plans of CSC to strengthen its contribution to public safety. The report sets out a vision for transforming the federal correctional system based on an increased emphasis on offender responsibility and accountability, the elimination of drugs from prisons, the provision of more employment and employability skills for offenders, and the modernization of physical infrastructure. The review contained significant components related to issues impacting Aboriginal offenders, stating “[there is a] need for CSC to be responsive to the disparities between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders through appropriate Aboriginal-specific measures” (CSC Review Panel, 2007, p.82) making specific references to the need to expand increase the number of Aboriginal Community Development Officers. Furthermore, the CSC Review Panel (2007) states in its report that ACDOs are “...critical in supporting Aboriginal communities as they build capacity to participate in the reintegration process. More of these positions are needed and their activities should be specifically focused on working with reserves and other Aboriginal communities that are actively supporting reintegration and employment of offenders” (p. 86).

In 2004, the Government of Canada established horizontal collaboration between 20 government departments pertaining to Aboriginal issues, known as the Aboriginal Horizontal Framework. This framework consists of seven themes (health, lifelong learning, safe and sustainable communities, housing, economic opportunities, land and resources, and governance and relationships) with the ACDOs having direct involvement in the Safe and Sustainable Communities theme. Specifically, the Safe and Sustainable Communities theme makes direct contributions to the needs of Aboriginal peoples with, among other departments and programs, CSC contributing to programming for Aboriginal federal offenders. CSC's contributions include healing lodges, sex offender treatment programs, and of particular relevance, the ACDO initiative (Aboriginal Horizontal Framework, 2005).

## Evaluation Strategy

The evaluation was conducted by the Evaluation Branch, CSC. The evaluation was completed to inform decision-making on the future disposition ACDOs and focused on success, cost-effectiveness, continued relevancy, implementation, as well as unintended effects.

The evaluation used both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Information used to facilitate these analyses was collected through:

- Interviews with key sources;<sup>1</sup>
- Data derived from CSC's automated data base - the Offender Management System (OMS), and the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) data;
- A review of relevant documentation (Commissioner's Directives (CDs) relevant to ACDOs, CCRA, information provided by CSC staff members to the evaluation team, and a previous evaluation of the ACDO initiative conducted in 2004); and,
- A review of the relevant literature regarding similar Aboriginal-specific initiatives.

Interviews were conducted by the evaluation team and members of CSC's Evaluation Branch, in person and by telephone during the months of March and April, 2009.

Data collected by ACDOs were used to identify offenders' engagement in Section 84 release planning ( $N = 759$ ) and the extent and nature of contacts made by ACDOs in federal institutions and in the community ( $N = 1,364$  contacts). Subsequently, two groups were created, a group of offenders who were engaged in the Section 84 release process through their interactions with an ACDO, and a comparison group of Aboriginal offenders who were not engaged or did not seek a Section 84 release plan. A multivariable approach to modeling was chosen to statistically control for any underlying differences that may have contributed to program effect other than program participation, such as offenders' age, risk, and need level.<sup>2</sup>

Effectiveness outcomes were defined as community outcomes (technical revocations and re-offending) which extended past the end of an offender's federal sentence.

## Financial Expenditures

Funding for the ACDO initiative was provided by the federal government to CSC as part of a larger initiative to increase Canadian public protection while containing Canada's incarceration rate and associated costs. In the spring of 2000, a strategy was approved for three categories of

---

<sup>1</sup>Sources included but were not limited to: ACDOs, Community Parole Officers, Elders/ Spiritual Advisors, Institutional Parole Officers, Aboriginal Liaison Officers, Community Parole Officer Supervisors, Aboriginal Community Liaison Officers, Institutional Parole Officer Supervisors, Community Program Officer Supervisors, Community Delivery Staff members, Correctional Program Managers, Regional Administrator for Aboriginal Initiatives, psychologists, and Associate District Directors.

<sup>2</sup> A multivariable approach was chosen over *a priori* subject matching (e.g., propensity score matching, exact matching) as a method for controlling confounding variables and reducing bias, because the former produces similar results and also allows for the examination of the effects of other covariates on the outcome. Also, study participants are less likely to be lost due to an inability to find controls who have the same distribution of matching factors as the study participants (Cepeda, Boston & Strom, 2003; Dohoo, Martin, & Stryhn, 2003; Shah, Laupacis, Hux, & Austin, 2005).

offender interventions – Aboriginal Corrections, Community Corrections Infrastructure, and Public Education/Citizen Engagement. The initiative is also referred to as the Effective Corrections Initiative. Funding for this strategy was provided to three departments within the Department of Public Safety portfolio: CSC, National Parole Board (NPB), and Public Safety Canada (PS).

Actual ACDO financial expenditures from fiscal years 2005-2006 to 2008-2009. were, on average, \$461,484 per year, including both salary dollars and operating costs.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> This figure represents yearly averages of both salaries and operating expenditures, from 2005/06 to 2008/09.



## **Key Findings**

**FINDING 1:** *The ACDO initiative is consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities, and is congruent with other Aboriginal-specific initiatives that aim to improve capacity for the safe and successful reintegration of Aboriginal offenders.*

**FINDING 2:** *The goals of the ACDO initiative are consistent with comparable initiatives in international jurisdictions, including Australia and New Zealand, where Aboriginal people are similarly over-represented among correctional populations.*

**FINDING 3:** *There is a continued need for the ACDO initiative, given the goals and objectives of the initiative and the current offender profile.*

**FINDING 4:** *Staff members indicated that there are barriers to implementing the ACDO initiative, including a shortage of staff members, lack of training, and the sharing of ACDO-related activities with Parole Officers.*

**FINDING 5:** *More than one-third of Section 84 release plans are initiated later rather than at the beginning of an offender's sentence.*

**FINDING 6:** *ACDOs actively liaise with Aboriginal communities and institutional staff members for the purposes of release planning and raising awareness.*

**FINDING 7:** *Offenders and staff members indicated that there are many stakeholders involved in Section 84 release planning, including ACDOs and Parole Officers, and the offenders.*

**FINDING 8:** *For every Section 84 release plan completed at the time of offenders' National Parole Board hearings, there was one plan pending or incomplete.*

**FINDING 9:** *Institutional and community outcomes were more positive for those involved in the Section 84 release process who had a Section 84 release plan completed when compared to those who did not have a plan completed.*

**FINDING 10:** *Both staff members and offenders interviewed indicated that the ACDO initiative facilitates the safe reintegration of offenders into the community.*

**FINDING 11:** *The level of cost-efficiency for the ACDO initiative was not optimized due to the number of incomplete release plans at the time of parole hearings.*

**FINDING 12:** *The ACDO initiative is cost-effective, as demonstrated through the cost-savings associated with reduced incarceration time for those with completed Section 84 release plans.*

## **Recommendations**

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** To facilitate monitoring and performance reporting, CSC should ensure that ACDOs record all information contained in the current ACDO Tracking Tool into CSC's automated Offender Management System. Further, this information should be reported in CSC's Departmental Performance Report to measure progress against Section 84 of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** CSC should establish clear guidelines regarding Section 84 release planning. These guidelines should designate the roles and responsibilities of ACDOs, Institutional Parole Officers, Community Parole Officers, and any other staff members required to facilitate the entire continuum of the Section 84 release process.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** CSC should develop a strategy to optimize the number of Section 84 release plans completed as early as possible in the sentence, thus increasing the likelihood of a discretionary release, and maximising value-for-money.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS.....  | III       |
| SIGNATURES.....   | IV        |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....   | V         |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....   | XI        |
| LIST OF TABLES .....  | XIII      |
| LIST OF FIGURES .....   | XIII      |
| LIST OF ACRONYMS .....  | XIV       |
| INTRODUCTION.....   | 1         |
| <b>1. Program Profile .....</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.1. Background .....</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.2. CSC Policy and Legislation.....</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>1.3. Effective Corrections Initiative and Aboriginal Community Development<br/>        Officers .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>1.4. The Section 84 Release Process.....</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>1.5. Governance Structure .....</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>1.6. Financial Expenditures.....</b>   | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>1.7. Planned Results .....</b>   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>1.8. Evaluation Context .....</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| <b>1.9. Purpose of Evaluation.....</b>  | <b>11</b> |
| <b>1.10. Logic Model .....</b>  | <b>12</b> |
| <b>2. EVALUATION METHOD.....</b>  | <b>13</b> |
| <b>2.1 Scope of the Evaluation .....</b>  | <b>13</b> |
| <b>2.2 Sample Composition .....</b>   | <b>14</b> |
| 2.2.1 <i>Offenders Who Have Participated in the ACDO Initiative</i> .....                                     | 14        |
| 2.2.2 <i>Key Sources of Qualitative Data</i> .....  | 16        |
| <b>2.3 Measures.....</b>  | <b>18</b> |
| 2.3.1 <i>Automated Data</i> .....   | 18        |
| 2.3.1.1 <i>Static and Dynamic Levels of Intervention, Reintegration Potential, and Motivation Level</i> ..... | 18        |
| 2.3.1.2 <i>Community Correctional Outcomes</i> .....  | 19        |
| 2.3.3 <i>Semi-Structured Interviews</i> .....   | 21        |
| 2.3.4 <i>Financial Information</i> .....  | 22        |
| 2.3.5 <i>Document Review</i> .....  | 22        |
| <b>2.4 Procedures .....</b>   | <b>23</b> |
| <b>2.5 Analyses .....</b>   | <b>24</b> |
| <b>2.6 Limitations.....</b>   | <b>26</b> |
| <b>3.0 KEY FINDINGS .....</b>   | <b>27</b> |
| <i>Objective 1: Continued Relevancy:</i> .....  | 27        |
| <i>Objective 2: Implementation:</i> .....   | 33        |
| <i>Objective 3: Success:</i> .....  | 39        |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <i>Efficiency:</i> .....   | 39 |
| <i>Effectiveness:</i> .....  | 40 |
| <i>Cost-Efficiency:</i> .....  | 42 |
| <i>Objective 4: Cost-Effectiveness:</i> .....  | 43 |
| <b>APPENDICES</b> .....  | 48 |
| <b>Appendix 1: The Section 84 Release Process</b> .....  | 48 |
| <b>Appendix 2: Effective Corrections Evaluation Matrix</b> .....                               | 51 |
| <b>Appendix 3: Schedule I Offences</b> .....   | 55 |
| <b>Appendix 4: Themes from Qualitative Interview Questions</b> .....                           | 59 |
| <b>Appendix 5: Descriptions of Aboriginal-Specific Correctional Programs Offered by CSC</b> 65 |    |
| <b>Appendix 6: ACDO’s Contact Activity</b> .....   | 68 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Table 1: Locations of Available ACDO FTEs and Current Position Occupancy by Region.</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Table 2: ACDO Financial Expenditures by Region.....</b>                                   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Table 3: ACDO Participants’ Static Risk and Dynamic Need Ratings .....</b>                | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Table 4: ACDO Participants’ Dynamic Factors Identification .....</b>                      | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Table 5: Key Informant Ratings of Release Planning and Information Sharing Practices.</b> | <b>36</b> |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Figure 1: Logic Model for the ACDO Initiative.....</b> | <b>12</b> |
|---|-----------|

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| ACDO | Aboriginal Community Development Officer |
| ACLO | Aboriginal Community Liaison Officer     |
| AID  | Aboriginal Initiatives Directorate       |
| ALO  | Aboriginal Liaison Officer               |
| CCRA | Corrections and Conditional Release Act  |
| CD   | Commissioner's Directive                 |
| CRS  | Custody Rating Scale                     |
| CSC  | Correctional Service Canada              |
| ECI  | Effective Corrections Initiative         |
| FTE  | Full time equivalent                     |
| NHQ  | National Headquarters                    |
| NPB  | National Parole Board                    |
| OMS  | Offender Management System               |
| PS   | Public Safety                            |
| SDC  | Senior Deputy Commissioner               |

# INTRODUCTION

## 1. Program Profile

### 1.1. Background

The Aboriginal Community Development Officer (ACDO) initiative supports and promotes the involvement of Aboriginal communities in correctional activities and provides information about policy and procedures regarding Section 84 releases. The initiative is intended to serve as a bridge between the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) and Aboriginal communities/organizations (Correctional Service Canada [CSC], 2006a).

Although only approximately 4% of Canadians identified themselves as Aboriginal in the 2006 Census, Aboriginal offenders were and continue to be over-represented in the federal offender population; 18% of all offenders in CSC were Aboriginal during 2006/07 (Babooram, 2008). From 1998/99 to 2007/08, the Aboriginal population under federal jurisdiction increased by 19.7%. Specifically, the number of incarcerated Aboriginal women increased steadily from 71 in 1998/99 to 164 in 2007/08, representing an increase of more than 131% in ten years. The number of incarcerated Aboriginal men increased by 15.9% during the same period, from 2,151 to 2,493. The number of Aboriginal offenders on community supervision also increased by 19.9% during this period, from 956 to 1,146, accounting for 13.6% of the total community population under supervision in 2007/08. Of the total number of Aboriginal offenders under federal jurisdiction in 2007/08, 41% were incarcerated or supervised in the Prairie Region (Public Safety Canada, 2008).

In addition to the historic and continued growth of the Aboriginal offender population, statistics suggest that CSC will face challenges related to continued growth and potential shifts in the geographic distribution of Aboriginal offenders. Statistics Canada projections to 2017 indicate that the over-representation of Aboriginal peoples among newly sentenced offenders will continue to grow in federal and provincial/territorial correctional systems, particularly in the West and the North (Statistics Canada, 2005). Of particular relevance is the projection that the 20-29 year old age group – the age group that has the greatest potential for criminal activity – will increase by over 40%. This is more than four times the projected growth rate of 9% for the non-Aboriginal population.

Statistics also indicate that, relative to non-Aboriginal offenders, Aboriginal offenders are more likely to be: (a) admitted to federal custody for violent offences (56% versus 42% of non-

Aboriginal offenders); (b) classified as having a higher risk of reoffending; and (c) rated as having higher needs for rehabilitation (Rugge, 2006).

The responsivity principle of effective correctional interventions states that programs and services should be delivered in a manner consistent with offenders' learning styles and abilities (Andrews & Bonta, 2006). Responsivity factors are not criminogenic needs, but are factors that may influence the effectiveness of treatments that target criminogenic needs. Culture is a responsivity factor that should be taken into consideration in program and service delivery. In a study of five Aboriginal communities in the Prairie Region, interviews with key informants (including members of Aboriginal households, institutional and community Elders, community circles, and incarcerated and released Aboriginal offenders) revealed that additional community services and programs must be made available for offenders who return to the community (Saulis, Fiddler & Howse, 2000). Of the offenders interviewed who had been released from institutions, the transitional phase of release to the community was considered the most difficult phase. Post-release preparation was considered a necessity to assist in successful re-adjustment. Specifically, an on-reserve community reintegration program to promote community acceptance, awareness, and needs of released offenders was considered essential. Incarcerated Aboriginal offenders indicated that a reintegration transitional phase involving Elders would be essential to develop basic life-skills and coping strategies, and to promote healing and wellness through traditional ways. Community-based initiatives, such as Elders' counseling, traditional and cultural activities, and healing circles were identified as necessities for successful reintegration into Aboriginal communities.

## **1.2. CSC Policy and Legislation**

The emergence of a focus on Aboriginal offenders in corrections began with the implementation of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA)* in 1992. This legislation committed CSC to recognize the distinct needs of Aboriginal offenders and the need to work cooperatively with Aboriginal communities to address these needs. Sections 79 through 84 of the CCRA provide the framework for moving forward with a responsible, effective Aboriginal-based approach to providing institutional and community correctional programs and services to Aboriginal offenders. Through funding for the Effective Corrections Initiative (ECI), CSC strives to address the legislated obligations outlined in the CCRA Sections 79-84 for



Aboriginal offenders. Section 84 of the CCRA (1992) places a legal responsibility on CSC to provide the Aboriginal community with the opportunity to participate in the release planning process:

84. Where an inmate who is applying for parole has expressed an interest in being released to an aboriginal community, the Service shall, if the inmate consents, give the aboriginal community:

- (a). adequate notice of the inmate's parole application; and
- (b). an opportunity to propose a plan for the inmate's release to, and integration into, the aboriginal community.

In 1995, *Commissioner's Directive (CD) 702: Aboriginal Programming*<sup>4</sup> was implemented to "...ensure that Aboriginal offenders were provided with an equitable opportunity to practice their culture and traditions without discrimination and with the opportunity to implement traditional Aboriginal healing processes" (CSC, 1995). Prior to the ECI, CSC's capacity to fully implement the legislated requirements of the CCRA and guidelines of *CD 702* and, therefore, to address the over-representation of Aboriginal peoples in federal institutions was limited. However, a variety of program initiatives – primarily in the Prairie Region – were in place to supplement the work of Elders and Aboriginal Liaison Officers (ALO). The focus at that time was on institutional service delivery, which addressed culture, spirituality, and traditions.

In 2003, CSC introduced the Aboriginal Corrections Continuum of Care model that integrates correctional services and programs within the Medicine Wheel framework, recognizes Aboriginal peoples' past, present, and future, and involves Aboriginal communities in offenders' reintegration and healing journey (CSC, 2006b). As part of this continuum, the institutional environment utilizes Aboriginal-specific personnel and interventions to best meet the needs of Aboriginal offenders while they are incarcerated and to prepare them for a successful transition into the community. In the community, CSC strives to work in partnership with Aboriginal communities to provide care, treatment and reintegration support for Aboriginal offenders upon release. This support is deemed instrumental to reducing recidivism among Aboriginal offenders. Services and programs that were identified in the Continuum of Care Model include elders, ALO, Aboriginal Correctional Program Officers, healing lodges, Aboriginal Community Liaison

---

<sup>4</sup> As of 2008, *Commissioner's Directive 702 is Aboriginal Offenders*.

Officers (ACLO), Pathways healing units, and ACDOs, which are the focus of the present evaluation.

### **1.3. Effective Corrections Initiative and Aboriginal Community Development Officers**

In May 1996, the Solicitor General of Canada (now the Minister of Public Safety) and the Minister of Justice recommended a six-part strategy, to increase Canadian public protection while containing Canada's incarceration rate and associated costs. As part of this strategy, a Framework for *Enhancing the Role of Aboriginal Communities* was completed in 1999. It formed the basis for development of an "Effective Corrections Initiative" in partnership with the then Department of the Solicitor General and the National Parole Board (NPB), with funding for this initiative totaling \$18.6 million over five years (2000-01 to 2004-05). The majority of the funding (\$11.9 million) was initially dedicated to working with Aboriginal communities to develop additional Aboriginal healing lodges. Emerging research evidence was indicating that reconnection with families and communities improved outcomes and reduced recidivism.

However, by the end of 2002, two key barriers to the success and sustainability of healing lodges were identified (CSC, 2006b). First, despite the interest of some Aboriginal communities in developing healing lodges, several lacked the capacity and/or expertise to participate in the planning, development, and implementation of community-based alternatives. Further, priorities for rural and remote communities were centered on more immediate needs, such as health, housing, and economic development. Priorities in urban areas were targeting the same needs, as well as issues related to social marginalization for Aboriginal peoples.

Secondly, in 2002, an examination of outcomes for offenders who had been released from healing lodges found they had higher rates of recidivism when compared to Aboriginal offenders released from CSC minimum security institutions (19% versus 13%; Trevethan, Crutcher & Rastin, 2002). CSC lacked Aboriginal-specific programs in institutions to help offenders prepare for the healing lodge environment. An audit of access to spiritual and cultural services in 2002 indicated that only 3% of Aboriginal offenders self-identified their affiliation with Aboriginal spirituality on admission, suggesting the need for a continuum of interventions that would begin upon admission (CSC, 2002).

As a result of these findings, CSC refocused efforts on amending operational approaches throughout the sentence to help Aboriginal offenders reconnect with their culture and

communities, and to better understand the varied and unique needs of First Nations, Métis and Inuit offenders and their communities. At the end of this five-year initiative, CSC had developed and implemented a number of initiatives within the aforementioned Continuum of Care model. Included in these initiatives was the implementation of ACDOs.

In 2001/02, ACDOs were hired in each region to develop a national infrastructure for consistent delivery of Aboriginal community correctional initiatives. The first year of the initiative (2001) was spent on education, training, and organization. In general, ACDOs spent much of the second year (2002/03) establishing community contacts and educating CSC staff on the Section 84 implementation process. A manager in the Aboriginal Initiatives Directorate (AID) was assigned to this project to ensure the effective development and implementation of this initiative. Originally, the focus of ACDOs was to be on the development of both Section 81 agreements and Section 84 release planning, as defined in the CCRA.<sup>5</sup> However, the ACDO role has been refined to focus specifically on increasing the use of Section 84, through increased awareness and involvement of the Aboriginal community.

The role of the ACDO is to liaise with Aboriginal communities and institutional staff, such as institutional parole officers, ALOs, Elders, Aboriginal offenders, and community parole officers. The ACDO is also a source of knowledge and a facilitator of Section 84 processes and implementation, as well as CSC's first point of contact in many instances with Aboriginal communities. To encourage strong partnerships with area Parole Officers, most of the ACDO positions were originally located in the District Parole Offices. Table 1 shows the current locations of available ACDO Full time equivalents (FTE) and the position occupancies by region as of June 2009.

---

<sup>5</sup> Section 81 of the CCRA provides for the provision of correctional services to offenders through an agreement with the Aboriginal community. Section 84 of the CCRA provides an opportunity for the Aboriginal community to propose a plan for an offender's release to, and integration into, the Aboriginal community where an offender who is applying for parole has expressed an interest in being released to an Aboriginal community.

**Table 1: Locations of Available ACDO FTEs and Current Position Occupancy by Region**

| Region   | Number of Available FTEs | Number of Occupied Positions ( <i>n</i> ) by Location   |
|----------|--------------------------|---|
| Pacific  | 4                        | New Westminster Parole Office (1)<br>Prince George Parole (1)<br>Fraser Valley / Abbotsford Parole Office (1)<br>Victoria Parole Office (1) |
| Prairies | 3                        | Saskatoon Parole (1)<br>Manitoba/Saskatchewan NW Ontario District Office (1)<br>Alberta NWT District Parole (1)                             |
| Ontario  | 3                        | Regional Headquarters (2)<br>Iqaluit District Parole (0)  |
| Quebec   | 1                        | East/West Quebec District (0)   |
| Atlantic | 1                        | Regional Headquarters (1)   |
| Total    | 12                       | (10)  |

*Note:* Among the 12 available ACDO FTEs, nine are funded through the Effective Corrections Initiative and the remaining three (one in the Pacific, one in the Prairies, and one in the Quebec Region) are funded through the NHQ Funding Integrity Initiative.

As outlined in the description of work (Government of Canada, 2007) the ACDOs' roles and activities have centred on the following areas:

- Promoting the provisions of Section 84 and increasing Aboriginal community involvement through awareness and training in the Aboriginal community;
- Providing awareness training for Parole Officers and the National Parole Board;
- Promoting the provisions of Section 84 and increasing offender awareness of these provisions;
- Promoting the involvement of the Aboriginal community in federal institutions; and,
- Implementing measures to ensure consistent follow-up where Section 84 has been identified as an option for an offender.

#### **1.4. The Section 84 Release Process**

The Section 84 release process entails a series of 17 steps which provide a focused reintegration plan for Aboriginal offenders to enhance their ability to reintegrate successfully back into their home communities. The process begins with the preliminary assessment, post sentence community assessment, and intake assessment, which determine the offender's potential interest in and suitability for the Section 84 release process. Once an offender has committed to participate and has consented to case information disclosure, the ACDO sends a

package to the Aboriginal community; included in this package is a letter of personal introduction written by the offender, an informative letter regarding Section 84, written by the ACDO, and other relevant Section 84 literature. Following a community presentation by the ACDO on Section 84, the decision is made as to whether the offender will be accepted into the community. In the event of a positive decision, the ACDO works with a Section 84 review committee to develop the community release plan that would best support and assist the offender in his/her reintegration efforts. Once the plan has been reviewed by the offender, the Aboriginal Liaison Officer, and the Institutional Parole Officer, and signed off by the committee, the Community Parole Officer consults with the ACDO to assess the feasibility of the plan and the possibility of release into the Aboriginal community. Finally, the ACDO attends the NPB hearing to speak on the developed release plan for the offender and the decision is made regarding the implementation of Section 84.<sup>6</sup>

### **1.5. Governance Structure**

The Assistant Commissioner, Correctional Operations and Programs (ACCOP), is ultimately accountable for the Effective Corrections Initiative. The Senior Deputy Commissioner (SDC) has direct responsibility for the advancement of Aboriginal Corrections within CSC. The SDC's responsibilities include: (a) the provision of leadership in integrating Aboriginal initiatives within the federal government framework; (b) the management of Aboriginal Affairs; and (c) external collaboration and coordination with other levels of government. The Director General, AID, with the assistance of a National Elders Working Group, provides strategic advice on the development of intergovernmental initiatives and supports the SDC in his role.

The staff members responsible for the implementation and day-to-day operations of the ACDOs report directly to regional representatives, who in turn report to the Director General, Aboriginal Initiatives Branch (DG, AI). Ultimate control over all local institutional activities rests with the warden of each facility.

### **1.6. Financial Expenditures**

Funding for the ACDO initiative was provided by the federal government to CSC as part of a larger initiative to increase Canadian public protection while containing Canada's

---

<sup>6</sup> These 17 steps are outlined in greater detail in Appendix 1.

re-incarceration rate and associated costs. In the spring of 2000, a strategy was approved with allocated funding for three categories of offender interventions: Aboriginal Corrections, Community Corrections Infrastructure, and Public Education/Citizen Engagement. The strategy is also referred to as the Effective Corrections Initiative. Funding for this strategy was provided to three departments within the Department of Public Safety portfolio: CSC, NPB, and Public Safety Canada (PS).

Table 2 presents the actual ACDO financial expenditures from fiscal years 2005-2006 to 2008-2009. On average, CSC spends \$461,484 per year on the ACDO initiatives, including both salary dollars and operating costs.

**Table 2: ACDO Financial Expenditures by Region**

| Region  | Fiscal Year |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |             |           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|   | 2005-2006   |           | 2006-2007 |           | 2007-2008 |           | 2008-2009 |           | Total       |           |
|   | Salaries    | Operating | Salaries  | Operating | Salaries  | Operating | Salaries  | Operating | Salaries    | Operating |
| ALL CANADA  | \$307,212   | \$160,475 | \$280,000 | \$237,694 | \$297,617 | 237,685   | \$247,048 | \$78,206  | \$1,131,878 | \$714,059 |
| ATLANTIC  | \$36,067    | \$162     | \$67,985  | \$0       | \$68,614  | \$2,345   | \$50,474  | \$189     | \$223,140   | \$2,697   |
| RHQ Atlantic  | \$36,067    | \$162     | \$67,985  | \$0       | \$68,614  | \$2,345   | \$50,474  | \$189     | \$223,140   | \$2,697   |
| QUEBEC  | \$74,634    | \$12,853  | \$50,053  | \$31,255  | \$72,105  | \$21,485  | \$34,674  | \$1,869   | \$231,466   | \$67,463  |
| RHQ Quebec  |             | \$2,141   |           |           | \$0       | \$1,355   |           |           | \$0         | \$3,496   |
| Montreal Metro District<br>Parole Office                |             |           |           |           |           | \$948     |           |           | 0           | 948       |
| East West Quebec<br>District Parole Office              | \$74,634    | \$10,712  | \$50,053  | \$31,255  | \$72,105  | \$19,182  | \$34,674  | \$1,869   | \$231,466   | \$63,018  |
| ONTARIO   |             |           |           | \$59,207  | \$0       | \$26,699  |           | \$8,970   | \$0         | \$94,876  |
| RHQ Ontario   |             |           |           | \$59,207  |           | \$26,699  |           | \$8,970   | \$0         | \$94,876  |
| PRAIRIES  | \$128,629   | \$94,392  | \$129,445 | \$33,130  | \$95,871  | \$28,954  | \$78,017  | \$19,067  | \$431,961   | \$175,543 |
| RHQ Prairies  | \$0         | \$36,249  |           | \$7,977   |           | \$13,308  |           |           | \$0         | \$57,535  |
| Stony Mountain  |             |           |           |           |           | \$753     |           |           | \$0         | \$753     |
| Riverbend   |             |           |           |           |           | \$448     |           |           | \$0         | \$448     |
| Drumheller  |             |           |           |           |           | \$1,036   |           |           | \$0         | \$1,036   |
| Grande Cache  |             | \$1,038   |           |           |           |           |           |           | \$0         | \$1,038   |
| Bowden  |             |           |           |           |           | \$509     |           |           | \$0         | \$509     |
| Manitoba-Northwest<br>Ontario District Parole<br>Office | \$35,283    | \$2,880   | \$51,604  | \$2,942   | \$27,087  | \$3,836   | \$41,852  | \$12,453  | \$155,826   | \$22,111  |
| Saskatoon District<br>Parole Office                     | \$65,794    | \$5,563   |           |           |           |           |           |           | \$65,794    | \$5,563   |
| Northern Alberta<br>District Office                     | \$27,551    | \$48,662  | \$77,840  | \$22,211  | \$68,784  | \$9,063   | \$36,166  | \$6,613   | \$210,341   | \$86,550  |
| PACIFIC   | \$67,882    | \$53,067  | \$32,517  | \$114,103 | \$61,028  | \$158,200 | \$83,882  | \$48,111  | \$245,310   | \$373,481 |
| RHQ Pacific   |             |           |           |           | \$0       | \$5,874   |           |           | \$0         | \$5,874   |
| Shared services   |             |           |           | \$9,901   |           |           |           |           | \$0         | \$9,901   |
| Fraser Valley   |             |           |           |           |           |           | 3,348     |           | \$3,348     | \$0       |
| Pacific Parole Offices                                  | \$67,882    | \$53,067  | \$32,517  | \$104,201 | \$61,028  | \$152,327 | \$80,534  | \$48,111  | \$241,962   | \$357,706 |

Source: CSC NHQ Finance (2009).

## **1.7. Planned Results**

The two major planned results of the ACDO initiative are as follows:

- i. Through consistent application of the principles of Section 84 of the CCRA, ACDOs will play an active role in assisting Aboriginal communities in the release planning for the safe reintegration of Aboriginal offenders. ACDOs will therefore actively promote the provisions of Section 84, develop links between the Aboriginal community and CSC, and increase Aboriginal Community awareness and involvement in the Section 84 release planning process; and
- ii. There will be an increased community capacity to provide Aboriginal offenders with support upon their release to the community. This will be accomplished through the identification of residential and program services within the Aboriginal community that respond to the program and geographic needs of inmates prior to their release.

## **1.8. Evaluation Context**

In 2004, an evaluation of the Effective Corrections Initiative was conducted by the Evaluation and Review Branch at CSC that examined the extent to which ACDOs: (a) engaged in community and institutional consultation; (b) had an impact on the provision of effective and efficient services; and (c) had an overall impact on the Section 81/84 development process (CSC, 2004a). Findings from the 2004 evaluation were largely positive, suggesting that, through the activities of ACDOs, progress had been made in expanding CSC's contacts and engagement with Aboriginal communities by increasing the knowledge of staff, offenders, and the NPB with regard to Section 84 consultations and implementation issues. However, it was also found that uncertainty existed among staff members and offenders regarding the meaning of Section 84. For example, some staff members indicated that they thought Section 84 was a discretionary clause that was to be used if supporting an offender's parole application. Further, the high turnover of Parole Officers and the high number of people temporarily in these positions had a significant impact on the Section 84 process and the capacity for ACDOs to complete their work. Technical difficulties inherent in CSC's automated Offender Management System (OMS) were also identified that impeded the capacity to effectively capture Section 84 information, and thus the ability to measure increases in this activity.



Despite these challenges, positive findings of the 2004 evaluation included that, since their introduction, ACDOs had a substantial positive effect on the number of successful Section 84 consultations and that offenders who receive Statutory Release may also benefit from the Section 84 process. In addition, best practices in the Prairie and Pacific Regions were highlighted in the 2004 evaluation report, including the addition of contracts for supplementary assistance to ACDOs (e.g., in-reach workers and Community Liaison Officers), which appeared to be effective in increasing awareness of the processes and benefits of Section 84 among the Aboriginal community and offenders.

As a result of the 2004 evaluation findings, three recommendations were made:

1. CSC should continue with the ACDO initiative to enhance the goal of developing a national infrastructure for consistent delivery of Aboriginal community correctional initiatives;
2. The ACDO initiative should be utilized as a means of providing regular and consistent levels of staff and inmate awareness with respect to Section 84; and,
3. CSC should re-examine the regional ACDO funding structure with a view to re-allocating funds based in large measure on the size of the incarcerated Aboriginal population and the geographic size of the region.

Based on the results of the 2004 evaluation, ongoing funding of \$3.7 million annually was provided to continue the work of existing Aboriginal Community Development Officers to actively engage Aboriginal communities in release planning for Aboriginal offenders. As a condition of this approval, CSC is required to provide the Treasury Board of Canada with an evaluation of the contribution of the ACDO and other ECI Aboriginal reintegration initiatives to the broader CSC reintegration results.


### **1.9. Purpose of Evaluation**

The current evaluation was summative in nature, simultaneously exploring issues of relevance, success, and cost-effectiveness, in addition to implementation issues and unanticipated findings.

### 1.10. Logic Model

A logic model outlining the activities, outputs, and outcomes of the ACDO initiative is presented in Figure 1 (CSC, 2004b).

**Figure 1: Logic Model for the ACDO Initiative**



The outputs illustrated in the logic model represent what the program produces in order to achieve its goals. Outcomes refer to program goals or what program activities intend to change and/or create, and can also include unintended effects of program activities. As illustrated in the logic model, outcomes are grouped into immediate, intermediate and long-term goals.

## **2. EVALUATION METHOD**

### ***2.1 Scope of the Evaluation***

The evaluation was conducted by the Evaluation Branch, CSC, and various components were reviewed by CSC's AID, Strategic Policy and Intergovernmental Relations, Women Offender Sector, and Research Branch. This targeted evaluation was completed to inform decision-making on the future disposition of the ACDO initiative and focused on success, cost-effectiveness, continued relevancy, as well as unintended effects. Key results, performance indicators, analyses, and data sources for each of these evaluation objectives are listed in the Evaluation Matrix (see Appendix 2).

At the outset of the current evaluation, the following expected results were identified under each evaluation objective:

#### ***Objective #1: Continued Relevancy***

1. ACDO activities are consistent with other correctional reintegration strategies and continue to operate under originally intended principles and guidelines;
2. ACDOs serve the public interest; and
3. There is an appropriate, legitimate, and necessary role for the ACDO initiatives.

#### ***Objective #2: Program Implementation***

1. Staff members and offenders have knowledge of ACDO activities and their purpose;
2. The initiative operates according to standards set out in policy;
3. Activities are supported by both internal and external stakeholders;
4. Activities are carried out in a similar manner and fashion across regions; and
5. Partnerships exist and function at an optimal level.

#### ***Objective #3: Success (Effectiveness & Efficiency)***

1. Community contact for capacity development purposes occurs regularly;
2. There is a regular pattern of offender intervention;
3. There is a well developed cadre of tools and resources made available to aid in the facilitation of the offender reintegration process;
4. There is high usage of ACDOs by the targeted groups; and

5. The initiative's target group demonstrates positive results.

#### ***Objective #4: Cost-effectiveness***

1. Outputs / outcomes listed in the logic model have been effectively achieved with designated funding; and
2. ACDO value-for-money analyses yield positive results.

## ***2.2 Sample Composition***

### ***2.2.1 Offenders Who Have Participated in the ACDO Initiative***

Program participants were profiled to provide an overview of participant demographic and related correctional characteristics. The profile represents all offenders who had some level of contact with an ACDO between January 2002 and May 2008, regardless of whether they had been released on a Section 84 ( $N = 759$ ).

#### ***Demographics***

The majority of offenders involved in the ACDO initiative were from the Prairie Region (51%,  $n = 390$ ), followed by the Pacific (29%,  $n = 218$ ), Ontario (10%,  $n = 78$ ), Quebec (7%,  $n = 53$ ), and Atlantic (3%,  $n = 22$ ) Regions. The largest proportion of ACDO participants were First Nations (77%,  $n = 580$ ), followed by Métis (15%,  $n = 114$ ), non-Aboriginal (5%,  $n = 35$ ),<sup>7</sup> and Inuit (4%,  $n = 27$ ). On average, offenders were 30 years old at the time of admission for their current sentence ( $SD = 9.56$ , range: 16-67) and the vast majority were men (91%,  $n = 687$ ).

The average sentence length for ACDO participants was 4.2 years ( $SD = 2.78$ , range: 2-36), excluding those who have received an indeterminate sentence (16%,  $n = 121$ ). In terms of security classification, the largest proportion of offenders received a medium security rating (59%,  $n = 436$ ), followed by maximum (22%,  $n = 161$ ), and minimum (19%,  $n = 137$ ) security.

---

<sup>7</sup> Aboriginal status is self-reported.

### *Static and dynamic risk factors*<sup>8</sup>

Overall, offenders involved in the ACDO initiative scored relatively high on both static and dynamic risk factors. For instance, 74% ( $n = 549$ ) of ACDO participants had a high dynamic need rating and almost two thirds (63%,  $n = 467$ ) had a high risk to re-offend (see Table 3).

**Table 3: ACDO Participants' Static Risk and Dynamic Need Ratings**

| Characteristic    | ACDO Participants<br>$N = 761$ |     |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----|
|                   | $n$                            | %   |
| Dynamic Need      |                                |     |
| Low               | 22                             | 3%  |
| Medium            | 170                            | 23% |
| High              | 549                            | 74% |
| Risk to Re-offend |                                |     |
| Low               | 45                             | 6%  |
| Medium            | 229                            | 31% |
| High              | 467                            | 63% |

In terms of overall need domains, ACDO participants were highest need in the substance abuse domain, with 93% ( $n = 672$ ) having some or considerable substance abuse need, followed by personal/emotional (92%,  $n = 667$ ), employment (80%,  $n = 577$ ), associates (74%,  $n = 534$ ), family (62%,  $n = 446$ ), attitude (60%,  $n = 434$ ), and community needs (40%,  $n = 291$ ; Table 4).

<sup>8</sup> Static and dynamic risk factors were extracted from CSC's automated Offender Management System (OMS).

**Table 4: ACDO Participants' Dynamic Factors Identification**

| Characteristic            | ACDO Participants<br>N = 761 |     |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
|                           | <i>n</i>                     | %   |
| <b>Substance</b>          |                              |     |
| No need                   | 50                           | 7%  |
| Some/Considerable Need    | 672                          | 93% |
| <b>Personal/Emotional</b> |                              |     |
| No need                   | 55                           | 8%  |
| Some/Considerable Need    | 667                          | 92% |
| <b>Employment</b>         |                              |     |
| Asset/No need             | 145                          | 20% |
| Some/Considerable Need    | 577                          | 80% |
| <b>Associates</b>         |                              |     |
| Asset/No need             | 188                          | 26% |
| Some/Considerable Need    | 534                          | 74% |
| <b>Family</b>             |                              |     |
| Asset/No need             | 276                          | 38% |
| Some/Considerable Need    | 446                          | 62% |
| <b>Attitude</b>           |                              |     |
| Asset/No need             | 288                          | 40% |
| Some/Considerable Need    | 434                          | 60% |
| <b>Community</b>          |                              |     |
| Asset/No need             | 431                          | 60% |
| Some/Considerable Need    | 291                          | 40% |

### *Offence characteristics*

The majority of ACDO participants were incarcerated for violent offences<sup>9</sup> on their current sentence (66%, *n* = 492) and only a small portion were incarcerated for non-violent offences (8%, *n* = 62). Furthermore, 61% (*n* = 409) of ACDO participants had a history of youth offences, while 87% (*n* = 581) had previous adult offences. In addition, 21% (*n* = 138) of ACDO participants had a gang affiliation.<sup>10</sup>

### **2.2.2 Key Sources of Qualitative Data**

#### *Key Informant Interviewees*

A total of *N* = 60 key informants were interviewed across all five regions and National Headquarters (NHQ). Interviewees included but were not limited to: ACDOs, Community Parole

<sup>9</sup> Violent offences were defined by the Schedule I1 offences listed in the CCRA (1992). See Appendix 3 for a listing.

<sup>10</sup> Gang affiliation was identified through CSC intake assessment process.

Officers, Elders/ Spiritual Advisors, Institutional Parole Officers, Aboriginal Liaison Officers, Community Parole Officer Supervisors, ACLOs, Institutional Parole Officer Supervisors, Community Program Officer Supervisors, Community Delivery Staff members, Correctional Program Managers, Regional Administrator for Aboriginal Initiatives, psychologists, and Associate District Directors.

The majority of key informants were from the Prairies (39%,  $n = 23$ ) and Ontario Regions (25%,  $n = 15$ ); 17% ( $n = 10$ ) were from the Pacific Region, 10% ( $n = 6$ ) were from the Atlantic Region, 7% ( $n = 4$ ) were from the Quebec Region, and 2% ( $n = 1$ ) were from NHQ.

Among key informants, 68% ( $n = 40$ ) reported being involved in the ACDO initiative. The vast majority of interviewees indicated at least moderate familiarity with the Section 84 release planning process (98%,  $n = 54$ ) and with the ACDO initiative (91%,  $n = 53$ ). Among interviewees who indicated limited familiarity with the ACDO initiative (9%,  $n = 5$ ), the majority reported that information about the initiative would be beneficial to their work capacity and further indicated that they would like to learn more about the initiative.

The majority of key informants who reported being involved in the ACDO initiative were ACDOs (19%,  $n = 8$ ), followed by Community Parole Officers and Parole Officer Supervisors (14%,  $n = 6$ ), Elders / Spiritual Advisors (12%,  $n = 5$ ), Institutional Parole Officers and Parole Officer Supervisors (12%,  $n = 5$ ), and ALOs (10%,  $n = 4$ ). The remainder of the interviewees involved with the ACDO initiative included other CSC frontline staff (e.g., an Institutional Parole Officer with an Aboriginal-specific caseload, an Intake Assessment Parole Officer, and a Community Parole Officer Supervisor), as well as other senior CSC management staff (e.g., a Manager Assessment and Intervention, a Regional Administrator for Aboriginal Initiatives). Among interviewees who reported no direct involvement in the initiative (25%,  $n = 15$ ), respondents included Community Parole Officers, an Institutional Parole Officer, a Community Program Officer and Supervisor, a Program Manager, an ALO, an Elder, a Director of Justice Services for a Native Council, and a psychologist.

Among CSC staff interviewees, the average number of years working for CSC was 10.2 (ranging from 1 to 34 years), with an average of 4.6 years in their current position (ranging from 3 weeks to 28 years).

## *Offender Interviewees*

A total of 19 offenders who have participated in the ACDO initiative were interviewed. At the time of the interview, the majority of respondents reported residing in a correctional facility (61%,  $n = 11$ ), with the remaining respondents living in a Healing Lodge (22%,  $n = 4$ ), a Community Residential Facility (11%,  $n = 2$ ) or a homeless shelter (5%,  $n = 1$ ). Approximately half of the interviewees (53%,  $n = 10$ ) reported that they lived in an Aboriginal community prior to their most recent incarceration and four offenders (24%,  $n = 4$ ) reported living on a reserve at the time of the interview.

## **2.3 Measures**

### **2.3.1 Automated Data**

Offender information (such as offender demographic characteristics, sentence information, static and dynamic levels of intervention, reintegration potential, motivation level, correctional outcomes, time spent in the community, and other pertinent information) was extracted from CSC's OMS.

#### **2.3.1.1 Static and Dynamic Levels of Intervention, Reintegration Potential, and Motivation Level<sup>11</sup>**

Data captured in OMS include information collected during the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process, which is a comprehensive and integrated examination of offenders at the time of their admission. The process begins with an assessment of immediate mental and physical health concerns, security risk and suicide potential, and is followed by completion of the Criminal Profile and the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis (DFIA) conducted by Institutional Parole Officers and/or Primary Workers.

The indicators analysed in the intake process included:

- **Static factors** are based on historical information related to risk that is available at the time of the offender's admission to federal custody.
- **Dynamic factors** are the seven domain areas that contribute to criminal offending. Interventions within these domains can reduce the risk to public safety and improve the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

---

<sup>11</sup> See CSC *Commissioner's Directive 705-6: Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile* for a more detailed description of these measures.



- **Reintegration potential** of male non-Aboriginal offenders is automatically calculated by OMS using the offender's individual scores on the Custody Rating Scale (CRS), General Statistical Information on Recidivism (GSIR) and the Static Factor Rating. The reintegration potential of women offenders and Aboriginal offenders is automatically calculated by OMS using the offender's individual scores on the CRS, Dynamic Factor Rating and Static Factor Rating.
- **Motivation level** is scored as low, medium or high. A high motivation level is assigned to an offender who is self-motivated and actively addresses problem areas related to his or her criminality. A medium level of motivation is assigned to an offender who may not fully accept overall assessments but will participate in recommended programs or other interventions, and a low motivation level is assigned to an offender who strongly rejects the need for change or is unwilling to participate in recommended programs or interventions.

### ***2.3.1.2 Community Correctional Outcomes***

For the purposes of this evaluation, effectiveness of the ACDO initiative was measured by means of post-release outcomes, including provincial as well as federal re-offending. As such, post-release outcomes extended past the end of an offender's federal sentence. The series of outcomes were defined as follows:

- **Discretionary release** is considered for all offenders who are being released on statutory release or at warrant expiry date. For offenders who require more structured monitoring in order to maximize reintegration and public safety, a discretionary release allows for proper follow-up to take place. There are two forms of discretionary release: *day parole* can be granted after an offender has served six months of a sentence or six months before full parole, whichever is later, with conditions that require the offender to return daily to a penitentiary or a community-based residential facility; *full parole* can be granted after an offender has served one third of a sentence or seven years, whichever is less, allowing the offender to be at large prior to the completion of sentence.
- **Readmissions** include readmissions for technical revocations (violation of terms of conditional release without re-offence and revocation without offence) and readmissions for new offences (see definitions below).

- a) *Readmission with a New (Federal or Provincial) Offence:* Readmissions with a new offence include readmissions to either federal or provincial custody. Readmissions to federal custody include new warrant of committal offences (i.e., new sentence of two years or more), violation of terms of conditional release with an offence, revocation of parole with an offence, and revocation with an outstanding charge. Provincial readmissions include any new sentences past the expiry of the federal sentence that resulted in a return to provincial custody (i.e., a sentence of less than two years).
- b) *Readmission with a New (Federal or Provincial) Violent Offence:* Readmissions with a new federal or provincial violent offence include readmissions with a new offence, where the new offence was violent as defined by the Schedule I offences listed in the CCRA (1992).<sup>12</sup>
- c) *Readmission with a New (Federal or Provincial) Sex Offence:* readmissions with a new federal or provincial sex offence include admissions with a new offence, with the new offence being sexual in nature (e.g., sexual assault).

### **2.3.2 ACDO Program Data**

ACDO data were collected on an ongoing basis by each region, using the ACDO Tracking Tool,<sup>13</sup> and submitted to the NHQ AID. The ACDO Tracking Tool was comprised of two parts: (1) Section 84 engagements; and (2) Community Engagements.

The Section 84 portion included data pertaining to:

- i) the date the case was referred to the ACDO;
- ii) the region;
- iii) the institution at which the offender was housed when the case was referred to the ACDO;
- iv) the offender's full name;
- v) the offender's fingerprint serial (FPS) number;
- vi) whether the offender has self-identified as an Aboriginal person;
- vii) any gang affiliation;

---

<sup>12</sup> See Appendix 3 for a listing of Schedule I offences.

<sup>13</sup> The ACDO Tracking Tool is a data collection tool, designed in Microsoft Excel that ACDOs use to collect information specific to their Section 84 release planning and contact activities.

- viii) the date at which the offender expressed interest in the development of a Section 84 release plan;
- ix) the offender's home community;
- x) the community identified for release;
- xi) when the community was contacted;
- xii) if the offender previously had contact with the selected community; and ,
- xiii) the status of the Section 84 release.

For those offenders who had completed the Section 84 release plan, data were also collected on the status of their parole and the NPB's final decision.

The community engagement data included:

- i) the date on which the ACDO made contact with the community;
- ii) where the contact took place;
- iii) the name of the community contact;
- iv) whether it was the ACDO's initial contact with the community;
- v) the purpose of the contact; and,
- vi) the outcome of the meeting.

The collected data were drawn upon for subsequent analyses, including the development of the offender and contact profile for the ACDO initiative.

### **2.3.3 *Semi-Structured Interviews***

Semi-structured interviews created with Snap Survey software were used to facilitate the collection of information and to provide stakeholders with the opportunity to identify issues that may not have been considered prior to the evaluation. Participation in interviews was solicited by way of a request to contribute information relevant to the evaluation through face-to-face meetings. Unique interview formats were developed for key informants and for offenders who had applied for a Section 84 release and been in contact with an ACDO. Interviews were structured such that they addressed the following evaluation objectives: relevancy, design and implementation, success, and unintended effects. Key informant and offender interviews

included a mix of “closed” interview questions (e.g., dichotomous/5-point scale responses) and open-ended questions.

#### **2.3.4 Financial Information**

The key data source of financial information, used for the cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness analyses, was drawn from CSC’s Integrated Management Reporting System (IMRS). The calculation of the cost of maintaining an offender is based on actual salaries and operating expenditures as reflected in the 2008-09 Public accounts, including contribution to employee benefit plan but excluding the retroactive payments of salaries pertaining to previous years for newly signed collective agreements. It excludes capital expenses and CORCAN (a special operating agency) disbursements. A reallocation of costs for common services (e.g., personnel, finance, material management) and for other shared services (e.g., food, utilities) between certain adjacent institutions (e.g., Westmorland/Dorchester, Laval complex, Joyceville/Pittsburgh) was performed. In addition, a number of central charges (e.g. employee benefit plan, Perimetric Intrusion Detection System [PIDS] maintenance contract cost, CORCAN training cost, inmate clothing, officers uniforms and training costs of Correctional Management Learning Centre [CMLC]) were reallocated to the various sites.

#### **2.3.5 Document Review**

Documents reviewed for various components of the evaluation included:

- *Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA)*;
- Commissioner’s Directives (CDs) relevant to ACDOs;
- *CSC Strategic Plan for Aboriginal Corrections: Innovation, Learning and Adjustment* (CSC, 2006b)
- *Effective Corrections Initiative – Aboriginal Reintegration* (CSC, 2004a);
- *Evaluation Framework for the Effective Corrections Initiative* (CSC, 2004b);
- *Work Description: Aboriginal Community Development Officer* (Government of Canada, 2007)
- A review of the relevant literature regarding the relevancy, success, and cost-effectiveness of correctional programs;
- Detailed program descriptions provided by AID; and

- Information provided by CSC staff members to the evaluation team.

## **2.4 Procedures**

### **2.4.1 Selection of Comparison Groups**

ACDO program data submitted by each region to NHQ Aboriginal Directorate Initiatives were cleaned and merged with automated data from OMS. Specifically, each offender record was matched with corresponding OMS data such as demographic, static and dynamic factors data, and criminal offence histories. From this merged data set, two sub-samples of ACDO participants were identified to establish outcome and profile information:

1. **ACDO Section 84:** ACDO participants who were released on a Section 84; and,
2. **ACDO No Section 84:** ACDO participants who were not (or not yet) released on a Section 84 but who had some degree of contact with an ACDO.

A comparison group (“No ACDO”) of Aboriginal offenders who were eligible for conditional release at roughly the same time as the ACDO study groups was also constructed. The distribution of the day parole eligibility dates for offenders who had a completed ACDO application that was approved was calculated. The dates at the 25th percentile (February 13, 2004) and 75th percentile (October 29, 2006) of the distribution were chosen as the selection period such that offenders in both groups were equivalent in their opportunities to be released. All (primarily) Aboriginal offenders, who had a day parole eligibility date within the selection period and who had not had a recorded contact with an ACDO officer were included in the comparison group.

For the purpose of recidivism analyses, these data were also matched with corresponding Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC)<sup>14</sup> records, which enabled follow-up of offenders at both the provincial and federal levels.

### **2.4.2 Interviews**

Interviews were conducted by the evaluation team at institutions and parole offices in all five regions during the month of March 2009. The interview process included site visits across all regions and NHQ. Interviews were approximately 25 to 40 minutes in duration.

---

<sup>14</sup> CPIC records capture both federal and provincial offending and sentencing data.

A total of 60 key informant interviews were conducted with CSC staff members who work with Aboriginal offenders, as well as with other individuals who were directly or indirectly involved with the ACDO initiative. Interview questions were primarily focused on experiences that would be specific to this group of individuals (e.g., implementation issues, the roles of ACDOs).

Nineteen Aboriginal offenders who had participated in the ACDO initiative were interviewed. Interview questions focused on the offenders' experiences with the ACDO initiative (e.g., the process of Section 84 release planning, experiences with ACDOs and other CSC staff related to the initiative).

Interview data were entered into Snap Survey software and exported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Qualitative data generated as a result of the interview process were exported into Microsoft Word. Qualitative themes relevant to the evaluation objectives were generated by evaluation analysts, who then tabulated theme frequencies using SAS. Quantitative interview data were analyzed in SPSS.

### ***2.4.3 Cost-Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness***

In order to determine the cost-effectiveness of the ACDO initiative, ACDO expenditures were collected for each of the five regions through NHQ Finance. Data received reflected regional funding allocations administered through the Effective Corrections Initiative. Included within these data were salary and operational expenditures.

The cost-efficiency of the ACDO initiative is presented in terms of the cost per completed Section 84 release plan. The cost-effectiveness of the ACDO initiative is presented as a function of reduced incarceration time associated with those offenders who had a Section 84 release plan completed.

## ***2.5 Analyses***

Themes generated from open-ended survey and interview responses are presented in the appropriate Key Findings sections and are detailed in Appendix 4. Summary data from quantitative interview questions are provided in the text related to the relevant findings. All interview results are presented as a percentage of the valid responses to the question, as some questions were not applicable or interviewees were unable to answer some questions.

Quantitative methods were used to profile the samples of offenders, to identify trends, and to compare various characteristics with a comparison group of offenders. Specifically, chi-square analyses<sup>15</sup> were used for within and between-group comparisons on categorical variables (e.g., static and dynamic levels of intervention), while t-tests<sup>16</sup> were used for similar comparisons on continuous variable (time to discretionary release). Survival analyses<sup>17</sup> were used to examine and compare between-group differences where data were censored.<sup>18</sup> Outcome measures examined for between-group analyses were:<sup>19</sup> positive decisions for discretionary release (i.e., day parole and full parole), average length of time in the community, and returns to federal custody (with and without a new offence). A series of Cox proportional hazards regression models<sup>20</sup> was tested, wherein the censoring variable was recidivism (no return to custody, return to custody with for any reason, return to custody with a new offence, or return to custody with a new violent offence) and the dependent variable was the time elapsed between the offender's release date and either re-offence or the end of the data collection phase. Five covariates were also considered: aggregate sentence length, gender, age at admission, dynamic need rating, and CRS score.

Similarly, within-group analyses of comparative/outcome measures were those listed above, in addition to static and dynamic levels of intervention, criminal history, age at admission, and aggregate sentence length.

Potential differences among some important variables between the ACDO groups (Section 84 and No Section 84) and the comparison group were controlled for in all analyses. These variables included age at admission, gender, sentence Length, dynamic need, and CRS score. All group comparisons and tests of hypotheses were conducted at the 5% significance level.

---

<sup>15</sup> Pearson's chi-square test -- also known as the chi-square goodness-of-fit test or chi-square test for independence -- tests a null hypothesis that the frequency distribution of certain events observed in a sample is consistent with a particular theoretical distribution.

<sup>16</sup> A t-test assesses whether the means from two samples are statistically different from one another.

<sup>17</sup> Survival analysis is a statistical technique that estimates the time taken to reach some event and the rate of occurrence of that event.

<sup>18</sup> Observations are referred to as censored when the dependent variable of interest represents the time to a terminal event (reconviction), and the duration of the study is limited in time.

<sup>19</sup> Outcome measures are dependent on resident status (inmate, discretionary release, statutory release with residency), thus a positive parole decision was not examined for those already on parole at the time of the analyses.

<sup>20</sup> Proportional hazards models are a sub-class of survival models, in which the effect of a treatment under study (e.g., engagement with an ACDO) has a multiplicative effect on the subject's hazard rate (e.g., risk for recidivism).

Logistic regression analysis<sup>21</sup> was used to model the likelihood of receiving a discretionary release (day parole or full parole).

## **2.6**    *Limitations*

The current evaluation has some limitations which may have impacted the reliability of data used in the report. As a result of difficulty recruiting offenders with interest, only 19 offenders across Canada, who had participated in the ACDO initiative, participated in the interviews. Therefore, it is recommended to use caution when interpreting interview responses, as these may not reflect the views of all offenders who had participated in the ACDO initiative.

The views of communities that are actively engaged in Section 84 releases were not represented in the evaluation. Retrospectively, these qualitative views may have been beneficial in understanding the community perspective when considering Section 84 releases.

Given that the ACDO Tracking Tool, which was used to collect data on offenders who had participated in Section 84 releases, was not centralized, the format and the level of detail of information provided to the evaluation team varied across operational sites. This may have impacted the reliability of some data used in the report.

---

<sup>21</sup> Logistic regression is used to predict a dichotomous dependent variable (e.g., parole / no parole) on the basis of continuous and/or categorical independent variables, and to determine the percent of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. It can also be used to rank the relative importance of independent variables, and to understand the impact of covariate control variables. The impact of predictor variables is usually explained in terms of odds ratios.



### 3.0 KEY FINDINGS

The following results are presented under their respective Evaluation Objectives, namely:  
(1) *Continued Relevancy*; (2) *Implementation*; (3) *Success (effectiveness and efficiency)*;  
(4) *Cost-effectiveness*; and (5) *Unintended Findings*.

**Objective 1: Continued Relevancy:**

*The extent to which the initiative remains consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities, and realistically addresses an actual need.*

**FINDING 1:** *The ACDO initiative is consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities, and is congruent with other Aboriginal-specific initiatives that aim to improve capacity for the safe and successful reintegration of Aboriginal offenders.*

In response to the challenges of managing a changing offender profile while contributing to public safety, one of the five strategic priorities identified in CSC's 2008/09 *Report on Plans and Priorities* is "enhanced capacities to provide effective interventions for First Nations, Métis and Inuit offenders"(CSC, 2008b). To address the challenges presented by the over-representation of Aboriginal offenders in the federal correctional system and, in accordance with its *Strategic Plan for Aboriginal Corrections* (CSC, 2006b), CSC committed to preventing the gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal correctional results from widening, as measured by:

- The percentage of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal federal offenders convicted of, or charged with, violent or non-violent offences in communities while under CSC supervision;
- The percentage of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal federal offenders convicted of a violent or non-violent offence and returning to federal custody within two years of the end of their sentence; and,
- The percentage of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal federal offenders convicted of violent or non-violent offences within five years of the end of their sentence.

Data provided by key informants indicated that the ACDO initiative is consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities of addressing the over-representation of Aboriginal

offenders in correctional populations. The majority of interviewees agreed that the ACDO initiative is consistent with CSC's mission (85%,  $n = 44$ ) and strategic priorities (89%,  $n = 46$ ). Among the few staff who disagreed that the ACDO initiative is consistent with departmental (4%,  $n = 2$ ) and government-wide (4%,  $n = 2$ ) priorities, explanations included that there is a lack of resources to adequately address CSC's strategic priorities (17%,  $n = 2$ ) and that the main role of ACDOs is awareness-raising, rather than reintegration (17%,  $n = 2$ ).

The ACDO initiative is also consistent with several of the specific recommendations made by the CSC Review Panel (2007). The CSC Review Panel outlines 109 recommendations, of which 15 were specifically focused on Aboriginal offenders. Of particular relevance to ACDOs are the following three recommendations:

32. The Panel recommends that CSC make resources available to respond to the specific needs of Aboriginal offenders populations, such as further investment in correctional programming tailored specifically to their needs.

37. The Panel recommends reviewing the number of Aboriginal Community Development Officers should be increased to work with Aboriginal communities and support local Aboriginal offender employment.

44. The Panel recommends that CSC continue to advance its collaboration with the territorial authorities in addressing the unique needs of offenders, particularly Inuit offenders, returning to northern communities.

The ACDO initiative is consistent with other services and programs offered by CSC and the NPB targeted towards the safe and successful reintegration of Aboriginal offenders, such as: Aboriginal treatment and healing programs;<sup>22</sup> Aboriginal-specific health strategies in HIV/AIDS, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome/Effects and traditional healing; research projects on Aboriginal reintegration; Aboriginal healing lodges; a national Aboriginal employment/recruitment strategy; Elders working in institutions and in the community; liaison services in federal institutions; Native Brotherhood and Sisterhood Groups; offender employment and job placement; and an Aboriginal gangs reintegration project.

---

<sup>22</sup> For a description of Aboriginal-specific correctional programs, see Appendix 5

**FINDING 2:** *The goals of the ACDO initiative are consistent with comparable initiatives in international jurisdictions, including Australia and New Zealand, where Aboriginal people are similarly over-represented among correctional populations.*

The over-representation of Aboriginal peoples in the correctional system has also been identified as an issue in Australia and New Zealand. Specifically, in Australia, Indigenous persons represented 2.5% of the total Australian population in 2006 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2008a) but they constituted 24% of the prison population (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2008b). In New Zealand, the Māori population accounted for 14.6% of the total New Zealand population in 2006 (Statistics New Zealand, 2007) while representing 50% of all offenders in prison (New Zealand Department of Corrections, 2007a) and 45% of all new community-based sentences (New Zealand Department of Corrections, 2007b).

The following is a brief description of research and initiatives in Australia and New Zealand that share the objective of addressing the over-representation of Indigenous and Māori offenders through community involvement in offender reintegration.

### *Australia*

As part of a large-scale study of the reintegration of Indigenous offenders across Australia, consultations with key stakeholders, including current and former offenders, highlighted the importance of community and family involvement in programs and services for offenders (Willis, 2008). Interviewees pointed to the fundamental influences of community and family on the behaviour of Indigenous prisoners; a theme that emerged in each consultation was the importance of continuity of care from custody to the community. Stakeholders indicated the need to involve communities in providing ongoing support to offenders and recognized the challenges of doing so, given the remoteness of Indigenous communities.

Based on these and other research findings and practices found in New Zealand and Canada, the Victorian state government in Australia developed the Aboriginal Cultural Immersion Program (ACIP; Barry, 1999). Offered by CORE, the Public Correctional Enterprise in Victoria, the aim of the program is to encourage Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander offenders to develop their understanding of their cultural identity. As part of the ACIP, all CORE prisons and Community Correctional Services have a local officer designated as the Indigenous

Services Officer (ISO), whose role is to work with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander offenders to address any concerns they might have, including personal issues. Local ISOs are the liaisons between the offender and the Indigenous Services Unit within CORE. They also work to develop relationships with local Aboriginal community agencies by encouraging their involvement with offenders in their local community.

The ACIP utilizes the support of Elders and community-based Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander agencies in the provision of culturally appropriate rehabilitation and/or diversionary programs. This approach aims to provide practical coping strategies and networks that enable offenders to return to, and reintegrate into, their local communities when they are released from institutions. The success of the ACIP has not yet been evaluated formally, although the rate at which institutions and community corrections locations have sought to become involved in the program suggests promise for the impact of ACIP on offender reintegration (Barry, 1999).

### *New Zealand*

For offenders who are located in a Māori Focus Unit or the Northland Region Corrections Facility in New Zealand, Whanau Liaison Workers are available to assist in strengthening relationships between offenders and their community members and agencies (New Zealand Department of Corrections, n.d.). This includes assisting the extended families and communities of Māori offenders to understand correctional programs and activities so that they can better support the offender and help prepare for their release.

Whanau Liaison Workers form part of the prison-based Regional Reintegration Teams. These teams are made up of Whanau Liaison Workers, Social Workers, Reintegration Case Workers and Reintegration Team Leaders. The Whanau Liaison Worker is responsible for the development of support processes that assist in increasing the well-being, rehabilitation and effective reintegration of offenders through facilitation and liaison with the *whanau* (extended family), *hapu* (a division of the tribe, made up of several extended families), and *iwi* (the larger Māori tribe).

Using an approach based in traditional Māori customs and culture, Whanau Liaison Workers provide the following support to offenders:

- Working directly with the offender's extended family by putting in place strategies to resolve or manage identified reintegration issues;
- Assisting in achieving rehabilitation and reintegration goals;
- Building or strengthening relationships between offenders and their whanau, hapu, iwi, and community agencies to assist in their reintegration;
- Liaising with whanau, hapu, iwi, and community agencies on an offender's behalf;
- Facilitating whanau hui (family group meetings) for offenders; and,
- Providing support to offenders when they undertake treatment programs.

Although a formal evaluation of the Whanau Liaison Worker initiative is yet to be conducted, the goal of reintegrating indigenous offenders into their home communities is consistent with that of the ACDO initiative, and suggests international recognition of the importance of these reintegration activities for the success of Aboriginal offenders in the community.

**FINDING 3:** *There is a continued need for the ACDO initiative, given the goals and objectives of the initiative and the current offender profile.*

Current trends in incarceration rates suggest a continued increase in the incarceration rates for Aboriginal peoples in Canada. Specifically, from 1998/99 to 2007/08, the Aboriginal population under federal jurisdiction increased by 19.7%. Specifically, the number of incarcerated Aboriginal women has increased more than 131% over this 10 year time period, while the number of incarcerated Aboriginal men has increased by 15.9% over the same period (Public Safety Canada, 2008).

All key informant interviewees (100%,  $n = 55$ ) agreed that there is a continued need for the ACDO initiative, given the goals and objectives of the initiative, and the current offender profile. More specifically, all (100%,  $n = 56$ ) agreed that there is a continued need for specific services provided through the initiative, including increasing community involvement (26%,  $n = 13$ ), addressing the needs and risk of Aboriginal offenders (26%,  $n = 13$ ), and addressing issues of public safety (10%,  $n = 5$ ).

The majority of offender interviewees (79%,  $n = 15$ ) agreed that being released to an Aboriginal community / organization is the best option for them. Several offenders stated that living in an Aboriginal community would provide access to support from family and community members (47 %,  $n = 9$ ), and would allow them to continue practicing Aboriginal teachings and spirituality (37%,  $n = 7$ ). Offenders also expressed the possibility of victims' families and offenders' families coming together if they return to the Aboriginal community (5%,  $n = 1$ ), and that communication and understanding is more likely if they are living in an Aboriginal community (11%,  $n = 2$ ). With regard to their integration into the community, offenders indicated that being released to an Aboriginal community/organization is important for similar reasons, in addition to increased feelings of belonging (14%,  $n = 2$ ) and respect (7%,  $n = 1$ ).

One offender disagreed that being released to an Aboriginal community/organization is the best option for them, reasons centred on the possibility of becoming involved with former associates and wanting to avoid family problems. Aside from not wanting to follow an Aboriginal healing plan, offender interviewees explained that some offenders might not want to be released to an Aboriginal community/organization because they might be unfamiliar with an Aboriginal way of life (46%,  $n = 6$ ), they might want to avoid issues in the Aboriginal community (including alcohol and drug abuse, and criminal activity; 15%,  $n = 2$ ), they might not be informed about the Section 84 release process or feel supported to return to the community (15%,  $n = 2$ ), and/or they might not want to return to negative/abusive situations (8%,  $n = 1$ ).

**Objective 2: Implementation:**

*This evaluation objective ascertains whether the initiative is organized or delivered in such a way that goals and objectives can be achieved. This involves appropriate and logical linkages between activities, outputs, outcomes and long-term outcomes.*

For performance measurement purposes, it is necessary to: (a) track offenders for which Section 84 release plans have been initiated; and (b) record a history of the community and institutional contacts in which ACDOs have been involved for the purposes of training, raising awareness, and capacity development. Although information has been collected through the ACDO Tracking Tool,<sup>23</sup> the process through which it is collected is not centralized, making it

---

<sup>23</sup> The ACDO Tracking Tool is a data collection tool, designed in Microsoft Excel, that ACDOs use to collect information specific to their Section 84 release planning and contact activities.

possible for information to vary across sites in detail, format and design. Data reliability issues could be remedied if the ACDO tracking tool was automated and incorporated into CSC's automated OMS. This approach would also improve the level of efficiency in manipulating information and for monitoring results on an ongoing basis.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: To facilitate monitoring and performance reporting, CSC should ensure that ACDOs record all information contained in the current ACDO Tracking Tool into CSC's automated Offender Management System. Further, this information should be reported in CSC's Departmental Performance Report to measure progress against Section 84 of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.**

**FINDING 4:** *Staff members indicated that there are barriers to implementing the ACDO initiative, including a shortage of staff members, lack of training, and the sharing of ACDO-related activities with Parole Officers.*

As noted earlier, the Section 84 release process entails a series of 17 steps which provide a focused reintegration plan for Aboriginal offenders to enhance their ability to reintegrate successfully back into their home communities. The process involves various offender assessments, multiple communications and contacts with communities, and the development, approval and presentation of a finalized release plan at an offender's parole hearing. The process involves multiple staff members, including the ACDO, the ALO, and institution and community parole officers.<sup>24</sup>

Staff members identified obstacles encountered during the implementation of the ACDO initiative, including inconsistent staffing or lack of staff (17%,  $n = 8$ ), lack of training (15%,  $n = 7$ ), communication problems (4%,  $n = 2$ ), lack of money and resources (11%,  $n = 5$ ), lack of awareness of Section 84 releases (4%,  $n = 2$ ), lack of support (2%,  $n = 1$ ), and the length of Section 84 release processes (9%,  $n = 4$ ).

The ACDO policy states that Parole Officers will be responsible for ACDO-related activities, such as developing the Section 84 release plan into the Community Strategy in consultation with the ACDO, and completing the assessment for decision in consultation with the Elder (CSC, 2009). Further, the policy states that where no ACDO is available to assist in the

---

<sup>24</sup> These 17 steps are outlined in greater detail in Appendix 1.

Section 84 process, the Parole Officer is responsible to fulfill these responsibilities. However, the majority of staff interviewees (77%,  $n = 33$ ) indicated that Parole Officers seldom or never take on ACDO-related responsibilities. Among the minority of staff who reported that this does occur at least sometimes (14%,  $n = 6$ ), explanations included: the ACDO caseload being too high (25%,  $n = 6$ ); not having an ACDO in the position (17%,  $n = 4$ ); the ACDO had a large geographic area to cover (13%,  $n = 3$ ); the ACDO was not available (8%,  $n = 2$ ); Parole Officers are more frequently on site than ACDOs (8%,  $n = 2$ ).

Three-fifths (60%,  $n = 18$ ) of staff interviewees indicated that ACDOs have not received the necessary training to perform their job in the most efficient/effective manner. Suggestions for additional training activities for ACDOs included training in the awareness of Aboriginal-community-specific culture and practices (28%,  $n = 9$ ), risk and case management training (19%,  $n = 6$ ); and maintenance/ongoing professional development training (6%,  $n = 2$ ). Several interviewees also suggested additional activities/responsibilities in which ACDOs should participate in order to increase the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the initiative, including the need to increase community involvement (36%,  $n = 15$ ), participate in additional training (12%,  $n = 5$ ), give presentations to increase awareness (17%,  $n = 7$ ), increase institutional involvement (9%,  $n = 4$ ). The majority of staff interviewees (21%,  $n = 6$ ) responded that they did not believe that there were activities or responsibilities in which the ACDOs currently participate that should be reduced in scope or removed from ACDOs' responsibilities. Several staff interviewees were uncertain as to whether there were activities / responsibilities that should be reduced or removed from the ACDOs current responsibilities (18%,  $n = 5$ ). However, some staff interviewees suggested that the excessive paperwork completed by ACDOs could be reduced (7%,  $n = 2$ ).

With regard to communication and collaboration between ACDOs and Parole Officers, just over half (55%,  $n = 27$ ) of staff and three-quarters of offenders (75%,  $n = 9$ ) agreed that there is frequent communication between ACDOs and offenders' Community Parole Officers. A slightly greater proportion of staff interviewees (58%,  $n = 28$ ) agreed that the services provided by ACDOs are coordinated with those provided by Community Parole Officers, and 70% ( $n = 7$ ) of offenders also agreed. The majority of staff (76%,  $n = 41$ ) agreed that Parole Officers are aware of the ACDO initiative; however, staff agreement was equivocal regarding whether Parole Officers promote the ACDO initiative (38% agreed,  $n = 19$ , and 30% disagreed,  $n = 15$ ). Somewhat higher proportions of staff interviewees agreed regarding whether CSC institutional



staff members are aware of the initiative (42%,  $n = 20$ ) and supportive of the initiative (40%,  $n = 19$ ). Two-thirds of offender interviewees (67%,  $n = 10$ ) agreed that CSC institutional staff were aware of their Section 84 release plans, and a greater proportion (90%,  $n = 9$ ) agreed that institutional staff were supportive of their plans. In addition, the majority of staff interviewees agreed that CSC community staff members are aware (62%,  $n = 31$ ) and supportive (60%,  $n = 29$ ) of the ACDO initiative. A greater proportion of offenders agreed that CSC staff were aware (86%,  $n = 6$ ) and supportive (83%,  $n = 5$ ) of their Section 84 release plan.

**FINDING 5:** *More than one-third of Section 84 release plans are initiated later rather than at the beginning of an offender's sentence.*

Results of interviews with staff members and offenders indicated that there is a low level of awareness and understanding of the ACDO initiative and the Section 84 release process at the beginning of an offender's sentence. However, once engaged in the process, Section 84 procedures are clear to offenders. Specifically, the majority of staff members interviewed indicated that it is important for offenders to be aware of and understand the Section 84 release process early in their sentences (88%,  $n = 50$ ). Although a large proportion of staff members indicated that offenders are in fact aware of, and understand, the Section 84 release process (87%,  $n = 46$ ), the majority of offender interviewees (65%,  $n = 11$ ) reported having limited or no familiarity with the ACDO initiative / Section 84 release process when they initiated their Section 84 release applications. In addition, less than half of offenders interviewed (41%,  $n = 7$ ) reported that they had been informed that they could indicate their interest in being released to an Aboriginal community during their intake assessment or the very early phases of their incarceration, with another 12% ( $n = 2$ ) indicating they were informed sometime after beginning their incarceration or toward the middle of their sentence. Of note, a sizeable minority of offenders (29%,  $n = 5$ ) stated that they were informed that they could indicate their interest in being released to an Aboriginal community just prior to their release into the community.

According to program data provided by ACDOs regarding their activities, 58% ( $n = 200$ ) of initial community contacts for Section 84 releases take place at the intervention stage of an offender's sentence (i.e., after an offender completes his/her intake process, but before beginning the release process into a community); another 7% ( $n = 23$ ) begin at or soon after the intake

phase of an offender’s sentence. However, a notable 35% ( $n = 120$ ) of ACDO community contacts only begin at the reintegration phase of an offender’s release.

The discrepancy between staff member and offender perceptions of the time at which the Section 84 release process is initiated may be attributed to the level of understanding and clarity of Section 84 procedures, as less than half of staff members interviewed indicated Section 84 procedures are clear to offenders (46%,  $n = 24$ ) and staff members (44%;  $n = 22$ ). However, most offender interviewees (82%,  $n = 14$ ) indicated that once they specified they were interested in being released to an Aboriginal community, Section 84 release procedures were made clear. Offenders interviewed typically agreed (76%,  $n = 13$ ) that the documents and discussions related to the approval of their Section 84 release were shared with them in an open and transparent manner. Further, most offenders interviewed (71%,  $n = 12$ ) agreed that they had timely contact with an ACDO, while fewer staff members (47%,  $n = 23$ ) agreed that offenders who wished to be released to an Aboriginal community had initial contact with ACDO staff in a timely manner.

**FINDING 6:** *ACDOs actively liaise with Aboriginal communities and institutional staff members for the purposes of release planning and raising awareness.*

One of the key roles of the ACDO is to liaise with Aboriginal communities and institutional staff. The vast majority of staff members interviewed agreed that the ACDOs’ release planning and information sharing activities were both important and present in the design and implementation of the ACDO initiative (See Table 5).

**Table 5: Key Informant Ratings of Release Planning and Information Sharing Practices**

| Preparations   | Considerably / Very Important | Present / Somewhat Present |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Involvement of Parole Officer in release planning                          | 100%                          | 98%                        |
| Involvement of the community in release planning                           | 100%                          | 94%                        |
| Ensuring community awareness/understanding of Section 84 release processes | 100%                          | 74%                        |
| Involvement of ACDO in release planning                                    | 96%                           | 88%                        |
| Delegation of a specific person in the Aboriginal community                | 90%                           | 76%                        |
| Promotion of the Aboriginal community in institutions                      | 89%                           | Not asked                  |

*Source:* Staff interviews ( $N = 60$ ).

The majority of staff (77%,  $n = 40$ ) agreed that ACDOs work with offenders, case managers, and Aboriginal communities to develop release plans. A similar proportion of staff (69%,  $n = 29$ ) agreed that ACDOs provide correctional support and expertise (e.g., interpretation of standard operating procedures, policy and legislation) to Aboriginal communities and organizations, and slightly fewer (67%,  $n = 29$ ) agreed that ACDOs set up partnerships between federal, provincial/territorial governments and Aboriginal communities and organizations. The majority of staff (77%,  $n = 33$ ) also agreed that ACDOs provide support to healing lodges regarding community reintegration and Section 84 opportunities and 75% ( $n = 36$ ) agreed that ACDOs clarify Aboriginal-relevant legislation and related community correctional initiatives (including Section 84 provisions). A similar proportion of staff interviewees (76%,  $n = 37$ ) agreed that ACDOs provide presentations to Assistant Commissioners, offenders, and CSC staff regarding Section 84 release planning.

Data collected by ACDOs revealed that of all contacts made ( $n = 1,564$ ), over two-thirds took place in the community (69.2%,  $n = 774$ ) with a large portion of the remaining occurring at federal institutions (25.3%,  $n = 283$ ). Some of the community locations in which contact was made included: Band Councils, Justice Committees, Training Centers, courthouses, reserves (Aboriginal Communities), treatment centers, women's centers/shelters, and Community Correctional Centres (CCCs).<sup>25</sup>

Data collected by ACDOs regarding the purpose of the contact that the ACDOs had within the institution and the community indicated that over half of the contact being made across the five regions occurred for the purposes of case conferencing (35.1%,  $n = 215$ ) and follow up contact (30.2%,  $n = 185$ ). The remaining contact occurred for the purposes of staff awareness (13.1%,  $n = 80$ ), initial contact (11.09%,  $n = 68$ ), and inmate awareness (10.60%,  $n = 65$ ). Contacts in the community included meetings with individuals such as Mayors, Directors of Justice, Legal Counsel, Native Brotherhood / Sisterhood, Police, Band Chiefs, Advisory Committees, and Interpreters. Further, many institutional contacts occurred within federal institutions (25.3%,  $n = 283$ ). Institutional contacts included contact with Directors, Office Staff, Case Management Teams, Institutional Employees (including new COs and Parole Officers), Clinical Supervisors, ALO and Activities Officer, and CORCAN Construction.

---

<sup>25</sup> See Appendix 6 for a regional breakdown of ACDO's contact activity.

**FINDING 7:** *Offenders and staff members indicated that there are many stakeholders involved in Section 84 release planning, including ACDOs and Parole Officers, and the offenders.*

Almost all offender respondents (93%,  $n = 14$ ) stated they were personally involved in preparing for their Section 84 release. Offenders indicated that, during their preparation for release into the community, they worked primarily with a Parole Officer (38%,  $n = 6$ ); several reported working equally with a Parole Officer and an ACDO (31%,  $n = 5$ ), whereas fewer offenders (25%,  $n = 4$ ) reported working primarily with an ACDO during their preparation for release. In addition to these individuals, offenders reported working with CSC or community Elders (88%,  $n = 14$ ), ALOs (81%,  $n = 13$ ), family and community members (50%,  $n = 3$ ), Chiefs and Councils of Aboriginal communities (19%,  $n = 3$ ), provincial / territorial Aboriginal organizations (19%,  $n = 3$ ), and/or their lawyer/advocate (17%,  $n = 1$ ). Staff interviewees also indicated that CSC or community Elders (94%,  $n = 54$ ), Parole Officers (94%,  $n = 54$ ), Chiefs and Councils of Aboriginal communities (90%,  $n = 51$ ), and ALOs (84%,  $n = 48$ ) are most often involved in Section 84 release planning, followed by provincial/territorial Aboriginal organizations (47%,  $n = 28$ ), national Aboriginal organizations (14%,  $n = 9$ ), friendship centres (17%,  $n = 6$ ), healing lodge staff (11%,  $n = 4$ ), and police services (11%,  $n = 4$ ). Only 8% of staff members indicated ACDOs were most often involved in release planning.

The majority of offenders (71%,  $n = 12$ ) personally contacted the community to which they wished to be released with a letter stating their interest. In most cases, offenders contacted the Chief and Council, the Healing Lodge Director, the Friendship Centre, or the mayor of the community. Several offenders (61%,  $n = 8$ ) reported requiring assistance from other organizations during their Section 84 release planning process, including the John Howard Society, the Mental Health Services, the Native Women Support Group, their Native Clan, and the Métis Federation of British Columbia.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** **CSC should establish clear guidelines regarding Section 84 release planning. These guidelines should designate the roles and responsibilities of ACDOs, Institutional Parole Officers, Community Parole Officers, and any other staff members required to facilitate the entire continuum of the Section 84 release process.**

**Objective 3: Success:**

***Efficiency:***

*The extent to which the ACDO initiative is producing planned outputs.*

**FINDING 8:** *For every Section 84 release plan completed at the time of offenders' National Parole Board hearings, there was one plan pending or incomplete.*

Data provided by the regions to the NHQ Aboriginal Directorate Initiative indicated that only 13% of applications for Section 84 releases resulted in approved parole applications. Of the 761 offenders who applied for Section 84 releases during the course of the data collection period, a little under one-third had been completed (31%,  $n = 239$ ) and a similar proportion were pending (28%,  $n = 214$ ) at the time of offenders' NPB hearings. The remaining applications had either been refused by the community (4%,  $n = 27$ ) or were not completed because the ACDOs had insufficient time to work on the Section 84 release plan (4%,  $n = 28$ ).

Among those offenders whose Section 84 release applications were completed ( $N = 239$ ), approximately two-fifths (41%,  $n = 97$ ) had their parole application approved, whereas 10% ( $n = 24$ ) had their parole application denied, and another 10% ( $n = 24$ ) waived or withdrew their parole application. Among offenders whose parole applications were approved with a completed Section 84 release plan, the majority were granted a discretionary release (day parole or full parole; 71%,  $n = 69$ ). Just under one-fifth (18%,  $n = 17$ ) were released on statutory release, and none of the offenders were granted an unescorted temporary absence, were detained, or had their parole revoked.

Interestingly, offenders who completed their Section 84 applications were significantly more likely to be granted a discretionary release than those who did not complete their application. Specifically, whereas 40% of completed applications resulted in day parole or full parole, only 9.6% ( $n = 50$ ) of offenders who did not complete their Section 84 application were granted a discretionary release;  $\chi^2(1) = 96.75, p < .001$ .

None of the offender interviewees reported having previously applied for a Section 84 release that was denied by the community. However, key informant interviewees indicated that they were aware of several (42%,  $n = 22$ ), a moderate number (15%,  $n = 8$ ) or many (11%,  $n = 6$ )

offenders who had applied for a Section 84 release, but who were not released to an Aboriginal community. According to staff, in most cases this occurred because the community declined involvement in the release process (80%,  $n = 27$ ), the offender withdrew his or her application (65%,  $n = 16$ ), there was a lack of support for the release from the Parole Officer (58%,  $n = 16$ ), there were challenges with timelines (25%,  $n = 8$ ), there was a lack of knowledge among community organizations about the Section 84 release (6%,  $n = 2$ ), there were lack of resources in the community (6%,  $n = 2$ ), NPB could not approve the offender's application based on risk (9%,  $n = 3$ ), and the offender lacked commitment towards their Section 84 release planning (6%,  $n = 2$ ).

***Effectiveness:***

*The extent to which a policy, program, or initiative is meeting its planned results.*

**FINDING 9:** *Institutional and community outcomes were more positive for those involved in the Section 84 release process who had a Section 84 release plan completed when compared to those who did not have a plan completed.*

*Institutional Outcomes*

Offenders involved in the Section 84 release process, regardless of whether a release plan was completed, were more likely to receive a discretionary release when compared to the comparison group ( $\chi^2(1) = 65.63, p < .0001, OR = 2.60$ ). Those who had Section 84 release plans completed were 1.5 times more likely to receive a discretionary release than those who did not have Section 84 release plans completed ( $\chi^2(1) = 43.09, p < .0001, OR = 2.26$ ).

*Community Outcomes*

Offenders involved in the Section 84 release process did not differ from the comparison group in their likelihood of returning to custody for a new offence (Hazard Ratio = 1.02,  $p = 0.85$ ) or new violent offence (Hazard Ratio = 1.03,  $p = 0.85$ ). However, offenders in the ACDO group were 1.3 times more likely than the comparison group to return to custody for technical revocations ( $p < .001$ ). Interestingly, once offenders involved in the Section 84 release process were disaggregated by those with completed and not-completed release plans, those with

completed release plans did not differ across community outcomes when compared to the comparison group, while those with incomplete release plans were 34% more likely to return to custody for any reason (including technical revocations) ( $\chi^2(1) = 17.95, p < .0001$ . Hazard Ratio = 1.34).

Offenders and staff interviewees made several suggestions to improve the correctional outcomes for participants; offenders most frequently noted increasing the involvement of Parole Officers and ALOs in the release process, having a chance to meet with community members throughout the process, working more closely with the community and victims' families, utilizing the experience of offenders in the community who have been successful in their reintegration efforts, increasing support for offenders and informing offenders of their responsibilities early in the release process, and developing a detailed release plan for offenders. Staff most frequently mentioned the need to address staffing issues (41%,  $n = 19$ ), increase community resources (17%,  $n = 8$ ), increase community engagement (13%,  $n = 6$ ), and finally to provide continual and enhanced training/education (9%,  $n = 4$ ).

**FINDING 10:** *Both staff members and offenders interviewed indicated that the ACDO initiative facilitates the safe reintegration of offenders into the community.*

The majority of offenders (71%,  $n = 10$ ) and staff (62%,  $n = 31$ ) indicated that offenders' participation in Aboriginal spiritual activities/traditions has increased through the implementation of the ACDO initiative. Further, most staff interviewees indicated that the number of offenders released to Aboriginal communities through Section 84 releases and the acceptance of released offenders by Aboriginal community members have both increased with the ACDO initiative compared to when there were no ACDOs (69%,  $n = 36$  and 67%,  $n = 33$ , respectively). All offenders agreed that their acceptance into the Aboriginal community had increased as a result of the ACDO initiative and 77% ( $n = 10$ ) of offenders agreed that overall, the ACDO initiative has contributed to their successful reintegration into the community. The majority of staff interviewees (79%,  $n = 42$ ) also agreed that, overall, the ACDO initiative has contributed to the successful reintegration of offenders in the community.

According to staff interviewees, the most important aspects of the initiative with regard to the reintegration of offenders into the community included the ability to connect and

communicate with Aboriginal communities (63%,  $n = 34$ ), support offenders (19%,  $n = 10$ ), create a link between the institution and the community (11%,  $n = 6$ ), be sensitive to the Aboriginal culture (9%,  $n = 5$ ). Offenders reported that the most important factors regarding their successful reintegration include receiving support from staff, Elders and the community, establishing contacts in the community, and gaining knowledge of resources and services available to them in the community. Offenders also noted the importance of abstaining from drugs and alcohol, having access to programs in the community, communicating with the victim's family, and reintegrating into the community. Becoming familiar with the Aboriginal culture and working with someone who is well-informed about Section 84 releases and the Aboriginal community were also mentioned by offenders as being important for their reintegration.

***Cost-Efficiency:***

*The extent to which the ACDO initiative is producing its planned outputs in relation to the resources used.*

**FINDING 11:** *The level of cost-efficiency for the ACDO initiative was not optimized due to the number of incomplete release plans at the time of parole hearings.*

The level of cost-efficiency may be measured by the average cost per Section 84 release plan. Specifically, over the course of the data collection period, there were 453 release plans initiated by ACDOs, of which 239 were completed and 214 were not completed. Over the same time period, CSC spent an average of \$461,484 per year to fund the ACDO initiative.<sup>26</sup>

As such, the cost per completed Section 84 release plan was \$1,930.90. Had all initiated Section 84 release plans been completed, the cost-per-plan would have been reduced to \$1,018.73. Notably, ACDOs reported an average number of 391 contacts with either CSC staff members, community stakeholders, or offenders. As such, CSC spent an average of \$1,180.27 per contact session per year.

The majority of staff interviewees indicated that the availability of resources/supports for CSC offenders in the community, and the linkage to support services while offenders are under

---

<sup>26</sup> This figure represents yearly averages of both salaries and operating expenditures, from 2005/06 to 2008/09.



CSC community supervision, have increased since the implementation of the ACDO initiative (75%,  $n = 39$  and 78%,  $n = 39$ , respectively). Offenders also typically agreed (80%,  $n = 8$ ) that their access to support services while under CSC community supervision has also increased. In addition, most staff interviewees (83%,  $n = 44$ ) indicated that community capacity building (i.e., building community partnerships with agencies and services to provide services/contracts to offenders) had also increased with the ACDO initiative.

Offenders typically agreed (70%,  $n = 7$ ) that the community Parole Officer responsible for their release was helpful; slightly lower proportions of offenders agreed that the ACDO and Institutional Parole Officer responsible for their release were helpful (64%,  $n = 9$  and 56%,  $n = 9$ , respectively). Toward the goal of improving communication between themselves, their ACDO/Parole Officer, and the community to which they are seeking release, offenders suggested increasing the frequency of communication, increasing Parole Officers' knowledge of the Section 84 release process, and involving the ALO in communications with the Aboriginal community. Offenders also suggested that ACDOs and/or Parole Officers could further facilitate their release to an Aboriginal community by providing more follow-up and support throughout the offenders' release into the community (50%,  $n = 8$ ). The majority of offenders (79%,  $n = 11$ ) reported being satisfied with the ACDO initiative, and several offenders (31%,  $n = 5$ ) reported that there were no other activities in which ACDOs and Parole Officers could participate in to facilitate their release. All offenders (100%,  $n = 16$ ) agreed that the ACDO initiative should continue to assist offenders with their release into Aboriginal communities.

**Objective 4: Cost-Effectiveness:**

*Cost-effectiveness determines the relationship between the amount spent and the results achieved relative to alternative design and delivery approaches.*

**FINDING 12:** *The ACDO initiative is cost-effective, as demonstrated through the cost-savings associated with reduced incarceration time for those with completed Section 84 release plans.*

As demonstrated earlier, offenders with completed Section 84 release plans were more likely to receive a discretionary release than those without a completed plan. As there were no differences in community outcomes between these groups, there is a cost-savings associated with

the reduced incarceration time for those who were released earlier in their sentence (i.e. those with a completed Section 84 release plan).

Specifically, it costs \$1,930.90 to complete a Section 84 release plan. The per diem cost to incarcerate an offender in a minimum security institution is \$244.87, \$239.72 in a medium security institution and \$372.25 in a maximum security institution. As such, in order for the ACDO initiative to be cost effective, offenders released from minimum and medium security institutions with completed Section 84 release plans would have to remain in the community for at least 8 days, while offenders released from a maximum security institution would have to remain in the community for at least 5 days. Of note, those offenders with a completed Section 84 release plan remained in the community for approximately 580 days. Lastly, virtually all staff members interviewed (100%,  $n = 48$ ) agreed that the ACDO initiative is a worthwhile initiative to fund.

**RECOMMENDATION 3: CSC should develop a strategy to optimize the number of Section 84 release plans completed as early as possible in the sentence, thus increasing the likelihood of a discretionary release, and maximising value-for-money.**

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (4th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2008a). *Prisoners in Australia, 2008* (Cat. No. 4517.0). Canberra, Australia: Author. Retrieved on January 7, 2009, from <http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/queensland-by-theme/society/crime-justice/corrections/briefs/prisoners-aus/prisoners-aus-2008.pdf>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2008b). *Experimental Estimates of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians, June 2006* (Cat no. 3238.0.55.001). Canberra, Australia: Author. Retrieved on January 7, 2009, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/cat/3238.0.55.001>
- Babooram, A. (2008). *The changing profile of adults in custody, 2006/2007*. Component of Census Canada Catalogue no. 85-002-X. Retrieved on January 9, 2009 from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2008010/article/10732-eng.pdf>.
- Barry, C. (1999). *The Aboriginal Cultural Immersion Program*. Paper presented at the Best Practice Interventions in Corrections for Indigenous People Conference, Adelaide, October 1999. Retrieved on December 17, 2008 from <http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/indigenous/barry.pdf>.
- Correctional Service Canada (1995). *Commissioner's Directive 702: Aboriginal programming*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2002). *The review of offender access to religious and spiritual programs and services*, File No. 378-1-149. Ottawa, ON: Author. Retrieved on January 12, 2009 from [http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/pa/ev-arsps-378-1-149/relig\\_spirit-eng.shtml](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/pa/ev-arsps-378-1-149/relig_spirit-eng.shtml).
- Correctional Service Canada (2004a). *Final Report – Effective Corrections Initiative – Aboriginal Reintegration*, Catalogue no. 394-2-32. Ottawa, ON: Evaluation and Review Branch, Correctional Service Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2004b). *Evaluation Framework for the Effective Corrections Initiative*. Ottawa, Ontario: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2004c). *The Tupiq program for Inuit Sexual Offenders: A Preliminary Investigation*. Catalogue No. R-153. Ottawa, ON: Research Branch, Correctional Service Canada
- Correctional Service Canada (2006a). *Commissioner's Directive 700: Correctional Interventions*. Ottawa, ON: Author.

- Correctional Service Canada (2006b). *Strategic Plan for Aboriginal Corrections: Innovations, Learning & Adjustment – 2006-07 to 2010-11*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2008a). *Commissioner's Directive 702: Aboriginal offenders*. Ottawa, ON: Author, s.51.
- Correctional Service Canada (2008b). *2008-2009 Report on Plans and Priorities*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2008c). *Evaluation Report – Correctional Services Canada's Correctional Programs*, Ottawa, ON: Evaluation Branch, Correctional Service Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada (2009) *Commissioner's Directive 712-1: Pre-release decision-making*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada Review Panel (2007). *A Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety. A Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act, S.C. 1992, c.20.
- Government of Canada (2007). *Work Description: Aboriginal Community Development Officer*. Ottawa, Ontario: Author.
- New Zealand Department of Corrections (2007a). *Over-representation of Māori in the Criminal Justice System: An Exploratory Report*. New Zealand: Author.
- New Zealand Department of Corrections (2007b). *Māori Strategic Plan: 2008-2013*. New Zealand: Author. Retrieved on December 30, 2008, from [http://www.corrections.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0010/290467/Maori-Strategy--ENGLISH.pdf](http://www.corrections.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/290467/Maori-Strategy--ENGLISH.pdf).
- New Zealand Department of Corrections (n.d.). *Reintegration fact sheets: Whanau Liaison Worker Profile*. Retrieved on January 8, 2009 from <http://www.corrections.govt.nz/about-us/reintegration-fact-sheets/whanau-liason-worker-profile.html>
- Public Safety Canada (2008). *Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview 2008*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Rugge, T. (2006). *Risk assessment of male Aboriginal offenders: A 2006 perspective*. Public Safety Canada.
- Saulis, M., Fiddler, S, & Howse, Y. (2000). Release potential of federally-sentenced Aboriginal inmates to communities. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 12(1), p. 53-56. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.

Statistics Canada. (2005). *Projections of the Aboriginal populations, Canada, provinces and territories 2001 to 2017*. Catalogue No. 91-547-XIE. Retrieved on January 7, 2009 from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/91-547-x/2005001/4072106-eng.htm>.

Statistics New Zealand (2007). *QuickStats About Māori: Census 2006*. New Zealand: Author. Retrieved on January 5, 2009, from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/095030F8-BD62-4745-836D-0EF185619C37/0/2006censusquickstatsaboutmaorirevised.pdf>.

Trevathan, S., Crutcher, N, & Rastin, C. (2002). *An Examination of healing lodges for federal offenders in Canada*. Catalogue No. 130. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Services Canada Research Branch. Retrieved January 12, 2009 from [http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/reports/r130/r130\\_e.pdf](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/rsrch/reports/r130/r130_e.pdf).

Willis, M. (2008). Reintegration of Indigenous prisoners: Key findings. *Trends and issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 264. Australian Institute of Criminology. Retrieved on January 7, 2009 from <http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi2/tandi364.pdf>.

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix 1: The Section 84 Release Process**

#### **Step 1 – Preliminary Assessment**

Community Parole Officer advises the offender about Section 81 and 84 of the CCRA and documents the offender's responses in OMS. Offenders also provide a community contact for the Post-sentence Community Assessment.

#### **Step 2 – Post Sentence Community Assessment**

Offender's community contact is interviewed to enhance and corroborate the information provided by the offender. When this takes place in an Aboriginal community, the Community Parole Officer will try to include Aboriginal community leaders or representatives.

#### **Step 3 – Intake**

Institutional Parole Officer confirms offender's briefing on Section 84 and indicates interest on the part of the offender with a Section 84 Flag in OMS.

#### **Step 4 – Offender Application**

Offender indicates interest in Section 84 prior to the completion of pre-release casework and the ACDO and ALO review the application with the offender to ensure understanding of the process

#### **Step 5 – The Section 84 Letter**

Offender initiates the process by preparing a letter to the appropriate contact of the Aboriginal community he/she intends to involve in release planning to develop a working relationship. Offenders are encouraged to include as much personal information as they are comfortable with.

#### **Step 6 – Consent for Disclosure**

This allows CSC to disclose information regarding the offender's case to the identified contact(s) in the Aboriginal community. This consent is valid only until Warrant Expiry Date.

### **Step 7 – ACDO Letter to the Community**

The Aboriginal community is formally notified of Section 84 and given information about the process to assist in decision-making.

### **Step 8 – Sending the Letters**

The ACDO sends the letters and consent form to the Aboriginal community, along with relevant information about preparing a Section 84 release plan.

### **Step 9 – The Community Presentation**

ACDO makes a presentation to Chief and Council on Section 84 and the Aboriginal community calls on members to speak on behalf of the offender.

### **Step 10 – The Community Response**

ACDO documents in OMS the Aboriginal community response to the presentation. If positive, the process will proceed to the next step. If negative, the process for that community is completed and the offender may initiate another Section 84 with a different community.

### **Step 11 – The Follow-up Section 84 Letter**

Offender sends a second letter to the community further introducing him- or herself, including information about life prior to and within the institution and the details of any release plans.

### **Step 12 – Completing the Community Plan**

ACDO meets with the Section 84 review committee, which must have the authority to speak on behalf of the community, to review relevant information pertaining to the offender that would assist in the development of the release plan. The ACDO ensures that the release plan is designed to support and assist the offender in his/her reintegration into the community.

### **Step 13 – Reviewing the Plan**

ACDO meets with the offender, ALO, and Institutional Parole Officer to review the plan developed by the Aboriginal community. Once agreed upon, the plan is sent to the Section 84 review committee for signature.

**Step 14 – Community Assessment**

Includes sources of community information and/or supports for the proposed Section 84 release plan, and should be read in conjunction with the corresponding Community Strategy and Assessment for Decision.

**Step 15 – The Correctional Plan Progress Report**

Institutional Parole Officer completes progress report for the pre-release planning and records the offender's Aboriginal community in OMS.

**Step 16 – Community Strategy and Assessment for Decision**

With the consultation of the ADCO, the Community Parole Officer assesses feasibility of the proposed plan and assesses the possibility of release into the Aboriginal community.

**Step 17 – The NPB Hearing**

ACDO attends the NPB hearing to speak on the developed release plan. There may be opportunity for a Community Based Hearing, allowing the community to witness the process and expectations of the offender, and to comment when permitted.



## Appendix 2: Effective Corrections Evaluation Matrix

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Evaluation Objective 1: <u>Relevance</u>:<br/> <i>Does the policy, program or initiative remain consistent with departmental and government wide priorities?</i></p>  |   |  |
| <i>Key Results</i>   | <i>Performance Indicators</i>   | <i>Information Sources</i>   |
| <p>i) Effective Corrections Initiatives' activities are consistent with other correctional reintegration strategies, and continue to operate under originally intended principles and guidelines.</p> <p>ii) Effective Corrections Initiatives serve the public interest.</p> <p>iii) There is an appropriate, legitimate and necessary role for CSC in Effective Corrections initiatives.</p> | <p>For all 5 initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders concede/ confirm the initiative(s) are relevant.</li> <li>Research (national and international) support the relevance of the initiative.</li> <li>The initiative is comparable to those existing in other correctional jurisdictions.</li> </ul>  | <p>For all 5 initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with stakeholders.</li> <li>Literature and document reviews.</li> </ul> <p>Programs and Program Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Auditor General's Report: 1999, 2003.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Evaluation Objective 2: <u>Success</u>: (Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness)<br/> <i>Is the policy, program or initiative producing its planned outputs in relation to expenditure of resources, and meeting its planned results?</i></p>   |   |  |
| <i>Key Results</i>   | <i>Performance Indicators</i>   | <i>Information Sources</i>   |
| <i>Efficiency</i>  |   |  |
| <p>i) Community contact for capacity development purposes occurs regularly.</p> <p>ii) There is a regular pattern of offender-intervention.</p> <p>iii) There is a well developed cadre of tools and resources made available to aid in the facilitation of the offender reintegration process.</p>  | <p>ACDOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community is engaging in Section 84 release planning frequently.</li> <li>Section 84 release plans initiated and/or completed often.</li> </ul> <p>Pathways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative urinalysis testing results, reclassification to lower security levels, program participation and completion, frequent temporary absences and/or parole reviews, significant interactions with Elders, frequent transfers to healing lodges.</li> </ul> <p>Training and Job Placements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High utilization rates.</li> <li>Services provided which meet the employment needs of offenders.</li> <li>Maintained employment.</li> </ul> <p>Community Residential Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services for offenders with special accommodation needs readily available.</li> <li>Residences operating at an</li> </ul> | <p>ACDOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ACDO logbook</li> <li>Community stakeholders</li> <li>Offender Management System (OMS), and data collected by the Aboriginal Initiatives Directorate, CSC.</li> </ul> <p>Pathways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programs, Transfers, Releases, Urinalyses and Absences modules derived from OMS</li> </ul> <p>Training and Job Placements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OMS programs module.</li> <li>Interviews with participants and community employers.</li> </ul> <p>Community Residential Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with participants and community service-</li> </ul> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>optimum capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher success rates in the community when compared to a matched cohort.</li> </ul> <p>Programs and Program Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased collaborations between Community and Institutional Parole Officers.</li> </ul>   | <p>providers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occupancy logs.</li> <li>• OMS</li> </ul> <p>Programs and Program Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with stakeholders.</li> <li>• File reviews.</li> </ul>   |
| <i>Effectiveness</i>   |   |   |
| <p>i)<br/>High Usage of Effective Corrections Initiative activities by the targeted groups</p> <p>ii)<br/>The initiative's target group demonstrates positive results.</p> | <p>ACDOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of communities engaged in Section 84 release planning.</li> <li>• Number of Section 84s release plans initiated and/or completed.</li> <li>• Post-release success of target group compared to matched counterparts.</li> </ul> <p>Pathways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High pre-post participation rates.</li> <li>• Successful transfers to lower security facilities and / or the community, more releases to the community and temporary absences when compared to matched cohort.</li> <li>• Better performance on institutional adjustment indicators when compared to a matched group.</li> <li>• Increases in reintegration potential ratings and motivation levels.</li> <li>• Post release success of individuals transferred to lower security, healing lodges or release to the community from Pathways compared to matched counterparts.</li> </ul> | <p>ACDOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACDO logbook</li> <li>• Community stakeholders</li> <li>• Offender Management System (OMS).</li> </ul> <p>Pathways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programs, Transfers, Urinalyses, Institutional Incidents, Releases and Case Document modules derived from OMS.</li> </ul> |
|  | <p>Training and Job Placements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High pre-post participation rates.</li> <li>• Employment needs addressed.</li> <li>• Target group more likely to successfully find employment when compared to matched cohort.</li> </ul>  | <p>Training and Job Placements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OMS programs module.</li> <li>• Employment domain of the Community Intervention Scale in OMS.</li> <li>• Interviews with participants and community employers.</li> <li>• File review.</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Community Residential Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased services for offenders with special needs.</li> <li>• Needs of offenders better addressed when compared to a matched group.</li> </ul> <p>Programs and Program Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs of offenders better addressed when compared to a matched group.</li> <li>• Improved reintegration when compared to matched counterparts.</li> <li>• Within group analyses reveal positive pre-post changes across dynamic risk factors.</li> </ul> | <p>Community Residential Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with participants and community service-providers.</li> <li>• Intake Assessment and Community Intervention Scale dynamic factor indicators, OMS.</li> <li>• OMS query profiling various demographic factors of residents.</li> <li>• File review.</li> </ul> <p>Programs and Program Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OMS.</li> <li>• Pre-post measures.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|--|

Evaluation Objective 3: Cost-effectiveness  
*Have the most appropriate and efficient means being used to achieve outcomes?*

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>i) Outputs / Outcomes listed in the logic model have been effectively achieved with designated funding.</p> <p>ii) Effective Corrections Initiatives value for money type analyses yield positive results.</p> | <p>For all 5 initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An examination of all measures of success (see above) reveals initiative outcomes are appropriately and effectively achieved. Comparisons of costs and success levels will be drawn with other initiatives where appropriate.</li> </ul> | <p>For all 5 initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with Stakeholders, file reviews and OMS queries.</li> </ul> |
|---|---|---|

| Evaluation Objective 4: <u>Implementation Issues</u><br><i>Has the policy, program or initiative been managed in such a way that goals and objectives can be realistically achieved, and have management implementation issues been adequately considered?</i>   |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <i>Key Results</i>   | <i>Performance Indicators</i>   | <i>Information Sources</i>  |
| i) Staff members and offenders at other institutions have knowledge of Effective Corrections Initiative activities and their purpose.<br><br>ii) Initiatives operate according to standards set out in policy.<br><br>iii) The Effective Corrections Initiative activities are supported by both internal and external CSC staff.<br><br>iv) Effective Corrections Initiative activities are carried out in a similar manner and fashion, where initiatives extend beyond a single institution, area or region.<br><br>v) Partnerships exist and function at an optimal level. | For all 5 initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders confirm implementation key results have been achieved adequately.</li> <li>• Review of relevant documents reveals implementation key results have been achieved.</li> <li>• The most appropriate partners are responsible for the delivery of services and/or programs.</li> </ul> | For all 5 initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with stakeholders.</li> <li>• Review of relevant documentation.</li> </ul> |
| Evaluation Objective 5: <u>Unintended Findings</u> – Has the <i>policy, program or initiative</i> created/encountered any positive or negative unintended effects?   |   |   |
| <i>Key Results</i>   | <i>Performance Indicators</i>   | <i>Information Sources</i>  |
| i) To be determined  | To be determined  | To be determined  |

Source: Correctional Service Canada (2004). *Evaluation Framework for the Effective Corrections Initiative*. Ottawa, ON: Author.

## Appendix 3: Schedule I Offences

### 1. An offence under any of the following provisions of the *Criminal Code*, that was prosecuted by way of indictment:

- (a) section 75 (piratical acts);
- (a.1) section 76 (hijacking);
- (a.2) section 77 (endangering safety of aircraft or airport);
- (a.3) section 78.1 (seizing control of ship or fixed platform);
- (a.4) paragraph 81(1)(a), (b) or (d) (use of explosives);
- (a.5) paragraph 81(2)(a) (causing injury with intent);
- (b) subsection 85(1) (using firearm in commission of offence);
- (b.1) subsection 85(2) (using imitation firearm in commission of offence);
- (c) subsection 86(1) (pointing a firearm);
- (d) section 144 (prison breach);
- (e) section 151 (sexual interference);
- (f) section 152 (invitation to sexual touching);
- (g) section 153 (sexual exploitation);
- (h) section 155 (incest);
- (i) section 159 (anal intercourse);
- (j) section 160 (bestiality, compelling, in presence of or by child);
- (k) section 170 (parent or guardian procuring sexual activity by child);
- (l) section 171 (householder permitting sexual activity by or in presence of child);
- (m) section 172 (corrupting children);
- (n) subsection 212(2) (living off the avails of prostitution by a child);
- (o) subsection 212(4) (obtaining sexual services of a child);
- (o.1) section 220 (causing death by criminal negligence);
- (o.2) section 221 (causing bodily harm by criminal negligence);
- (p) section 236 (manslaughter);
- (q) section 239 (attempt to commit murder);
- (r) section 244 (discharging firearm with intent);

- (s) section 246 (overcoming resistance to commission of offence);
- (s.1) subsections 249(3) and (4) (dangerous operation causing bodily harm and dangerous operation causing death);
- (s.2) subsections 255(2) and (3) (impaired driving causing bodily harm and impaired driving causing death);
- (s.3) section 264 (criminal harassment);
- (t) section 266 (assault);
- (u) section 267 (assault with a weapon or causing bodily harm);
- (v) section 268 (aggravated assault);
- (w) section 269 (unlawfully causing bodily harm);
- (x) section 270 (assaulting a peace officer);
- (y) section 271 (sexual assault);
- (z) section 272 (sexual assault with a weapon, threats to a third party or causing bodily harm);
- (z.1) section 273 (aggravated sexual assault);
- (z.2) section 279 (kidnapping);
- (z.21) section 279.1 (hostage taking);
- (z.3) section 344 (robbery);
- (z.31) subsection 430(2) (mischief that causes actual danger to life);
- (z.32) section 431 (attack on premises, residence or transport of internationally protected person);
- (z.33) section 431.1 (attack on premises, accommodation or transport of United Nations or associated personnel);
- (z.34) subsection 431.2(2) (explosive or other lethal device);
- (z.4) section 433 (arson — disregard for human life);
- (z.5) section 434.1 (arson — own property);
- (z.6) section 436 (arson by negligence); and
- (z.7) paragraph 465(1)(a) (conspiracy to commit murder).

**2. An offence under any of the following provisions of the *Criminal Code*, as they read immediately before July 1, 1990, that was prosecuted by way of indictment:**

- (a) section 433 (arson);

- (b) section 434 (setting fire to other substance); and
- (c) section 436 (setting fire by negligence).

**3. An offence under any of the following provisions of the *Criminal Code*, chapter C-34 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, as they read immediately before January 4, 1983, that was prosecuted by way of indictment:**

- (a) section 144 (rape);
- (b) section 145 (attempt to commit rape);
- (c) section 149 (indecent assault on female);
- (d) section 156 (indecent assault on male);
- (e) section 245 (common assault); and
- (f) section 246 (assault with intent).

**4. An offence under any of the following provisions of the *Criminal Code*, chapter C-34 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, as they read immediately before January 1, 1988, that was prosecuted by way of indictment:**

- (a) section 146 (sexual intercourse with a female under 14);
- (b) section 151 (seduction of a female between 16 and 18);
- (c) section 153 (sexual intercourse with step-daughter);
- (d) section 155 (buggery or bestiality);
- (e) section 157 (gross indecency);
- (f) section 166 (parent or guardian procuring defilement); and
- (g) section 167 (householder permitting defilement).

**5. The offence of breaking and entering a place and committing an indictable offence therein, as provided for by paragraph 348(1)(b) of the *Criminal Code*, where the indictable offence is an offence set out in sections 1 to 4 of this Schedule and its commission**

- (a) is specified in the warrant of committal;
- (b) is specified in the Summons, Information or Indictment on which the conviction has been registered;
- (c) is found in the reasons for judgment of the trial judge; or
- (d) is found in a statement of facts admitted into evidence pursuant to section 655 of the *Criminal Code*.

**6. An offence under any of the following provisions of the *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act*:**

(a) section 4 (genocide, etc., committed in Canada);

(b) section 5 (breach of responsibility committed in Canada by military commanders or other superiors);

(c) section 6 (genocide, etc., committed outside Canada); and

(d) section 7 (breach of responsibility committed outside Canada by military commanders or other superiors).



## Appendix 4: Themes from Qualitative Interview Questions

### General Notes:

- This appendix provides information regarding themes from open-ended survey and interview questions. Responses to dichotomous (yes/no) and rating scale questions are reported in the text of the document.
- Percentages were calculated using total number of respondents for each survey or interview protocol.
- Note that total percentages may not sum to 100% since multiple themes were noted by individual respondents.
- Note that only responses to questions where clear themes emerged relevant to the evaluation questions are listed here. In some cases, few responses were generated by interviewees/survey respondents, or no clear themes emerged based on the responses that were generated. Thus, some questions may not be shown here due to lack of clear emerging themes.
- Note that due to the nature of these questions and the degree of knowledge that various stakeholder groups were anticipated to have with respect to a specific topic area, not all questions were presented to all stakeholder groups. Blank spaces are shown in the tables below when the question was not presented to that particular stakeholder group, or in rare cases, when none of the respondents for that group provided responses relating to any identifiable themes.

### A. Relevance

Please explain why or why not being released to an Aboriginal community / organization is the best option for you?

| Theme  | General CSC staff |   | Offenders ( <i>n</i> = 19) |     |
|--|-------------------|---|----------------------------|-----|
|  | <i>n</i>          | % | <i>n</i>                   | %   |
| Community & family support                   |                   |   | 9                          | 14% |
| Practice Aboriginal teachings & spirituality |                   |   | 7                          | 37% |

With regard to your reintegration into the community, why is it important that you are / were released to an Aboriginal community / organization?

| Theme                           | General CSC staff |   | Offenders (n = 14) |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
|                                 | n                 | % | n                  | %   |
| Increased feelings of respect   |                   |   | 1                  | 7%  |
| Increased feelings of belonging |                   |   | 2                  | 14% |

Aside from not wanting to follow an Aboriginal healing plan, can you think of any other reasons why an offender would not want to be released to an Aboriginal community / organization?

| Theme   | General CSC staff |   | Offenders (n = 14) |     |
|---|-------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
|   | n                 | % | n                  | %   |
| Unfamiliar with an Aboriginal way of life   |                   |   | 6                  | 46% |
| Want to avoid issues in an Aboriginal community (including alcohol and drug abuse, and criminal activity) |                   |   | 2                  | 15% |
| Not informed of Section 84 release process or feel supported to return to community                       |                   |   | 2                  | 15% |
| Not wanting to return to negative/ abusive situations   |                   |   | 1                  | 8%  |

If you indicated “strongly disagree” or “disagree” that the ACDO initiative is consistent with CSC’s strategic priorities, please explain:

| Theme  | General CSC staff (n = 12) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|----------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | n                          | %   | n         | % |
| Lack of resources to adequately address priorities | 2                          | 17% |           |   |
| ACDO role is to raise awareness, not reintegrate   | 2                          | 17% |           |   |

Please explain why or why not there is a continued need for the ACDO initiative, given the goals and objectives of the initiative and the current offender profile:

| Theme  | General CSC staff (n = 50) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|----------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | n                          | %   | n         | % |
| Importance of community involvement          | 13                         | 26% |           |   |
| To address the needs of Aboriginal offenders | 13                         | 26% |           |   |
| Address issue of public safety               | 5                          | 10% |           |   |

## B: Design and Implementation

If any other groups / individuals were involved in the preparation of your Section 84 release plan please specify:

| Theme            | General CSC staff |   | Offenders ( <i>n</i> = 6) |     |
|------------------|-------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|
|                  | <i>n</i>          | % | <i>n</i>                  | %   |
| Lawyer/ Advocate |                   |   | 1                         | 17% |

In your opinion, are there any other activities that the ACDO or Parole Officer could have done to help facilitate your release to an Aboriginal community?

| Theme  | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 16) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Provide more follow-up & support                                   | 6                                     | 38% |           |   |
| Assist the offender through the release process into the community | 2                                     | 13% |           |   |

Please describe any obstacles encountered in the implementation of the ACDO initiative.

| Theme                                  | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 46) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Staffing issues (e.g., need more)      | 8                                     | 17% |           |   |
| Lack of training/education             | 7                                     | 15% |           |   |
| Communication Problems                 | 2                                     | 4%  |           |   |
| Lack of resources                      | 5                                     | 11% |           |   |
| Awareness of Section 84 releases       | 2                                     | 4%  |           |   |
| Lack of support                        | 1                                     | 2%  |           |   |
| Length of Section 84 release processes | 4                                     | 9%  |           |   |

If ACDO work gets transferred to Parole Officers (sometimes, often or frequently in Q35), what are some reasons why this occurs?

| Theme                                      | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 24) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| ACDO caseload being too high               | 6                                     | 25% |           |   |
| Not having an ACDO in position             | 4                                     | 17% |           |   |
| ACDO has a large geographic area to cover  | 3                                     | 13% |           |   |
| The ACDO was not available                 | 2                                     | 8%  |           |   |
| POs are more frequently on site than ACDOs | 2                                     | 8%  |           |   |

If ACDOs do not receive the necessary training, what other training activities are necessary for ACDOs to perform their job in the most efficient / effective manner?

| Theme  | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 32) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Training in the awareness of Aboriginal-community-specific culture and practices | 9                                     | 28% |           |   |
| Risk and case management training  | 6                                     | 19% |           |   |
| Maintenance / ongoing professional development training                          | 2                                     | 6%  |           |   |

Are there any additional activities / responsibilities in which ACDOs should participate in order to increase the efficiency and / or effectiveness of the ACDO initiative?

| Theme                                    | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 42) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Increase community involvement           | 15                                    | 36% |           |   |
| Participate in additional training       | 5                                     | 12% |           |   |
| Give presentations to increase awareness | 7                                     | 17% |           |   |
| Increase institutional involvement       | 4                                     | 9%  |           |   |

Are there any additional activities / responsibilities in which ACDOs should participate that should be reduced in scope or removed from ACDO responsibilities?

| Theme               | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 28) |    | Offenders |   |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|----|-----------|---|
|                     | <i>n</i>                              | %  | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Excessive paperwork | 2                                     | 7% |           |   |

If you are aware of offenders who were not released to an Aboriginal community, please specify any other factors (not in the provided list) in these occurrences:

| Theme  | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 32) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Challenges with timelines  | 8                                     | 25% |           |   |
| NPB could not approve the offender's application based on risk               | 3                                     | 9%  |           |   |
| Lack of knowledge among community organizations about the Section 84 release | 2                                     | 6%  |           |   |
| Lack of resources in the community   | 2                                     | 6%  |           |   |
| The offender lacked commitment towards their Section 84 release planning     | 2                                     | 6%  |           |   |

## C: Success

If you indicated yes to Q45, please describe what should be changed to improve the correctional outcomes for offenders participating in the initiative:

| Theme   | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 46) |     | Offenders ( <i>n</i> = 10) |     |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|
|   | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>                   | %   |
| Address staffing issues                           | 19                                    | 41% |                            |     |
| Increase community resources                      | 8                                     | 17% |                            |     |
| Increase community engagement                     | 6                                     | 13% | 1                          | 10% |
| Provide continual and enhanced training/education | 4                                     | 9%  |                            |     |
| Have ALOs and POs more involved                   |                                       |     | 2                          | 20% |

What is / are the most important aspect(s) of the ACDO initiative with regard to the reintegration of offenders into the community?

| Theme   | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 54) |     | Offenders ( <i>n</i> = 15) |     |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|
|   | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>                   | %   |
| Connect and communicate with Aboriginal communities     | 34                                    | 63% | 3                          | 20% |
| Support offenders                                       | 10                                    | 19% | 5                          | 33% |
| Create a link between the institution and the community | 6                                     | 11% |                            |     |
| Sensitive to the Aboriginal culture                     | 5                                     | 9%  |                            |     |
| Knowledge of available resources                        |                                       |     | 2                          | 13% |

## D: Unintended Outcomes

Please describe lessons learned and best practices in the implementation of the Aboriginal Community Development Officer initiative.

| Theme                                  | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 47) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Community involvement                  | 17                                    | 36% |           |   |
| Being culturally aware and sensitive   | 6                                     | 13% |           |   |
| Appropriate education and training     | 4                                     | 9%  |           |   |
| Working collectively with the offender | 3                                     | 6%  |           |   |

In your opinion, is there a continued need for the services provided through the Aboriginal Community Development Officer initiative?

| Theme  | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 36) |     | Offenders |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|  | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Community engagement / involvement/ support      | 19                                    | 53% |           |   |
| Provides support to offenders                    | 6                                     | 17% |           |   |
| Addresses the needs of Aboriginal offenders      | 2                                     | 6%  |           |   |
| Initiative needs to be strengthened and enhanced | 5                                     | 17% |           |   |

In your opinion, do you think this is a worthwhile initiative to fund?

| Theme   | General CSC staff<br>( <i>n</i> = 30) |     | Offenders |   |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----|-----------|---|
|   | <i>n</i>                              | %   | <i>n</i>  | % |
| Helps connect the community and build resources | 6                                     | 20% |           |   |
| Address the needs of Aboriginal offenders       | 6                                     | 20% |           |   |
| Will lower recidivism                           | 4                                     | 13% |           |   |

## **Appendix 5: Descriptions of Aboriginal-Specific Correctional Programs Offered by CSC**

### ***Aboriginal High Intensity Family Violence Prevention Program***

This program is for Aboriginal male offenders who are rated as high risk on the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) and who have a documented history of two or more incidents of violence against a female partner. The objectives of the program are to: eliminate violence and abuse toward female partners and in the family context; develop insight, relationship skills, thinking skills, and emotion management skills to promote healthy relationships; accept responsibility; increase awareness of unhealthy (abusive) attitudes and behaviour towards women partners and children; and reduce the intergenerational transmission of violence. This program consists of 72 sessions, including 2.5-hour group sessions and full day ceremonies. Ten sessions are conducted individually with the program facilitator, and individual sessions with the Elder are offered.

### ***Aboriginal Offender Substance Abuse Program***

This program is for Aboriginal male offenders who demonstrate a need for a high intensity program, as indicated by scores on the Alcohol Dependence Scale (ADS) and/or the Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST) and/or Problems Related to Drinking Scale (PRD). The program objectives include the following: develop awareness of linkages between substance abuse and criminality; develop opportunities to engage and motivate participants in positive change process; develop a skill base to promote an abstinence lifestyle in the four domains of the Circle (physical, mental, emotional and spiritual); and introduce and incorporate spiritual and cultural activity as a means of healing and living a healthy lifestyle. The program consists of 33 sessions.

### ***In Search of Your Warrior Program***

This program is for Aboriginal male offenders who have a history of violent offending and who are considered a high risk to re-offend violently. Participants must be actively following native spirituality. The program requires a high degree of commitment from the participant and

includes a number of traditional ceremonies. The program is four months in length and is offered in institutions.

### ***Spirit of A Warrior Program***

This program is for Aboriginal women offenders who have a moderate to high need for treatment of violence. The program consists of an in-depth intervention that is intended to reduce the risk to re-offend with violence, reduce risk to relapse, improve family relations, improve the ability to communicate with others, improve coping skills, and adapt Aboriginal culture and spirituality into all aspects of behaviour and everyday life. It is expected that with a more informed base of traditions, Aboriginal women will be better able to manage their lives. The program is offered in institutions and consists of 92 group sessions, each lasting 1 to 2 hours.

### ***Circles of Change Program***

This program is for Aboriginal women offenders who demonstrate a moderate to high need in the associates/social interaction domain and/or the general attitude domain, as well as those who have a demonstrated deficit in problem-solving. This cognitive-behavioural and solution-based program teaches participants about Canadian Aboriginal culture, communication styles, self-esteem and self-care issues, problem-solving skills, women's roles in their family of origin, healthy and unhealthy relationships, and social injustice. The program is offered in institutions and consists of 19 modules delivered in 25 to 30 sessions, each lasting 2.5 hours.

### ***National Aboriginal Basic Healing Program***

This is a moderate intensity program for male Aboriginal offenders who are actively participating in Aboriginal spiritual practices. The program develops a spiritual foundation. Other program objectives are: (a) acquiring historical knowledge about Aboriginal people, the land, and colonization; (b) healing from personal childhood traumas; (c) developing effective communication and problem solving skills; and (d) learning about the cultural and spiritual traditions, thereby changing attitudes and behaviours. If the offender is referred to this program and another national Aboriginal program, he is expected to take this one first. The program contains 60 sessions.



In 2008, the Evaluation Branch at CSC completed a comprehensive evaluation (CSC, 2008c) of CSC's core correctional programs that included Aboriginal High Intensity Family Violence Prevention Program, Aboriginal Offender Substance Abuse Program, In Search of Your Warrior Program, Spirit of A Warrior Program, Circles of Change Program and National Aboriginal Basic Healing Program. The results from the evaluation report concluded that offenders that participated in CSC's correctional programs were more likely to obtain a discretionary release and less likely to recidivate.

### ***Tupiq Program for Inuit Offenders***

This program is for male Inuit offenders and Inuit offenders that have past records of sexual offences and Inuit offenders that have past records of family violence. This program is offered in institutions and lasts around 16 weeks with 64 sessions of around 3 hours each. Research by the CSC Research Branch (CSC, 2004c) indicated that the Tupiq program had a positive impact on the successful reintegration into the community for program participants, reducing the number of offenders being detained by the National Parole Board, and reducing the recidivism rate among Inuit offenders.

## Appendix 6: ACDO's Contact Activity

### ACDO Contact in per Region

| Region   | <i>n</i> | %      |
|----------|----------|--------|
| Atlantic | 95       | 6.96%  |
| Quebec   | 238      | 17.45% |
| Ontario  | 204      | 14.96% |
| Prairies | 342      | 25.07% |
| Pacific  | 485      | 35.56% |

*Note: Missing 200, n = 1,564.*

|          | Institutional Contact<br>(n = 283) |        | Community Contact<br>(n = 774) |        | Offender Contact (n = 62) |       | Total Contact by Region |        |
|----------|------------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------------|--------|
|          | <i>n</i>                           | %      | <i>n</i>                       | %      | <i>n</i>                  | %     | <i>n</i>                | %      |
| Atlantic | 45                                 | 47.37% | 48                             | 50.52% | 2                         | 2.11% | 95                      | 8.56%  |
| Quebec   | 80                                 | 34.04% | 135                            | 57.45% | 20                        | 8.51% | 235                     | 21.11% |
| Ontario  | 62                                 | 45.26% | 75                             | 54.74% | 0                         | 0%    | 137                     | 12.31% |
| Prairies | 87                                 | 31.18% | 192                            | 68.8%  | 0                         | 0%    | 279                     | 25.07% |
| Pacific  | 9                                  | 2.45%  | 324                            | 88.28% | 40                        | 10.9% | 367                     | 32.95% |

### ACDO Purpose of Contact by Region

|          | Case Conference |        | Staff Awareness |        | Inmate Awareness |        | Follow Up |        | Initial Contact |        | Total    |        |
|----------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------------|--------|----------|--------|
|          | <i>n</i>        | %      | <i>n</i>        | %      | <i>n</i>         | %      | <i>n</i>  | %      | <i>n</i>        | %      | <i>n</i> | %      |
| Atlantic | 6               | 2.79%  | 13              | 16.25% | 27               | 41.54% | 13        | 7.03%  | 0               | 0%     | 59       | 9.62%  |
| Quebec   | 32              | 14.88% | 60              | 75.0%  | 35               | 53.85% | 33        | 17.84% | 68              | 28.57% | 228      | 37.2%  |
| Ontario  | 113             | 52.56% | 2               | 2.50%  | 0                | 0%     | 21        | 11.35% | 0               | 0%     | 136      | 22.19% |
| Prairies | 64              | 29.77% | 5               | 6.25%  | 3                | 4.62%  | 89        | 48.11% | 0               | 0%     | 161      | 26.26% |
| Pacific  | 0               | 0%     | 0               | 0%     | 0                | 0%     | 29        | 15.68% | 0               | 0%     | 29       | 4.73%  |
| Total    | 215             | 35.07% | 80              | 13.05% | 65               | 10.60% | 185       | 30.18% | 68              | 11.09% | 613      | 100.0% |

### **ACDO Contact**

|                       | <i>n</i> | %      |
|-----------------------|----------|--------|
| Institutional Contact | 283      | 25.29% |
| Community Contact     | 774      | 69.17% |
| Inmate Contact        | 62       | 5.54%  |

### **Types of Contact and Contact Person**

|                                  | Case Conference |        | Staff Awareness |        | Inmate Awareness |        | Follow Up |        | Initial Contact |        | Total contact by group of individuals (n=554) |        |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------------|--------|---|--------|
|                                  | <i>n</i>        | %      | <i>n</i>        | %      | <i>n</i>         | %      | <i>n</i>  | %      | <i>n</i>        | %      | <i>n</i>                                      | %      |
| Community Staff                  | 96              | 12.40% | 17              | 2.20%  | 18               | 2.33%  | 129       | 16.67% | 58              | 7.49%  | 318   | 57.40% |
| Institution Staff                | 84              | 29.68% | 61              | 21.55% | 28               | 9.89%  | 35        | 12.37% | 7               | 2.47%  | 215   | 38.81% |
| Inmates                          | 2               | 3.23%  | 0               | 0%     | 19               | 30.65% | 0         | 0%     | 0               | 0%     | 21  | 3.79%  |
| Total contact by type of contact | 182             | 32.85% | 78              | 14.08% | 65               | 11.73% | 164       | 29.60% | 65              | 11.73% | 554   | 100.0% |