

CCRA 5 YEAR REVIEW

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION PROVISIONS

February 1998

Ce rapport est disponible en français

This report is part of a series of 24 research/evaluation reports (listed below) that were prepared as background to the Consolidated Report of the Working Group studying the provisions and operations of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and related Consultation Paper.

The Working Group is composed of representatives from the following agencies:

Correctional Service Canada
National Parole Board
Correctional Investigator
Justice
Department of the Solicitor General

Research/Evaluation Reports:

Information about Offenders
Security Classification of Inmates
Judicial Determination
The Temporary Absence Program: A Descriptive Analysis
Personal Development Temporary Absences
Work Release Program: How it is used and for what purposes
Day Parole: effects of the CCRA (1992)
Case Management: Preparation for Release and Day Parole Outcome
Accelerated Parole Review
Statutory Release and Detention Provisions
Community Supervision Provisions
Provisions Relating to Victims
Observers at National Parole Board Hearings
The National Parole Board Registry of Decisions
CSC Human Resources
Administrative Segregation
Search, Seizure and Inmate Discipline
Offender Grievance System
Urinalysis Testing Program
Inmate's Input in Decision-making
Information to Offenders
Aboriginal Offenders
Health Services
Women Offenders

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO STANDARD CONDITIONS OF RELEASE	1
ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS SET BY RELEASING AUTHORITY	2
RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT ON RELEASE	2
SUSPENSION, TERMINATION AND REVOCATION OF PAROLE OR STATUTORY RELEASE	2
THE CONTEXT OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE	3
GENERAL.....	3
PRE-RELEASE RISK ASSESSMENT	4
POST-RELEASE RISK MANAGEMENT	4
POST-RELEASE INTERVENTIONS.....	5
KEY FINDINGS	5
PROFILE OF THE ACTIVE FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION - JANUARY 18, 1997	6
TYPE OF CONDITIONS	6
CONDITION TO RESIDE AT A CBRF ON FULL PAROLE	7
CONDITION TO RESIDE AT A CBRF ON STATUTORY RELEASE	7
NUMBER OF CONDITIONS.....	7
SUSPENSION OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE	8
PROFILE OF THE FEDERAL SUPERVISION POPULATION	9
DISTRIBUTION BY RELEASE TYPE.....	9
DISTRIBUTION BY REGION	9
DISTRIBUTION BY LENGTH OF TIME ON SUPERVISION.....	9
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS SERVING INDETERMINATE SENTENCES	10
AGING OFFENDERS.....	10
CONDITIONS OF RELEASE	11
TYPE OF ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS	11
NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS.....	15
COMMUNITY RISK/NEEDS MANAGEMENT SCALE	17
CRNMS RISK RATINGS COMPARED TO NUMBER OF CONDITIONS APPLIED.....	17
LENGTH OF TIME ON SUPERVISION	18
POST-RELEASE INTERVENTIONS	18
REASONS FOR SUSPENSION.....	18
TIMELINESS OF CSC CANCELLATION OR REFERRAL TO NPB	19
NPB POST-RELEASE DECISION-MAKING	20
APPENDIX ‘A’ – STATISTICAL TABLES	21

CCRA REVIEW

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION PROVISIONS

INTRODUCTION

The CCRA recognized that decisions within the conditional release system must be fair and equitable, treating like cases alike but distinguishing among offenders according to the relevant risk and needs that they present. It must contribute to the successful reintegration of offenders into society, since all but a small minority of offenders will ultimately return to the community. It must strive to distinguish between the offender who is a serious threat to the lives or safety of others, and the offender who is not. Finally, it must be well integrated with the other components of the criminal justice system.

In relation to community supervision, two themes are predominant:

1. protection of the public in release decisions that give paramount consideration to risk to society and that promote rehabilitation and facilitate reintegration; and,
2. effective communication and information exchange within the criminal justice system.

The primary changes impacting on community supervision were in the decision-making about conditions of release and suspensions of conditional release, with no significant changes to community supervision practices and procedures. A brief summary of the changes follows.

Technical Amendment to Standard Conditions of Release

The CCRA differentiates between two types of release conditions

- conditions prescribed by the Regulations (standard conditions) apply to all offenders on any type of release; and
- conditions imposed by the releasing authority (additional conditions) when considered reasonable and necessary to protect society and to facilitate the successful reintegration of the offender.

A technical amendment was made to the standard conditions of release in the Regulations giving the parole supervisor the discretion to require or not that the parolee report to the police. This amendment reflected differing requirements of police forces for offender police reporting.

Additional Conditions Set by Releasing Authority

Amendments to the previous Parole Act and Penitentiary Act placed the purpose, eligibility and decision criteria for unescorted temporary absences in legislation and introduced a new type of temporary absence for correctional purposes. These changes resulted in CSC having legislative authority to authorize UTA's for a larger number of offenders. The NPB retained the UTA authority for offenders serving life sentences, indeterminate sentences, and violent offenders. With this change in legislation came an additional change authorizing institutional heads (as releasing authorities for some UTA's) to impose additional conditions on the UTA release.

Residence Requirement on Release

One of the mechanisms for managing risk in the community is the requirement for an offender to reside at a community-based residential facility. Prior to the CCRA, this condition was applicable only for day parole. Section 133(4) of the CCRA extended the authority to NPB to impose such a condition for offenders granted full parole, where the circumstances of the case so justify. The principles of public safety and the “least restrictive option” must be considered in imposing such a condition.

Bill C-45, proclaimed January 24, 1996, amended Section 133(4) further extending NPB authority to impose this condition on statutory release.

Suspension, Termination and Revocation of Parole or Statutory Release

Changes to the suspension and termination/revocation provisions of the Parole Act were introduced in Sections 135 and 138 of the CCRA, with the objective of ensuring that full information is available for decision-making on suspensions and to provide a wider range of options than just cancellation or revocation of an offender's release after a suspension.

Section 135(3)(b) increased the timeframe from 14 days to 30 days within which CSC must decide to cancel a suspension or refer the case to NPB. This change addressed the need to reduce postponements of post-suspension hearings due to insufficient time for parole supervisors to obtain full community information on the circumstances of the suspension. At the time the legislation was introduced, it was envisaged that this extended timeframe should only be necessary where information gathering could not be completed within the 14-day timeframe.

Prior to the CCRA, the only legislative decision options for NPB on referral of a suspension were to cancel the suspension of conditional release and return the offender to the community, or to terminate or revoke the release. Termination was used only where the circumstances of the suspension were directly beyond the offender's control.

Section 135(6) introduced two additional options for NPB when making decisions on post-suspension cases. These are:

- to reprimand the offender in order to warn of the Board’s dissatisfaction with the offender’s behaviour since release;
- when cancelling a suspension, to order delay of the cancellation for a specified period not exceeding 30 days after the decision date, where the offender violated the conditions of release on at least one previous occasion that led to suspension.

It was envisaged these additional options would be used where the circumstances of a suspension do not warrant revocation, but are significant enough to justify more serious action than simply cancellation of the suspension with no sanctions.

THE CONTEXT OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE

General

One of the key goals of the government’s Directions for Reform initiative was to articulate clearly the purpose of the corrections and conditional release system and the framework within which the system operates. The principles contained in the CCRA were designed to respect the rights of individuals, including the general public, victims and offenders, the key one being that public safety is to be the paramount consideration in decision-making. However, the Act also requires that this principle be balanced with the principle of the “least restrictive option”.

Objective offender risk assessment and systematic reassessment have been a priority for CSC in implementing strategies to balance the rights of offenders with public safety concerns. Continuing research has been undertaken to develop and enhance objective tools with which to assess the risk individual offenders present. It is evident in the research that offenders do not fall clearly into “high” and “low” risk categories, and that risk prediction can never be an exact science, particularly with respect to timing of reoffending. Certain key factors, however, are strong indicators of potential risk. Research in CSC is now focusing on those differentiating factors as well as time to reoffending, and the need to gain an understanding of individual risk presented by each offender is critical.

Research studies over the past several years have also addressed risk factors and recidivism for various groups of offenders, including the mentally disordered, sex offenders and high-risk violent offenders. The findings of these studies have been incorporated into the various risk assessment tools used by both NPB and CSC. These tools have been validated against the federal offender population in Canada and continue to undergo refinement as more experience is gained.

In 1994, CSC and NPB, in conjunction with the academic and research community, developed and delivered a new training program on risk assessment. One of the objectives of this training was to provide individuals, who make recommendations or decisions affecting offenders, with a clear picture of the major risk factors presented by different types of offenders. Initial risk assessment training for all CSC staff and NPB members was completed in 1995-96. Specific training on family violence issues and in recognizing risk factors for such violence had also been delivered.

Pre-Release Risk Assessment

The process for risk assessment and risk management on conditional release involves an initial pre-release assessment by CSC incorporating the results of the various risk assessment tools. This assessment is provided to the NPB in the form of a “Risk Assessment Profile” which addresses static and dynamic risk factors (including the results of the General Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale) and a “Community Risk Management Strategy” which addresses the level of monitoring and control required in the community. These two documents form the basis for a recommendation to NPB on the offender’s suitability for release and the conditions that are recommended in order to mitigate that risk.

The NPB conducts a structured risk assessment during a pre-release hearing with the offender. Board Members address conditions to those risk and need factors which are most relevant to that individual in preserving public safety. Where a decision has been made to release the offender, the supervising parole office is provided with all the CSC and NPB risk assessment information, as well as the reasons for the NPB decision.

Post-Release Risk Management

The nature of risk is highly dynamic in the community, where reliance is placed on a variety of monitoring and control techniques rather than the physical monitoring conducted within a penitentiary.

While it is recognized that the general risk presented by an individual offender can be categorized, parole supervisors must also address factors unique to each individual -- that combination of factors which, in a given situation, may result in higher or lower levels of risk to public safety. Numerous factors, which may be indirectly related to the risk/needs identified during incarceration, can impact on the success of the release. For example, an offender who suffers from a mental health disorder related to criminality may be experiencing a high degree of anxiety on release. The parole supervisor addresses these immediate concerns and develops a specific supervision strategy based on all the dynamics for on-going monitoring of the offender’s adjustment to supervision.

One of the structured risk assessment tools utilized for community case management is the “Community Risk/Needs Management Scale” (CRNMS). The results of this assessment assist the supervising officer in determining the appropriate supervision strategy and the frequency of contact with the individual offender. The CRNMS is completed within the first 30 days of release, and is reviewed and updated on an on-going basis throughout the supervision period.

Post-Release Interventions

Throughout the supervision period, an offender is subject to various interventions, the most significant of which is suspension of the release. This can result in the release being revoked and the offender being re-incarcerated if the parole supervisor is of the opinion the offender’s level of risk has elevated to such an extent that continued presence in the community will jeopardize public safety.

KEY FINDINGS

This report provides a profile of the federal offender supervision population and data on the changes resulting from the CCRA impacting on how community supervision is managed. Separate CCRA projects regarding the impact of conditional release on recidivism have been prepared by the CSC Research Branch to address success of conditional release.

This project did not identify any corporate issues with respect to the legislative framework for community supervision. Regional concerns identified with respect to community supervision related primarily to the application of additional conditions. Regional differences in application are addressed in this report. CSC and NPB are revising their respective policies related to the imposing of additional conditions with a view to ensuring that additional conditions are imposed only when reasonable and necessary for the protection of society and to facilitate the successful reintegration of the offender. There is also one issue with respect to the structuring of the Additional Conditions Table in OMS, to reflect some of the more frequently imposed conditions (Section V.1).

Some offices are proceeding with suspension of release in any instance where an offender breaches a condition of release. Section 135(1) states “may” rather than “shall”, and there is no corporate policy requirement to suspend in all instances of violations. Thus, there are variations across the country. The application of an “across the board” suspension rule is not consistent with the “reasonable” and “necessary” test inherent in the legislation.

There is a need to clearly define the performance framework within which community reintegration activities are undertaken. CSC has initiated several projects to address how community reintegration is managed. A review of community case management practices in relation to standards is scheduled to occur in 1997/98 as a result of the CSC Reintegration Task Force. In addition, a separate project is underway in the Performance Assurance Sector to establish performance and management indicators for community corrections, and the Reintegration Task Force identified those that should be monitored on an on-going basis at the operational level.

Profile of the Active Federal Offender Supervision Population - January 18, 1997

- 12.4% Day Parole (DP), 58.1% Full Parole (FP), 29.5% Statutory Release (SR).
- Female offenders had higher representation in the DP and FP release types, with much smaller representation in SR. Aboriginal offenders had higher representations on FP and SR, with smaller representation on DP.
- For length of time on supervision, 9.8% had been on supervision since prior to 1990, 30.7% from 1990-1995, and 59.5% from 1996. The long-term cases (prior to 1990) were generally indeterminate offenders on FP. Female and aboriginal offenders had greater proportions of offenders on supervision from 1996 (62.9% and 75.1% respectively).
- 16.2% were serving indeterminate sentences (life or other indefinite sentence), of which 44.9% were on supervision since prior to 1990 and 17.8% from 1996. Indeterminate female/aboriginal distributions by length of time since release were not significantly different.
- Age distribution reflected 13.0% 50-59, 4.8% 60-69, 1.4% 70-79, 0.2% 80+, for a total of 19.4% 50 or older

Type of Conditions

For conditions applicable to all types of releases, the frequency of each type was the lowest for offenders on FP release. The most frequently applied conditions, as coded in OMS:

- avoid certain persons 49.7% -- highest in SR at 58.8%
- follow treatment plan 37.3% -- highest in DP at 55.1%
- Abstain from intoxicants 32.0% -- highest in DP at 44.3%
- Abstain from drugs 22.2% -- highest in SR at 28.6%
- Psych. counselling 21.9% -- highest in DP at 36.3%
- Abstain from alcohol 20.3% -- highest in SR at 27.9%
- avoid certain places 15.4% -- highest in DP at 23.9%

The remaining four conditions captured through OMS coding applied in less than 1% of all cases. 18.3% had “other” conditions that were not coded by type.

Analysis of “other” conditions reveal some that are frequently applied but not on the table. These more frequently applied conditions are important to capture for CSC to demonstrate that public safety and victim concerns are taken into consideration and included:

- at least 10% to avoid contact with victim(s) of offence(s)
- at least 20% to restrict relationships and/or contact with women and/or children
- between 5-10% to comply with medication requirement which relates to risk level.
- approximately 10% to restrict financial transactions and/or to require disclosure of financial dealings to parole officer.

Overall, 83.9% of aboriginal offenders had conditions to abstain from intoxicants compared to approximately 50% for all offenders.

Condition to Reside at a CBRF on Full Parole

8.8% of FP offenders had a condition to reside. The proportion of aboriginal offenders with a condition to reside was almost twice as high at 16.5%, while the proportion for female offenders was 5.7%. 76.4% of those with a condition to reside were serving their first federal sentence and had not had a previous conditional release in that sentence. Regional distribution reflected the highest proportion of reside conditions on FP in the Atlantic Region (14.1%), with other regions ranging from 5.7% to 10.7%.

Condition to Reside at a CBRF on Statutory Release

11.1% of SR offenders had a condition to reside. The proportion for aboriginal offenders was 18.6% and for female offenders, 7.4%. 53.0% of those with a reside condition on SR had a previous release in the current sentence or a previous federal sentence. The remaining 47.0% were serving their first federal sentence and had not had a previous conditional release in that sentence. The highest proportion of reside conditions on SR was in the Pacific Region (15.6%), with other regions between 9.6% and 11.6%.

Number of Conditions

The number of conditions appears to relate directly to the length of time on supervision. For offenders on supervision since prior to 1990, 78.5% had no conditions, 13.4% had one condition, and the remaining 8.0% had two or more conditions.

Compared to the total supervision population (83.4% with additional conditions), aboriginal offenders had additional conditions imposed more frequently (93.8%), while female offenders had additional conditions imposed much less frequently (60.1%),

The number of conditions applied was compared to the risk ratings as a result of application of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale for the total supervision population. Overall, the distribution of risk ratings indicated 24.2% high risk, 15.1% medium risk and 60.7% low risk. There was little differentiation between offenders classified medium or high risk and the number of conditions applied. Offenders on FP were more frequently rated low risk (78.8%) and generally had fewer conditions, while offenders on SR were more frequently rated high risk (48.9%) and generally had more conditions. Female offenders generally had lower risk ratings (76.4% low risk) with conditions applied less frequently, while aboriginal offenders generally had higher risk ratings (41.2% high risk) with conditions applied more frequently.

The greatest proportion of offenders with no conditions (88.5%) were on FP, while 8.8% were on SR and 2.8% were on DP. The greatest proportion of offenders with more than three conditions (45.6%) were on SR, while 37.5% were on FP and 16.8% were on DP.

There were significant regional differences in the number of conditions applied. The highest proportion of offenders with no conditions was in the Pacific Region (27.1%) with other regions ranging from 8.9% to 19.3%. The highest proportion with one to three conditions was in the Prairie Region (71.1%) with other regions ranging from 50.6% to 64.1%. The highest proportions with more than three conditions were in the Ontario (39.0%) and Atlantic (27.9%) regions, with other regions ranging from 10.1% to 16.6%. The higher numbers of conditions in the Atlantic and Ontario regions may be partially explained by the fact that these regions use a combination of two conditions - abstain from alcohol and abstain from drugs, rather than the single condition to abstain from all intoxicants, which is used by other regions. However, this does not fully explain the higher number of conditions in the Ontario Region.

Suspension of Conditional Release

In the 1995-96 fiscal year, a total of 5,765 Warrants of Apprehension and Suspension of Conditional Release were issued for all offenders under supervision (both federal and provincial), involving 4,453 individual offenders. Of these, 18.6% were suspensions of Day Parole, 24.4% for suspensions of Full Parole, and 57.0% for suspensions of Statutory Release.

66.0% of suspensions were for breach of condition, 16.3% to prevent a breach of condition, and 17.8% for public safety.

A random sample of followup action indicated 48.0% of suspensions were either cancelled by CSC or referred to NPB within 14 days, 19.4% between 15 and 20 days, and 23.7% between 21 and 30 days. Only a small proportion of suspensions referred to NPB are cancelled, with a smaller proportion of those resulting in reprimand or delay of cancellation (11.5% in 1995/96).

PROFILE OF THE FEDERAL SUPERVISION POPULATION

Tables A-1 to A-3 reflect the active federal offender supervision population, excluding offenders on temporary detention (release suspended pending a decision) and those unlawfully at large, as at January 18, 1997.

Distribution by Release Type

The distribution of the supervision population by release type reflected 12.4% on Day Parole, 58.1% on Full Parole and 29.5% on Statutory Release.

Female offenders represented 4.5% of the total supervision population, with proportionately higher representations on Day and Full Parole (5.2% and 6.0% respectively), and a much smaller proportion on Statutory Release (1.3%). Aboriginal offenders represented 8.2% of the supervision population, with proportionately higher representations on Full Parole and Statutory Release (10.6% and 12.7% respectively) and a smaller proportion on Day Parole (5.5%).

Distribution by Region

The distribution of offenders by region reflected the largest representations in the Quebec (31.5%), Ontario (25.7%) and Prairie (20.3%) regions, and the smallest in the Pacific (12.6%) and Atlantic (9.9%) regions.

Female offender representation, as a proportion of the regional supervision population, was highest in the Ontario Region (6.3%), with other regions ranging from 3.5% to 4.6%. Aboriginal offender representation, as a proportion of the regional supervision population, was highest in the Prairie (27.0%) and Pacific (11.2%) regions, with other regions ranging from 1.1% to 3.1%.

Distribution by Length of Time on Supervision

Table B reflects a range of supervision start dates from 1955 to date. For purposes of this analysis, the distributions were categorized into long-term (1955 to 1990), medium-term (1990-1995) and short-term (1996-1997). The distribution reflects 9.8% of the population in the long-term category, 30.7% medium-term, and 59.5% short-term.

Both female and aboriginal offender supervision populations had greater proportions of offenders in the short-term category. The distribution for female offenders reflected 6.6% long-term, 31.5% medium-term and 62.9% short-term.

While the aboriginal offender distribution reflected the same proportion in the long-term category (9.8%) compared to the total supervision population, there were significantly fewer (15.1%) in the medium-term category and significantly more (75.1%) in the short-term category. Given that the trend for aboriginal admissions to federal custody has been increasing, while the non-aboriginal population has decreased in recent years, it is likely that this representation will continue.

Distribution of Offenders Serving Indeterminate Sentences

Offenders serving indeterminate sentences represented 16.2% of the supervision population (Table C). Of these, 44.9% were in the long-term supervision category, 37.3% medium-term, and 17.8% short-term. Of those in the short-term category, 64.9% were on Day Parole.

Female and aboriginal distributions by length of time on supervision were not significantly different than for the overall supervision population. Female offenders with indeterminate sentences represented 14.8% of females under supervision. Of these, 44.7% were in the long-term category, while 23.4% were short-term. Aboriginal offenders with indeterminate sentences represented 15.7% of aboriginal offenders under supervision. Of these, 40.7% were in the long-term supervision category, while 24.2% were short-term.

Aging Offenders

Older offenders (whose date of birth was prior to 1947) represented approximately one-fifth (19.4%) of the supervision population, with greater representation in the long-term supervision category by virtue of length of time on supervision. However, further analysis by the start date of supervision reflected many older offenders in the medium- and short-term categories as well.

A further breakdown of older offender proportions in the total population reflected 13.0% 50-59 years, 4.8% 60-69 years, 1.4% 70-79 years, and 0.2% 80-95 years. The proportion of female offenders in the older offender category was not significantly different than their representation in the total population. (4.1% compared to 4.5% overall). There was a lower representation of older aboriginal offenders (5.1% compared to 8.2% overall).

CONDITIONS OF RELEASE

The conditions applied to releases are indicators of some of the dynamics that must be managed in order to mitigate the risk of reoffending for individual offenders.

As with the previous Parole Act, the CCRA defines “standard” conditions of release which apply to all offenders (eg. keep the peace, remain in Canada, not to possess weapons, etc.) and “additional” conditions which can be imposed by NPB. The major change with the CCRA was the introduction of an option for NPB to impose, as an additional condition of Full Parole, residency in a community-based residential facility. Bill C-45, promulgated January 24, 1996, extended this option to Statutory Release decision.

In this context, two key indicators of the extent of monitoring and control required are the type and number of conditions applied to an offender’s release. Once an initial decision on conditions is made, these may be altered based on a request from CSC or the offender. In either case, a submission is made to NPB to recommend the removal, addition or change of conditions. In the 1995/96 fiscal year NPB made over 4,000 decisions to alter conditions. When such a decision is made, the offender’s Certificate of Release is amended to make the change.

The OMS captures the conditions currently applying to an offender’s release and thus data which distinguishes between conditions applied at a pre-release hearing or post-release is difficult to extract. Accordingly, the statistical analysis is based on the conditions existing for the federal offender supervision population as at January 18, 1997. Tables E-1 to E-4 present data on types of conditions, Tables F-1 to F-5 provide further analysis of the additional condition to reside at a CBRF, and Tables G-1 to G-7 provide data on the numbers of conditions.

Type of Additional Conditions

Distribution by Release Type

For conditions applicable to all release types, the frequency of each type was the lowest for offenders on Full Parole, as noted in the following table. However, these proportions reflect only the number of occurrences of each condition and most offenders had multiple conditions of release in various combinations. The multitude of combinations does not lend itself to analysis as each case has specific risk and need factors.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS BY RELEASE TYPE				
TYPE OF CONDITION	Proportion for all Release Types %	Proportion for each Release Type %		
		Day Parole	Full Parole	Stat. Rel.
Avoid Certain Persons	49.7	53.9	44.1	58.8
Follow treatment plan	37.3	55.1	26.3	51.4
Abstain from all intoxicants	32.0	44.3	22.4	31.4
Abstain from drugs	22.2	21.7	19.1	28.6
Psychological and/or psychiatric counselling	21.9	36.3	14.3	30.7
Abstain from alcohol	20.3	25.1	15.4	27.9
Other	18.3	23.3	18.1	16.6
Restrict being in or at specific places	15.4	23.9	12.0	18.7
Reside at a specific place	8.5	N/A	8.8	11.1
Abstain from Driving	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.5
Abstain from Gambling	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.4
NPB Ordered police reporting	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.4
Psychiatric treatment	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

The condition type coding in OMS does not lend itself to more in-depth analysis, however, it revealed types of conditions that are used infrequently and likely do not justify distinct coding. In addressing the more frequently applied conditions, a further examination of a sample of approximately 3,000 conditions was conducted. This examination indicated some conditions that are frequently applied but do not have a separate coding. These more frequently identified conditions are important to capture in order to demonstrate that CSC and NPB are taking public safety and victim concerns into consideration in managing offender risk. The following observations provide a more detailed analysis.

a) Avoid certain persons

In the majority of cases with a condition to avoid certain persons, there is a general condition to avoid individuals who have a criminal record, drug dealers, specific associates and/or specific organizations. However, this analysis also revealed **at least 10%** of offenders had an additional condition to avoid contact with the victim(s) of their offence(s), and **at least 20%** had an additional condition which restricted relationships or contact with women and/or children generally.

- b) Follow treatment plan**
 This type of additional condition provided either a general requirement for the offender to follow a treatment or program plan identified as part of the conditional release plan, while others required attendance at a specific program or programs during the period of release. The coding in OMS does not allow distinction between the different types of treatment or programs where these were specific.
- c) Abstain Conditions**
 The data for the Atlantic and Ontario Regions reflects, in the majority of cases, a combination of two conditions -- one to abstain from alcohol and one to abstain from drugs. The data for other Regions reflects more extensive use of the condition to abstain from all intoxicants.
- d)Psychiatric and/or Psychological Counselling/Treatment**
 It was not possible to quantify the application of these types of conditions precisely, since these types of requirements were found in some cases to be applied in the general “follow treatment plan” condition. It was also noted that requirements to comply with medication prescribed for psychiatric or psychological disorders are generally coded as “other”, but may account for as much as 5-10% of the supervision population.
- e) Abstain from intoxicants/alcohol/drugs**
 Approximately 50% of offenders had an additional condition to abstain from some type of intoxicants. Over 90% of offenders with abstain conditions had either both a condition to abstain from alcohol and drugs, or a single condition to abstain from all intoxicants. It should be noted that the Atlantic and Ontario regions generally applied two conditions -- one to abstain from alcohol and another to abstain from drugs, while the remaining regions utilized the additional condition to “abstain from all intoxicants”.
- f) Reside Condition**
 The legislation is specific that a condition to reside on Full Parole or Statutory Release requires residency at a community-based residential facility. Some conditions coded in this category included requirements to reside in a specific area or at a specific individual’s home, which do not meet the definition in the legislation. Such conditions should be coded as “other”. A more in-depth analysis of conditions to reside for both Full Parole and Statutory Release is provided in the following Section III.2.b.

g) “Other” Conditions

Conditions coded as “other” varied significantly and did not lend themselves to categorization in all except two cases -- at least 5% with a condition to comply with prescribed medication where compliance related significantly to the offender’s risk to reoffend, and at least 10% with a condition that restricted financial transactions and/or required disclosure of financial dealings to the parole officer.

Types of Conditions Applied to Female Offenders

Table E-5 presents a somewhat similar distribution in the type of conditions applied to female offenders as for the overall population. However, while the female offender population is generally thought to have a higher degree of substance abuse problems, the rate of abstain conditions (approximately 40%) was somewhat lower than that of the supervision population overall (**50%**). This may be indicative that substance abuse is less frequently related to their criminal risk.

Types of Conditions Applied to Aboriginal Offenders

Table E-4 reflects a different application of additional conditions for aboriginal offenders, the most significant of which is the application of conditions to abstain from intoxicants. In total, 83.9% of aboriginal offenders had either a condition to abstain from all intoxicants, or both a condition to abstain from alcohol and a condition to abstain from drugs, compared to approximately 50.0% for all supervised offenders.

Additional Condition to Reside

Tables F-1 to F-5 provide data on offenders under supervision on January 18, 1997, with an additional condition to reside at a community-based residential facility (CBRF).

Additional Condition to Reside - Full Parole

NPB data indicates that from 1992/93 to 1995/96, NPB imposed an additional condition to reside on Full Parole in 1,469 pre-release decisions. Of these cases, 1,112 (75.9%) were Accelerated Parole Review offenders (first time, non-violent federal offenders), while 375 were for other Full Parole offenders.

The January 18, 1997, population profile reflects 8.8% of offenders on Full Parole with a condition to reside at a CBRF. Within this group, the proportion of aboriginal offenders with a reside condition was almost twice as high at 16.5%, while the proportion for female offenders was somewhat lower at 5.7%.

Offenders serving their first federal sentence and with no previous conditional release in that sentence represented 76.4% of those under supervision with a reside condition. Regional distribution reflected the highest proportion of offenders with reside conditions in the Atlantic Region (14.1%). Other regions ranged from 5.7% to 10.7%.

Additional Condition to Reside - Statutory Release

Overall, 11.1% of federal offenders on Statutory Release had a condition to reside at a CBRF. Of these, 47.0% were serving their first federal sentence and had not had a previous conditional release, while 7.2% had a previous release on their first sentence. The remaining 16.4% had a previous federal sentence.

The proportion of aboriginal offenders with a condition to reside was significantly higher (18.6%). For female offenders, only 2 of the 27 (7.4%) had a reside condition.

Number of Additional Conditions

General

The number of additional conditions appears to relate most directly to the length of time on supervision. For offenders who are supervised for a lengthy period, 78.5% had no conditions, 13.4% had one condition, and the remaining 8.0% had two or more conditions.

Overall, 83.4% of the total supervision population had conditions applied to their release. The greatest proportion of the supervision population (61.5%) had between one and three additional conditions, while 21.9% had more than three.

Compared to the total supervision population, aboriginal offenders more frequently had additional conditions applied to their release (93.8%), while female offenders had a additional conditions applied much less frequently (60.1%). A greater proportion (71.5%) of aboriginal offenders had between one and three (compared to 61.5% for the total supervision population), and 22.3% with more than three (compared to 16.6% for the total supervision population). Table G-4 reflects that female offenders had significantly fewer additional conditions -- 39.9% with none, 45.0% with one to three, and 16.7% with more than three.

The greatest proportion of offenders with no conditions (88.5%) was on FP, while 8.8% were on SR and 2.8% were on DP. The greatest proportion of offenders with more than three conditions (45.6%) were on SR, while 37.5% were on FP and 16.8% were on DP.

Distribution by Release Type

RELEASE TYPE	PROPORTION OF ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS FOR EACH RELEASE TYPE & OVERALL		
	0	1-3	> 3
Day Parole	3.7%	66.6%	29.7%
Full Parole	25.5%	60.6%	14.2%
Stat. Release	4.9%	61.2%	33.9%
OVERALL	16.6%	61.5%	21.9%

Offenders on Full Parole generally had fewer conditions than offenders on Day Parole or Statutory Release. The number of conditions was generally reduced the longer the offender had been under supervision. Of those offenders under supervision since prior to 1990 (long-term), 78.5% had no conditions, 13.4% had one condition and 4.0% had two conditions. The remaining 4.0% had three or more conditions.

For those offenders with no additional conditions, 88.5% were on Full Parole, while 8.8% were on Statutory Release and 2.8% were on Day Parole. For those with one to three additional conditions, 13.4% were on Day Parole, 57.2% on Full Parole and 29.4% on Statutory Release. Of those with more than three conditions, 16.8% were on Day Parole, 37.5% were on Full Parole and 45.6% were on Statutory Release.

Distribution by Region of Supervision

There were significant regional differences in the number of conditions applied, as reflected in the table below.

REGION	NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS		
	0	1-3	> 3
Atlantic	8.9%	61.7%	27.9%
Quebec	19.3%	64.1%	16.6%
Ontario	10.3%	50.6%	39.0%
Prairie	17.0%	71.1%	10.1%
Pacific	27.1%	59.4%	13.5%

The highest proportion of offenders with no conditions was in the Pacific Region (27.1%) with other regions ranging from 8.9% to 19.3%. The highest proportion with one to three conditions was in the Prairie Region (71.1%) with other regions ranging from 50.6% to 64.1%. The highest proportions with more than three conditions were in the Ontario (39.0%) and Atlantic (27.9%) regions, with other regions ranging from 10.1% to 16.6%.

The higher numbers of conditions in the Atlantic and Ontario regions may be partially explained by the fact that these regions use a combination of two conditions - abstain from alcohol and abstain from drugs, rather than the single condition to abstain from all intoxicants, which is used by other regions. However, this does not fully explain the higher number of conditions in the Ontario Region

COMMUNITY RISK/NEEDS MANAGEMENT SCALE

As indicated previously, the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale is updated on an ongoing basis. Accordingly, the current risk ratings in OMS provide a general indicator of the nature of the federal supervision population. Overall, the current distribution of CRNMS risk ratings in the January 18, 1997, federal supervision population reflected 60.7% low risk, 15.1% medium risk, and 24.2% high risk for supervision management purposes.

The distribution of risk ratings varied significantly for aboriginal offenders in the low and high risk categories, with a distribution of 41.2% low risk compared to 60.7% overall and 41.8% high risk compared to 24.2% overall. The distribution of risk ratings for female offenders also varies significantly, in that 76.4% rated low risk and 9.4% rated high risk. The difference in proportions of medium risk cases was less than 2%.

The data extract excluded those cases where offenders were under temporary detention, as the current risk/needs rating in OMS may not reflect the rating at the time of suspension.

CRNMS Risk Ratings Compared to Number of Conditions Applied

Of 2,024 offenders with no conditions or only one condition, 82.9% were rated low-risk. Of the 1,345 offenders with two conditions, there was very little difference in the proportion of offenders at any risk level. Of the 2,763 with three or more conditions, 44.2% were rated in the low risk category, 21.9% medium risk, and 33.9% high risk. Closer examination of the 520 low risk cases with more than three conditions revealed 65% had “Needs” rated as medium or high.

NUMBER OF CONDITIONS BY CRNMS RISK RATING						
Risk Rating/%	0	1	2	3	>3	TOTAL
Low Risk	874	803	822	719	502	3720
% of Low Risk	23.5%	21.6%	22.1%	19.3%	13.5%	100%
Medium	27	101	192	292	314	926
% of Med Risk	2.9%	10.9%	20.7%	31.5%	33.9%	100%
High	46	173	331	432	504	1486
% of High Risk	3.1%	11.6%	22.3%	29.1%	33.9%	100%
TOTAL	947	1077	1345	1443	1320	6132
% of All	15.4%	17.6%	22.9%	23.5%	21.5%	100%

Length of Time on Supervision

Tables D-4 to D-6 reflect that almost two-thirds of offenders with a high or medium risk classification on the CRNMS had been released since July 1, 1996 (under supervision 6 months or less). Conversely, two-thirds of offenders with a low-risk classification had been released prior to January 1, 1996 (under supervision one year or more).

POST-RELEASE INTERVENTIONS

In the 1995-96 fiscal year, a total of 5,765 Warrants of Apprehension and Suspension of Conditional Release were issued for all offenders under supervision (both federal and provincial), involving 4,713 individual offenders, as follows:

Total Offenders		Number of Warrants per Offender	Total Warrants
Number	Percent		
3901	82.7%	1	3901
610	12.9%	2	1220
167	3.5%	3	501
32	0.6%	4	128
3	0.0%	5	15
4713	100.0%		5765

Of these, 18.6% were suspensions of Day Parole, 24.4% for suspensions of Full Parole, and 57.0% for suspensions of Statutory Release. A total of 444 warrants was subsequently withdrawn by CSC and did not result in a period of temporary detention for the offender. The remaining 5,321 warrants resulted in a period (or periods) of temporary detention for 4,453 offenders. Multiple warrants were issued for 18.2% of the offenders who were subject to temporary detention.

Reasons for Suspension

The legislative criteria in Section 135 of the CCRA for suspension recognize the linkage between risk and the application of conditions of release.

- 135(1)(a) - Breach of condition
- 135(1)(b) - To prevent a breach of condition
- 135(1)(c) - Public safety

Distinction of the reasons in the legislation is difficult in that additional conditions relate to risk to public safety and therefore “breach of condition” or “to prevent a breach of condition” is not mutually exclusive from the “public safety” criterion. The data presented identifies the reason as classified in OMS. Risk/needs ratings are also normally reviewed for suspensions and therefore the current risk rating in OMS may not reflect the rating at the time of the suspension.

Reason for Suspension	Release Type					TOTAL	
	Day Parole		Full Parole		Stat. Release		
135(1)(a)	704		946		2152		2152 66.0%
135(1)(b)	142		195		601		601 16.3%
135(1)(c)	226		266		533		533 17.8%
TOTAL	1072	100%	1407	100%	3286	100%	5768 100%

It was also not possible to determine with precision which suspensions resulted from further involvement in criminal activity, due to the timing of police investigations, charges, court results, etc. Additional detail on reasons for suspension would require review of actual post-suspension reports to establish whether the offender was involved in subsequent criminal activity. The OMS captures “Revocation with Offence” and “Revocation without Offence” but it is not clear if these classifications are updated consistently when the conviction occurs after the revocation date.

Timeliness of CSC Cancellation or Referral to NPB

Analysis of a random sample of 350 Warrants of Apprehension & Suspension resulted in 31 being rejected from the sample analysis. The two primary reasons for these latter cases included the fact that an offender’s sentence expired prior to expiry of the time period within which CSC must cancel the suspension or refer to NPB, or the offender was convicted of a new offence which resulted in automatic revocation of the release. The automatic revocation provision was introduced with implementation of Bill C-45 on January 24, 1996, and was amended on August 1, 1997. It provides that where an offender is incarcerated as a result of an additional sentence for an offence under an Act of Parliament, the offenders parole or statutory release is revoked.

Of the remaining 319 in the sample, 48.0% (168) were either cancelled or referred to NPB within 14 days, 19.4% (68) were either cancelled or referred to NPB between 15 and 20 days, and 23.7% (83) were either cancelled or referred to NPB between 21 and 30 days.

NPB POST-RELEASE DECISION-MAKING

The CCRA introduced additional post-suspension options for NPB, however, data indicates that only a small proportion of suspensions are cancelled by NPB each year, with a very small proportion of those resulting in reprimand or delay of cancellation.

Release Type	NPB Decision	Fiscal Year				
		1992/93	1993/94	1994/95	1995/96	1996/97
Day Parole	Susp. Canc.	263	262	182	127	102
	Reprimand	8	9	7	8	8
	Delay Canc.	10	12	10	9	8
Full Parole	Susp. Canc.	216	246	237	201	154
	Reprimand	14	15	11	14	15
	Delay Canc.	6	10	14	17	17
Statutory Release	Susp. Canc.	257	170	145	157	164
	Reprimand	2	9	6	7	16
	Delay Canc.	11	21	10	8	11
All Release Types	Susp. Canc.	736	678	564	485	420
	Reprimand	24	33	24	29	39
	Delay Canc.	26	44	34	34	36

Note: Decisions apply to both federal and provincial conditional releases.

APPENDIX 'A' – STATISTICAL TABLES

Table Index

- A By Release Type and Region
 - A-1 Summary
 - A-2 Female
 - A-3 Aboriginal

- B By Calendar Year of Supervision Start Date

- C Indeterminate Offenders by Indeterminate Sentence Type

- D Community Risk/Needs Rating
 - D-1 Summary Risk/Needs Rating by Release Type
 - D-2 Aboriginal Risk/Needs Rating by Release Type
 - D-3 Female Risk/Needs Rating by Release Type
 - D-4 High Risk by Supervision Start Date and Release Type
 - D-5 Medium Risk by Supervision Start Date and Release Type
 - D-6 Low Risk by Supervision Start Date and Release Type

- E Additional Conditions
 - E-1 By Condition Type and Release Type
 - E-2 By Condition Type by Region
 - E-3 Female by Condition Type and Release Type
 - E-4 Aboriginal by Condition Type and Release Type

- F Additional Condition to Reside (Full Parole/Statutory Release)
 - F-1 Summary by Release Type by Region
 - F-2 Aboriginal by Release Type by Region
 - F-3 Female by Release Type by Region
 - F-4 Additional Condition to Reside and Community Risk Rating
 - F-5 By Sentence Number/Term Number by Region

- G Number of Conditions
 - G-1 Summary by Release Type
 - G-2 Summary by Region for All Release Types
 - G-3 Aboriginal by Region
 - G-4 Female by Region
 - G-5 Day Parole by Region
 - G-6 Full Parole by Region
 - G-7 Statutory Release by Region

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE A - By Release Type and Region

A-1 Summary								
REGION	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release		ALL REL. TYPES	
	No.	% of All DP	No.	% of All FP	No.	% of All SR	No.	% of ALL
Atlantic	83	9.5	383	9.4	229	11.0	695	9.9
Quebec	292	33.6	1343	32.9	576	27.8	2211	31.5
Ontario	210	24.1	1070	26.3	527	25.4	1807	25.7
Prairies	169	19.4	804	19.7	452	21.8	1425	20.3
Pacific	116	13.3	476	11.7	289	13.9	881	12.6
TOTAL	870		4076		2073		7019	

A-2 - Female								
REGION	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release		ALL REL. TYPES	
	No.	% of All DP	No.	% of All FP	No.	% of All SR	No.	% of ALL
Atlantic	2		18		4		24	
Quebec	13		69		3		85	
Ontario	13		91		9		113	
Prairies	13		44		8		65	
Pacific	4		24		3		31	
TOTAL	45	5.2	246	6.0	27	1.3	318	4.5

A-3 - Aboriginal¹								
REGION	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release		ALL REL. TYPES	
	No.	% of All DP	No.	% of All FP	No.	% of All SR	No.	% of ALL
Atlantic	2		7		7		16	
Quebec	4		7		13		24	
Ontario	8		21		27		56	
Prairies	64		153		167		384	
Pacific	14		36		49		99	
TOTAL	92	5.5	224	10.6	263	12.7	579	8.2

¹ Of 7019 records, 30 did not contain a Race Code and 65 were recorded as UNKNOWN

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE B - By Calendar Year of Supervision Start Date

Calendar Year	Number	Percent of Current Supervision Population
1955-59	7	<i>0.1</i>
1960-69	30	<i>0.4</i>
1970-79	137	<i>2.0</i>
1980-89	421	<i>6.0</i>
1990	92	<i>1.3</i>
1991	146	<i>2.1</i>
1992	200	<i>2.8</i>
1993	261	<i>3.7</i>
1994	429	<i>6.1</i>
1995	1119	<i>15.9</i>
1996	3783	<i>53.9</i>
1997 (to Jan. 18/97)	394	<i>5.6</i>
TOTAL	7019	

CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT

FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)

**TABLE C - Indeterminate Offenders Under Supervision
by Indeterminate Sentence Type**

Indeterminate Sentence Type	Number
Dangerous Offender	4
Dangerous Sexual Offender	27
Habitual Criminal	5
Life	984
Life Maximum	50
Life Commuted from Death	62
Lieutenant Governor Warrant	1
Preventive Detention Order	4
TOTAL - Indeterminate Offenders Under Supervision	1137
<i>PERCENT OF TOTAL SUPERVISION POPULATION</i>	<i>16.2</i>

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE D - Community Risk/Needs Ratings

D-1 - Summary Risk/Needs Ratings by Release Type										
Release TYPE	HIGH RISK			MEDIUM RISK			LOW RISK			TOTAL² with Rating
	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	
Day Parole	125	66	9	35	116	25	26	139	74	
Total DP	200			176			239			615
% DP	32.5%			28.6%			38.9%			100.0%
Full Parole	233	169	34	78	228	60	90	952	1934	
Total FP	436			366			2976³			3778
% FP	11.5%			9.7%			78.8%			100.0%
Statutory Release	611	214	25	123	224	37	44	320	141	
Total SR	850			384			505			1739
% SR	48.9%			22.1%			29.0%			100.0%
TOTAL All Rel. Types	969	449	68	236	568	122	160	1411	2158	
TOTAL by Risk Rating	1486			926			3720			6132
%	24.2%			15.1%			60.7%			100.0%

² Of 7019 records, 887 did not have a current risk/needs rating in the file extract. Of this 887, 360 (40.6%) were not yet due (i.e. COMMUNITY RISK/NEEDS MANAGEMENT SCALE is required to be completed within 30 days of release).

³ Of 2976 low-risk offenders on Full Parole, 521 (17.5%) had a Supervision Start Date prior to 01/01/1990

CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT

FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)

TABLE D - Community Risk/Needs Ratings

D-2 - Aboriginal Risk/Needs Rating by Release Type										
Release TYPE	HIGH RISK			MEDIUM RISK			LOW RISK			TOTAL⁴ with Rating
	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	
Day Parole	16	6	0	3	4	1	5	14	2	
Total DP	22			8			21			51
% DP	43.1%			15.7%			41.2%			100%
Full Parole	27	14	4	10	12	3	7	43	82	
Total FP	45			25			132			202
% FP	22.3%			12.4%			65.3%			100%
Statutory Release	92	31	4	10	33	2	5	26	8	
Total SR	127			45			39			211
% SR	60.2%			21.3%			18.5%			100%
TOTAL All Rel. Types	135	51	8	23	49	6	17	83	92	
TOTAL by Risk Rating	194			78			192			464
%	41.8%			16.8%			41.2%			100%

⁴ Of 579 records, 115 did not have a current risk/needs rating in the file extract. Of this 115, 60 (52.2%) were not yet due (i.e. COMMUNITY RISK/NEEDS MANAGEMENT SCALE is required to be completed within 30 days of release).

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE D - Community Risk/Needs Ratings

D-3 - Female Risk/Needs Rating by Release Type										
Release TYPE	HIGH RISK			MEDIUM RISK			LOW RISK			TOTAL⁵ with Rating
	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	
Day Parole	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	9	7	
Total DP	0			3			19			22
% DP	0.0%			13.6%			86.4%			100%
Full Parole	8	2	0	10	15	0	10	75	51	
Total FP	10			25			136			171
% FP	5.8%			14.6%			79.5%			100%
Statutory Release	9	1	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	
Total SR	10			2			7			19
% SR	52.6%			10.5%			36.8%			100%
TOTAL All Rel. Types	17	3	0	13	17	0	14	87	61	
TOTAL by Risk Rating	20			30			162			212
%	9.4%			14.2%			76.4%			100%

⁵ Of 318 records, 106 did not have a current risk/needs rating in the file extract. Of this 106, 20 (18.9%) were not yet due (i.e. COMMUNITY RISK/NEEDS MANAGEMENT SCALE is required to be completed within 30 days of release).

CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT

FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)

TABLE D - Community Risk/Needs Ratings

D-4 - High Risk - by Supervision Start Date and Release Type								
Supervision Start Date	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release		ALL REL. TYPES	
	No.	% of DP	No.	% of FP	No.	% of SR	No.	% of HR
Prior to 1/1/96	0		165		63		228	15.3
1/1/96-6/30/96	2		125		192		319	21.5
7/1/96-12/31/96	175		141		533		849	57.1
1/1/97-1/18/97	23		5		62		90	6.1
TOTAL	200		436		850		1486	100.0

D-5 - Medium Risk - by Supervision Start Date and Release Type								
	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release		ALL REL. TYPES	
	No.	% of DP	No.	% of FP	No.	% of SR	No.	% of HR
Prior to 1/1/96	0		118		38		156	16.9
1/1/96-6/30/96	1		85		96		182	19.7
7/1/96-12/31/96	166		155		234		555	59.9
1/1/97-1/18/97	9		8		16		33	3.56
TOTAL	176		366		384		926	100.0

D-6 - Low Risk - by Supervision Start Date and Release Type								
	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release		ALL REL. TYPES	
	No.	% of DP	No.	% of FP	No.	% of SR	No.	% of HR
Prior to 1/1/96	0		2194 ⁶		117		2311	62.0
1/1/96-6/30/96	2		437		171		610	16.4
7/1/96-12/31/96	227		334		191		752	20.2
1/1/97-1/18/97	10		11		26		47	1.3
TOTAL	239		2976		505		3720	100.0

⁶ 521 with Supervision Start Date prior to 1/1/90 (445 Indeterminate/76 Determinate)
1676 with Supervision Start Date between 1/1/90 and 12/31/95 (372 Indeterminate/1304 Determinate)

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE E - ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

E-1 - By Condition and Release Type								
ADDITIONAL CONDITION TYPE	ALL REL. TYP.		Number/Percent of Each Release Type					
	No.	%	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
01 - Report to Police	25	<i>0.4</i>	1	<i>0.1</i>	15	<i>0.4</i>	9	<i>0.4</i>
02 - Psychiatric Treatment	8	<i>0.1</i>	1	<i>0.1</i>	5	<i>0.1</i>	2	<i>0.1</i>
03 - Abstain from Driving	49	<i>0.7</i>	7	<i>0.8</i>	29	<i>0.7</i>	11	<i>0.5</i>
04 - Abstain from Gambling	32	<i>0.5</i>	7	<i>0.8</i>	16	<i>0.4</i>	9	<i>0.4</i>
05 - Abstain from Drugs	1559	<i>22.2</i>	189	<i>21.7</i>	778	<i>19.1</i>	592	<i>28.6</i>
06 - Abstain from Intoxicants	2249	<i>32.0</i>	385	<i>44.3</i>	914	<i>22.4</i>	950	<i>31.4</i>
07 - Avoid Certain Places	1084	<i>15.4</i>	208	<i>23.9</i>	489	<i>12.0</i>	387	<i>18.7</i>
08 - Avoid Certain Persons	3485	<i>49.7</i>	469	<i>53.9</i>	1798	<i>44.1</i>	1218	<i>58.8</i>
09 - Abstain from Alcohol	1425	<i>20.3</i>	218	<i>25.1</i>	628	<i>15.4</i>	579	<i>27.9</i>
10 - Follow Psychiatric Counsel	120	<i>1.7</i>	12	<i>1.4</i>	53	<i>1.3</i>	55	<i>2.7</i>
11 - Follow Psychological Counsel	1416	<i>20.2</i>	304	<i>34.9</i>	531	<i>13.0</i>	581	<i>28.0</i>
12 - Reside at a Specific Place	595	<i>8.5</i>	5	<i>0.6</i>	360	<i>8.8</i>	230	<i>11.1</i>
13 - Follow Treatment Plan	2619	<i>37.3</i>	480	<i>55.1</i>	1073	<i>26.3</i>	1066	<i>51.4</i>
14 - Other	1284	<i>18.3</i>	203	<i>23.3</i>	736	<i>18.1</i>	345	<i>16.6</i>
TOTAL RELEASES BY TYPE	7019		870		4076		2073	

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE E - ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

E-2 - By Condition Type by Region												
ADDITIONAL CONDITION TYPE	All Rel. Types		Atlantic		Quebec		Ontario		Prairies		Pacific	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
01 - Report to Police	25	<i>0.4</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	5	<i>0.2</i>	1	<i>0.1</i>	16	<i>1.1</i>	3	<i>0.3</i>
02 - Psychiatric Treatment	8	<i>0.1</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	8	<i>0.4</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>
03 - Abstain from Driving	49	<i>0.7</i>	4	<i>0.6</i>	4	<i>0.2</i>	28	<i>1.5</i>	11	<i>0.8</i>	2	<i>0.2</i>
04 - Abstain from Gambling	32	<i>0.5</i>	4	<i>0.6</i>	6	<i>0.3</i>	16	<i>0.9</i>	5	<i>0.4</i>	1	<i>0.1</i>
05 - Abstain from Drugs	1559	<i>22.2</i>	309	<i>44.5</i>	247	<i>11.2</i>	889	<i>49.2</i>	49	<i>3.4</i>	65	<i>7.4</i>
06 - Abstain from Intoxicants	2249	<i>32.0</i>	106	<i>15.3</i>	831	<i>37.6</i>	46	<i>2.5</i>	875	<i>61.4</i>	391	<i>44.4</i>
07 - Avoid Certain Places	1084	<i>15.4</i>	26	<i>3.7</i>	793	<i>35.9</i>	213	<i>11.8</i>	36	<i>2.5</i>	16	<i>1.8</i>
08 - Avoid Certain Persons	3485	<i>49.7</i>	381	<i>54.8</i>	1435	<i>64.9</i>	1247	<i>69.0</i>	251	<i>17.6</i>	171	<i>19.4</i>
09 - Abstain from Alcohol	1425	<i>20.3</i>	335	<i>48.2</i>	168	<i>7.6</i>	849	<i>47.0</i>	38	<i>2.7</i>	35	<i>4.0</i>
10 - Follow Psychiatric Counsel	120	<i>1.7</i>	9	<i>1.3</i>	28	<i>1.3</i>	39	<i>2.2</i>	32	<i>2.2</i>	12	<i>1.4</i>
11 - Follow Psychological Counsel	1416	<i>20.2</i>	71	<i>10.2</i>	281	<i>12.7</i>	451	<i>25.0</i>	343	<i>24.1</i>	270	<i>30.6</i>
12 - Reside at a Specific Place	595	<i>8.5</i>	77	<i>11.1</i>	188	<i>8.5</i>	125	<i>6.9</i>	132	<i>9.3</i>	73	<i>8.3</i>
13 - Follow Treatment Plan	2619	<i>37.3</i>	444	<i>63.9</i>	303	<i>13.7</i>	1066	<i>59.0</i>	527	<i>37.0</i>	279	<i>31.7</i>
14 - Other	1284	<i>18.3</i>	83	<i>11.9</i>	282	<i>12.8</i>	252	<i>13.9</i>	432	<i>30.3</i>	235	<i>26.7</i>
TOTAL UNDER SUPERVISION	7019		695		2211		1807		1425		881	

CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT

FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)

TABLE E - ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

E-3 - Female by Release Type								
ADDITIONAL CONDITION TYPE	ALL REL. TYP.		Number/Percent of Each Release Type					
			Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
01 - Report to Police	2	<i>0.6</i>	0		2		0	
02 - Psychiatric Treatment	0	<i>0.0</i>	0		0		0	
03 - Abstain from Driving	0	<i>0.0</i>	0		0		0	
04 - Abstain from Gambling	1	<i>0.3</i>	0		1		0	
05 - Abstain from Drugs	64	<i>20.1</i>	7		46		11	
06 - Abstain from Intoxicants	42	<i>13.2</i>	10		25		7	
07 - Avoid Certain Places	14	<i>4.4</i>	2		9		3	
08 - Avoid Certain Persons	96	<i>30.2</i>	14		73		9	
09 - Abstain from Alcohol	56	<i>17.6</i>	8		38		10	
10 - Follow Psychiatric Counsel	9	<i>2.8</i>	1		7		1	
11 - Follow Psychological Counsel	76	<i>23.9</i>	13		54		9	
12 - Reside at a Specific Place	16	<i>5.0</i>	1		13		2	
13 - Follow Treatment Plan	97	<i>30.5</i>	21		64		12	
14 - Other	44	<i>13.8</i>	7		34		3	
TOTAL FEMALE	318		45		246		27	

CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT

FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)

TABLE E - ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

E-4 - Aboriginal by Release Type								
ADDITIONAL CONDITION TYPE	ALL REL. TYP.		Number/Percent of Each Release Type					
	No.	%	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
01 - Report to Police	9	<i>1.6</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	5	<i>2.2</i>	4	<i>1.5</i>
02 - Psychiatric Treatment	0	<i>0.0</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>
03 - Abstain from Driving	5	<i>0.9</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	2	<i>0.9</i>	3	<i>1.1</i>
04 - Abstain from Gambling	1	<i>0.2</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	1	<i>0.4</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>
05 - Abstain from Drugs	61	<i>10.5</i>	10	<i>10.9</i>	17	<i>7.6</i>	34	<i>12.9</i>
06 - Abstain from Intoxicants	431	<i>74.4</i>	75	<i>81.5</i>	149	<i>66.5</i>	207	<i>78.7</i>
07 - Avoid Certain Places	43	<i>7.4</i>	6	<i>6.5</i>	14	<i>6.3</i>	23	<i>8.7</i>
08 - Avoid Certain Persons	129	<i>22.3</i>	17	<i>18.5</i>	30	<i>13.4</i>	82	<i>31.2</i>
09 - Abstain from Alcohol	72	<i>12.4</i>	12	<i>13.0</i>	22	<i>9.8</i>	38	<i>14.4</i>
10 - Follow Psychiatric Counsel	3	<i>0.5</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	3	<i>1.1</i>
11 - Follow Psychological Counsel	139	<i>24.0</i>	21	<i>22.8</i>	43	<i>19.2</i>	75	<i>28.5</i>
12 - Reside at a Specific Place	86	<i>14.9</i>	0	<i>0.0</i>	37	<i>16.5</i>	49	<i>18.6</i>
13 - Follow Treatment Plan	308	<i>53.2</i>	73	<i>79.3</i>	90	<i>40.2</i>	145	<i>55.1</i>
14 - Other	189	<i>32.6</i>	41	<i>44.6</i>	78	<i>34.8</i>	70	<i>26.6</i>
TOTAL ABORIGINAL	579		92		224		263	

NOTE: 54 aboriginal offenders have both a condition to abstain from drugs and a condition to abstain from alcohol; while 431 have only a condition to abstain from ALL intoxicant -- a total of 485 of 579 (83.8%).

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE F - Additional Condition to Reside

F-1 - Summary by Release Type by Region									
REGION	FULL PAROLE			STATUTORY RELEASE			TOTAL		
	All FP	FP Res.	% of FP	All SR	SR Res.	% of SR	FP/SR	Res.	% of FP/SR
Atlantic	383	54	14.1	229	23	10.0	612	77	12.6
Quebec	1343	131	9.8	576	55	9.6	1919	186	9.7
Ontario	1070	61	5.7	527	61	11.6	1597	122	7.6
Prairie	804	86	10.7	452	46	10.2	1256	132	10.5
Pacific	476	28	5.9	289	45	15.6	765	73	9.5
TOTAL	4076	360	8.8	2073	230	11.1	6149	590	9.6

F-2 - Aboriginal by Release Type by Region									
REGION	FULL PAROLE			STATUTORY RELEASE			TOTAL		
	All FP	FP Res.	% of FP	All SR	SR Res.	% of SR	FP/SR	Res.	% of FP/SR
Atlantic	7	1		7	1		14	2	
Quebec	7	1		13	3		20	4	
Ontario	21	1		27	1		48	2	
Prairie	153	27		167	29		320	56	
Pacific	36	7		49	15		85	22	
TOTAL	224	37	16.5	263	49	18.6	487	86	17.7

F-3 - Female by Release Type by Region									
REGION	FULL PAROLE			STATUTORY RELEASE			TOTAL		
	All FP	FP Res.	% of FP	All SR	SR Res.	% of SR	FP/SR	Res.	% of FP/SR
Atlantic	18	4		4	1		22	5	
Quebec	69	1		3	0		72	1	
Ontario	91	6		9	0		100	6	
Prairie	44	2		8	1		52	3	
Pacific	24	1		3	0		27	1	

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE F - Additional Condition to Reside

F-4 - Additional Condition to Reside and Community Risk Rating										
Release TYPE	HIGH RISK			MEDIUM RISK			LOW RISK			TOTAL with Rating
	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	High Need	Medium Need	Low Need	
Full Parole	233	169	34	78	228	60	90	952	1934	
Total FP	436			366			2976			3778
Reside Cond. FP	89 (20.4% of High Risk FP)			78 (21.3% of Med. Risk FP)			149 (5.0% of Low Risk FP)			316
Statutory Release	611	214	25	123	224	37	44	320	141	
Total SR	850			384			505			1739
Reside Cond. SR	114 (13.4% of High Risk SR)			35 (9.1% of Med. Risk SR)			14 (2.8% of Low Risk SR)			163
Total FP//SR with Risk Rating	1286			750			3481			5517
Reside Condition with Risk Rating	203			113			163			479

NOTE: Of 590 FP/SR records WITH A CONDITION TO RESIDE, 111 did not have a current risk/needs rating in the file extract. Of the 111, 56 were not yet due, as they had been released within the previous 30 days.

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE G - Number of Conditions

G-1 Summary by Release Type								
Number of Conditions	Day Parole		Full Parole		Statutory Release		ALL REL. TYPES	
	No.	% of All DP	No.	% of All FP	No.	% of All SR	No.	% of ALL
0	32	<i>3.7</i>	1028	<i>25.2</i>	102	<i>4.9</i>	1162	<i>16.6</i>
1	93	<i>10.7</i>	841	<i>20.6</i>	226	<i>10.9</i>	1160	<i>16.5</i>
2	201	<i>23.1</i>	851	<i>20.9</i>	448	<i>21.6</i>	1500	<i>21.4</i>
3	285	<i>32.8</i>	778	<i>19.1</i>	594	<i>28.6</i>	1657	<i>23.6</i>
4	179	<i>20.6</i>	388	<i>9.5</i>	453	<i>21.9</i>	1020	<i>14.5</i>
5	60	<i>6.9</i>	149	<i>3.7</i>	189	<i>9.1</i>	398	<i>5.7</i>
6	17	<i>1.9</i>	36	<i>0.9</i>	52	<i>2.5</i>	105	<i>1.5</i>
7	3	<i>0.3</i>	5	<i>0.1</i>	9	<i>0.4</i>	17	<i>0.2</i>
TOTAL	870		4076		2073		7019	

G-2 - Summary by Region for All Release Types												
No. of Cond.	Atlantic		Quebec		Ontario		Prairies		Pacific		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	62	<i>8.9</i>	427	<i>19.3</i>	187	<i>10.3</i>	247	<i>17.3</i>	239	<i>27.1</i>	1162	<i>16.6</i>
1	83	<i>11.9</i>	399	<i>18.0</i>	225	<i>12.5</i>	284	<i>19.9</i>	169	<i>19.2</i>	1160	<i>16.5</i>
2	147	<i>21.2</i>	450	<i>20.4</i>	318	<i>17.6</i>	408	<i>28.6</i>	177	<i>20.1</i>	1500	<i>21.4</i>
3	199	<i>28.6</i>	569	<i>25.7</i>	372	<i>20.6</i>	340	<i>23.9</i>	177	<i>20.1</i>	1657	<i>23.6</i>
4	160	<i>23.0</i>	274	<i>12.4</i>	381	<i>21.1</i>	107	<i>7.5</i>	98	<i>11.2</i>	1020	<i>14.5</i>
5	37	<i>5.3</i>	76	<i>3.4</i>	231	<i>12.8</i>	35	<i>2.5</i>	19	<i>2.2</i>	398	<i>5.7</i>
6	6	<i>0.9</i>	15	<i>0.7</i>	78	<i>4.3</i>	4	<i>0.3</i>	2	<i>0.2</i>	105	<i>1.5</i>
7	1	<i>0.1</i>	1	<i>0.0</i>	15	<i>0.8</i>	-	<i>0.0</i>	-	<i>0.0</i>	17	<i>0.2</i>
TOTAL	695		2211		1807		1425		881		7019	

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE G - Number of Conditions

G-3 - Aboriginal by Region							
No. of Cond.	Atlantic	Quebec	Ontario	Prairie	Pacific	TOTAL ABORIGINAL	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	%
0	0	0	6	17	13	36	6.2
1	0	2	3	68	14	87	15.0
2	3	3	7	123	19	155	26.8
3	5	9	8	118	32	172	29.7
4	6	8	19	39	16	88	15.2
5	2	2	7	19	5	35	6.0
6	0	0	5	0	0	5	0.9
7	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.2
TOTAL	16	24	56	384	99	579	

G-4 - Female by Region							
No. of Cond.	Atlantic	Quebec	Ontario	Prairie	Pacific	TOTAL FEMALE	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	%
0	1	71	16	20	19	127	39.9
1	3	8	16	9	5	41	12.9
2	4	5	30	18	4	61	19.2
3	7	0	14	13	2	36	11.3
4	6	0	18	4	0	28	8.8
5	2	1	12	1	1	17	5.3
6	0	0	6	0	0	6	1.9
7	1	0	1	0	0	2	0.6
TOTAL	24	85	113	65	31	318	

**CCRA REVIEW
COMMUNITY ISSUES PROJECT**

**FEDERAL OFFENDER SUPERVISION POPULATION
as at January 18, 1997
(excludes provincial/UAL/TD/Deported)**

TABLE G - Number of Conditions

G-5 - Day Parole by Region												
No. of Cond.	Atlantic		Quebec		Ontario		Prairies		Pacific		TOTAL	
	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%
0	2		15		-		7		8		32	3.7
1	7		32		16		22		16		93	10.7
2	17		55		35		59		35		201	23.1
3	29		101		49		66		40		285	32.8
4	22		73		56		12		16		179	20.6
5	3		15		39		3		-		60	6.9
6	2		1		13		-		1		17	1.9
7	1		-		2		-		-		3	0.3
TOTAL	83		292		210		169		116		870	

G-6 - Full Parole by Region												
No. of Cond.	Atlantic		Quebec		Ontario		Prairies		Pacific		TOTAL	
	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%
0	58		376		181		211		202		1028	25.2
1	71		293		193		179		105		841	20.6
2	87		265		223		195		81		851	20.9
3	93		261		204		159		61		778	19.1
4	55		106		159		45		23		388	9.5
5	17		35		80		14		3		149	3.7
6	2		7		25		1		1		36	0.9
7	-		-		5		-		-		5	0.1
TOTAL	383		1343		1070		804		476		4076	

G-7 - Statutory Release by Region												
No. of Cond.	Atlantic		Quebec		Ontario		Prairies		Pacific		TOTAL	
	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%	All	%
0	2		36		6		29		29		102	4.9
1	5		74		16		83		48		226	10.9
2	43		130		60		154		61		448	21.6
3	77		207		119		115		76		594	28.6
4	83		95		166		50		59		453	21.9
5	17		26		112		18		16		189	9.1
6	2		7		40		3		-		52	2.5
7	-		1		8		-		-		9	0.4
TOTAL	229		576		527		452		289		2073	