

# **Understanding the Operation of Correctional Service Canada’s Structured Intervention Units: Some Preliminary Findings**

26 October 2020

Anthony N. Doob  
University of Toronto

and

Jane B. Sprott  
Ryerson University

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Preface: Attempting to Understand Correctional Service Canada.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Executive Summary.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Understanding the Operation of Correctional Service Canada’s Structured Intervention Units: Some Preliminary Findings .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Background .....	6
An overview of SIU cases.....	7
A description of SIU person-stays.....	8
A brief glance at those who completed more than one stay in an SIU .....	13
Reasons for transferring people to the SIUs.....	15
Time Outside of Cells.....	17
Regional Variation in Time out of Cell.....	21
Ethnicity .....	26
Conclusion.....	29
<b>Appendix A: Overview of Restrictive Movement Stays (N=156) .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix B: Removing Institutions with positive COVID cases for four-hour and two-hour outside of cell calculations .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Appendix C: Email from CSC (24 October 2020).....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix D: History (August 2020).....</b>	<b>40</b>

## **Preface: Attempting to Understand Correctional Service Canada**

Anthony N. Doob and Jane B. Sprott

26 October 2020

The mandate of the Structured Intervention Unit – Implementation Advisory Panel (SIU-IAP) was to examine the operation of the new Structured Intervention Units (SIUs). Its mandate ran out in mid-2020 without receiving any data from Correctional Service Canada (CSC), notwithstanding a request in November 2019 to start delivering data beginning at the end of February 2020. Details of the past attempts to obtain data from CSC in order to try to understand the operation of Correctional Service Canada’s Structured Intervention Unit (SIU) regime (the replacement for solitary confinement) are available in documents released in August 2020. We have also appended this history as Appendix D. Generally, however, CSC had been unable or unwilling until 30 September 2020, to provide any data to the panel established by Public Safety Canada to advise on the implementation of the SIUs.

We received some data from CSC on 30 September (after the panel formally ceased to exist). We then worked quickly to prepare a report on the operation of these units because of the importance of knowing how these new SIUs were functioning. The SIUs were designed to be a substitute for Administrative Segregation (or solitary confinement). A draft of this report was given to CSC on Friday 16 October. A revised version follows this preface. We asked CSC for comments to be sent to us by Saturday 24 October. The reason for the short time frame was simple: until this report was completed and public, there was no systematic information about the operation of this new regime. Having volunteered our time to do this report, and after completing our analyses 16 days after being given the data, we thought that additional delays should be avoided.

Without going into details of the findings (which follow this preface), we would imagine that CSC was not pleased with what we found in *their* administrative data. Some prisoners were spending a very long time in the SIUs; most people were not getting out of their cells for the 4 hours a day that would be expected, given the legislation governing the SIUs. And most people were not getting the expected 2 hours per day of “meaningful human contact” – a provision designed to minimize the harmful impact of solitary confinement. We also found important regional (and institutional) variation.

We think it is fair to say that an organization like CSC -- that appears to us not to be comfortable admitting its weaknesses -- probably did not like our draft report even though we tried to write it in a very neutral tone. So the challenge for CSC, we presume, was how to respond to our draft report. Rather than addressing any of the very serious issues raised by the report, they suggested that the data that they provided were flawed. We suggest that this explanation for the findings be given some serious thought.

If you find credible what CSC told us on 24 October 2020, you would also have to believe that they have no idea how the SIUs are operating today or how the SIUs have operated for the past 10 months. They also refer to “case specific reviews” which one would assume, would have to be based on flawed data. But they are telling us – and telling anyone else in Canada who happens to be interested in the operation of the SIUs -- that they do not know, on a systematic basis, how this new regime operates. Here are the two key paragraphs from an email that we received on Saturday 24

October 2020 (about four hours before the deadline we set for them to read and comment on the draft report).

Since delivering the 38 data points on September 30, work has continued on the rest of the IAP's data request, as well as interpreting the data that was shared on September 30. As a result of this ongoing work, we are in a better position to address data integrity issues (e.g. start and end dates of an inmate's confinement in SIU; time out of cell, some of which are outlined below) impacting the first offset of data.

While there was ready acceptance by front-line staff for the new method of gathering SIU-related information via a hand-held mobile application, it has now become apparent that a number of technical challenges exist with respect to exporting data in a useable format from the new application to the OMS data warehouse. Of note, a few issues remain with the integrity of some records, which may be attributed to the inputs made by staff as they continue to adapt to a new system. These issues include start and end dates of an inmate's confinement in an SIU. In addition, there are some overlapping or duplicative records in respect of the same inmate. Given this, the accuracy of data points related to an inmate's time out of cell and interactions with others is also affected, since the inmate may not have actually been in the SIU for the period covered by the record. We remain available to discuss these issues with you more fully if you should wish. In the meantime, we continue to work on these challenges and expect improvements to the integrity of the data.

The full "Saturday Night Email" is reproduced in Appendix C.

We have each worked for decades with administrative data from the justice system. It is our experience that all administrative data have errors in them. We have seen this when working with Canadian court data, with other data from Canadian correctional systems, and with a range of other types of administrative data. People make mistakes in recording data and often these mistakes are not corrected if nothing rides on it. We have no doubt that there are some errors in the SIU data. There may well be delays, for example, in recording that a prisoner has left or has been returned to a cell. These things happen. The issue, of course, is whether there are important *systematic* errors that would change the inferences one might draw from these data. Simply put, there is no reason we can see that we would expect "errors" to be predominantly in one direction. It would seem that errors should be equally likely to make CSC look "better" as they are to make CSC look "worse."

All we can say about this is that we find it odd, that at 8:06 pm (EDT) on a Saturday night, a few days before a report is likely to be released suggesting that CSC is not doing a very good job of complying with the expectations of this new "SIU" regime, CSC suddenly comes up with the explanation that the data that they provided to us are flawed.

Curiously, they also mention the challenges of COVID-19, implying, perhaps, that responding to COVID might explain some of the more damaging data – data that they had already discounted as being flawed. In response to this, we looked at some of the more worrisome findings (e.g., related to time out of the cell) for those institutions that have *never* (through mid-October 2020) had any COVID cases: It did not substantially change the findings.

Our interpretation of their statement is simple: this is the best that they could come up with at the “eleventh hour” (or, more accurately, closer to the eighth hour, EDT) on a Saturday night. And it is an explanation that we cannot independently verify.

So, as a reader, you will have to decide on your own. You can believe that CSC suddenly, on a Saturday night in late October, 2020, discovered that they do not know what they have been doing since 30 November 2019 in Structured Intervention Units in 16 federal penitentiaries spread out across Canada even though the SIU-IAP had requested the data in November 2019. This is, after all, what they are telling us. Or you can believe that they *do* know what is going on, and saw a picture of the operation of the SIUs that they recognized, but did not like, in the draft of the report we gave them.

We would invite you to make your own assessment based, in part, on what we found (and have included in the report) and on your own assessment of what they have said.

## Executive Summary

After the term of all of the members of the Structured Intervention Units – Implementation Advisory Panel had expired, we (AND and JBS) were given access to data on the operation of these units and volunteered to provide a first analysis of what is happening in these units. This report, then, constitutes a preliminary overview of the operation of this part of Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) during the first nine months of the operation of these units. The analysis is based solely on “administrative data” obtained from CSC. As noted in the preface, our experience is that there are always some errors or ambiguities in such data, but we saw nothing that led us to doubt that, in general, they give a good picture of what is happening. At the same time, however, certain important questions cannot be addressed with these data alone (such as what constitutes “meaningful human contact,” two hours of which is required to be provided to each SIU prisoner each day). Some of our most notable findings are as follows:

1. Looking only at those who ended up in a Structured Intervention Unit (SIU) cell, and excluding those who were first placed in a Restricted Movement cell (in an institution without an SIU) but never were transferred to an SIU, we found that most ‘visits’ (person-stays) in SIUs were relatively short. However, a non-trivial number of person-stays (268 or 16.1% of all person stays) were for periods of time exceeding 2 months (Table 1).
2. Those sent to SIUs tended to be disproportionately male, young, and Indigenous (Table 3). Most (82%) of the person-stays by women came from (and stayed in) the Edmonton Institution for Women.
3. Even in this relatively short period of time (9 months) multiple stays in SIUs were fairly common. Of the 1037 people who were transferred to an SIU, 362 of them (35%) were transferred more than once (Table 6). Those who, in this short period of time, had multiple SIU stays tended to be male and had identifiable mental health needs *before* being transferred to an SIU (Tables 7 & 8).
4. There were large regional differences in the use of SIUs, with a disproportionate number of person-stays being in Quebec (Table 4). The length of stays in SIUs also varies dramatically across region (Table 5). These regional variations provide an opportunity for CSC to learn from those regions that appear to be somewhat more successful than others in using the SIUs as a last resort (as directed in the legislation).
5. The stated reasons for transferring prisoners to SIUs varied substantially across regions (Table 10). Those prisoners placed in SIUs because CSC thought that this was the best way to ensure the safety of the prisoner disproportionately had mental health needs prior to being placed in an SIU (Table 11). More generally, those placed in SIU because of concern about the prisoner’s own safety ended up staying in the SIU a substantially longer period of time (Table 12) than those transferred for other reasons.
6. Prisoners transferred to SIUs are, by law, supposed to be provided with 4 hours out of their cell, with two of those hours engaged in “meaningful human contact”. This requirement was seldom met. Only 21% of SIU prisoners met the 4-hours out of cell requirement on **half or more** of their days in the SIU (Table 14). In 46% of the stays in SIUs, the prisoner had the 2-hours of meaningful human contact on at least **half** of the days (Table 16).

7. Looking at those who were in SIUs for more than two months, we found that a substantial number missed getting their four hours out of the cell (about 82%) half or more of their days in the SIU (Table 15). Similarly, about 51% of this same group did not get their 2 hours of meaningful human contact in at least half of their days in the SIU (Table 16).
8. Looking at prisoners who spent a long time in an SIU, we found large regional differences in the ability of CSC to achieve the 4- and 2-hour out-of-cell requirements. Generally, the Prairie Region – and Stony Mountain Institution in particular – was most successful (Tables 17-20) in this area.
9. Indigenous prisoners who were kept in SIUs for over a month appeared, overall, to have more success in achieving the required 4-hours out of cell and 2 hours of meaningful human activity.

These data, we believe, point strongly to one important conclusion: there is a need to continue to have monitoring and oversight of what is happening in CSC's SIUs. The failure to achieve the four hours out of the cell and two hours of meaningful human contact are, obviously, a special cause for concern.

At the same time, the variation that exists – across institutions and regions – suggests that, if CSC wishes to learn from its (relative) successes, it has the opportunity to do so.

This report, however, only begins to scratch the surface of what should be known about the operation of these new units that were designed and funded to replace “administrative segregation” or solitary confinement. Much more needs to be learned both from the existing administrative data and from other research carried out by an independent body.

But those interested in policies related to the SIUs might find even these preliminary findings to be useful. Some, for example, have suggested that there be some form of judicial oversight of SIUs. Looking at the data in Table 1, for example, one can see that if more thorough oversight procedures (e.g., judicial oversight of the decision) were implemented only for those who had already spent a ‘long time’ in an SIU (however that might be defined), the ‘burden’ of oversight could be dramatically reduced.

Similarly, at the moment, we know very little about the reasons for prisoners not getting their four hours out of cell each day and their two hours per day of meaningful human contact. Even if there happened to be a notation that the prisoner ‘refused’ an opportunity to leave the cell, it would be important to know *why* that refusal was given. One could easily imagine scenarios where a prisoner saw a ‘refusal’ as the safest alternative. These data suggest that one might want to implement special oversight of those cases in which this was a persistent problem. Defining “persistent” might be aided by data such as those contained in Tables 17 or 19.

Finally, we can't help expressing our disappointment that the findings contained in our report are the first to be released on the operation of the SIUs. One might have hoped that CSC itself might have released information like that contained in this report in order to elicit suggestions on how the treatment of prisoners might be shifted closer to what is contemplated in the current legislation.

**Understanding the Operation of Correctional Service Canada's Structured Intervention  
Units: Some Preliminary Findings**  
26 October 2020

Anthony N. Doob  
University of Toronto

and

Jane B. Sprott  
Ryerson University

**Background.** In mid-2019, Public Safety Canada established an “Implementation Advisory Panel” (“the panel”) to look into the implementation of the Structured Intervention Units (SIUs) that were designed to replace the “Administrative Segregation” (or solitary confinement) cells in Canada’s penitentiaries. This new regime started operating formally on 30 November 2019. The operation is governed by the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act*, sections 31-37, *Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations*, sections 19 to 23.07, and related Commissioner’s Directives.

The panel formally requested that Correctional Service Canada (CSC) provide it with information about the operation of the SIUs in mid-November 2019. The panel expected that the first set of information would be delivered to it by 1 March 2020. After that, the panel had requested that every two months after that it be given the data for the previous two months. For reasons that have been described elsewhere (see Appendix D), the panel never got these data. The panel itself died a natural predetermined death (between June and September 2020) as its members, one by one, reached the end of their one-year appointments as a volunteer member of the panel.

At that point, Public Safety Canada asked one of us (AND) to continue as a member of the panel. He told Public Safety Canada that a necessary, but not sufficient condition, was that Public Safety Canada ensure that he receive the data that had been requested 8 months earlier.

A substantial amount of data that had been requested by the panel in November 2019 was, in fact, delivered to AND on 30 September 2020. It was in a format consistent with the November request and appears to us to have been compiled in an appropriate and effective fashion with excellent documentation on the meaning of each variable. These data have now allowed us to do an initial examination of the operation of the SIUs. As someone interested in the issues surrounding the SIUs, AND voluntarily took on the task of seeing what kinds of things could be learned from these data. He requested JBS’s help in this project.

With the assent of Public Safety Canada, JBS’s offer to volunteer to help on this project was accepted and we began our work. One important aspect of these data needs to be remembered: they are administrative in their origin; hence they reflect what is in CSC’s information systems. We are limited by that fact. However, they provide a window through which we can examine some important aspects of the SIUs. Importantly, our focus here is solely SIUs – other forms of restricted custody or isolation that may have been, or are being, employed are not captured by the data.

A second point to remember is this: these are preliminary findings. The word “preliminary” has a couple of meanings. First, we are talking about data from the first 9 months of the operation of the SIUs. Many organizations, when starting a new regime, discover unforeseen challenges. Thus what happens in the beginning may not be what will happen later on. Additionally, although the SIUs

began operation before COVID-19 became an important fact of life in Canada, much of the period covered in this report was during the COVID pandemic. We have not attempted (yet) to look in a detailed fashion at the “COVID issue”, though we do remove the three institutions that had positive COVID cases from some analyses in order to investigate whether the presence of COVID might account for the findings.

As we have said, this is a report of some preliminary findings. We, as authors of this report, decided that it was more important to get some preliminary findings into the public discussion of the SIUs as quickly as possible, rather than to wait until we were able to fully explore the data. We believe that we have just begun to draw a picture of the operation of the SIUs.

One of the things we have tried to do in this first report is to show the breadth of what *can* be known about the operation of the SIUs from the data that are available<sup>1</sup>. Hence we have tended to try to use measures that are available simply to demonstrate that they may help inform later analyses of these data.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, in reading this report, we would urge readers to come to their own conclusions about the meaning of the findings. The purpose of the report is not to give our interpretations, explanations, or recommendations. It is to make the findings public so that there can be a serious and evidence-informed discussion about the operation of the SIUs. Such a discussion, we hope, will help give all of us ideas about what aspects of the SIUs need more examination from these data, other administrative data that we have not requested and/or received, and other data that a body with oversight responsibility of the SIUs might want to collect.

We begin our preliminary report by providing an overview of the SIU cases (basic demographics, length of time in SIUs, regional variation in the use of SIUs, multiple visits to SIUs, etc.) followed by a closer examination of the time (4 hours out of cell and 2 hours of meaningful human contact) that is part of the original legislation.

***An overview of SIU cases.*** We were given access to a number of separate datasets.<sup>3</sup> The main dataset described all “person-stays” (N=1,966) in which a prisoner entered a “Restricted Movement” (RM) cell and/or an SIU cell from the time that the SIU cells were opened<sup>4</sup> until the closing date for the data set (31 August 2020). If this stay ended, and the prisoner returned to the regular population and then, on a *later* date, was referred again to an SIU, that second event would be considered as a ‘new’ event, even though it involved the same prisoner.<sup>5</sup> Our main unit of analysis, then, will be a “person stay”.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately we cannot compare any results to the previous administrative segregation that existed up until 29 November since there are no comparable measures.

<sup>2</sup> That said, there are some data that we have not examined at all (e.g., some information about the criminal justice backgrounds of those who were placed in SIUs.)

<sup>3</sup> Those at CSC who put together these datasets did, we believe, an excellent job both of collecting the data from the various sources, documenting those data, and structuring the files in such a way that we could access the data with a minimum of difficulty. We very much appreciate their excellent work.

<sup>4</sup> The prisoner may have moved into the SIU from segregation prior to 30 November. But the earliest recorded start date for an SIU stay was 30 November 2020.

<sup>5</sup> Later reports can address, in more detail, these frequent visitors to an SIU.



If a prisoner is not in one of the 16 institutions with SIUs and CSC believes that they cannot be left in the general penitentiary population, they can be placed in RM in that institution. Within a small number of days, they are normally expected to be either moved back to the general population or moved to an SIU. If they were already housed in one of the 16 institutions that had an SIU, they would go directly to the SIU.

A total of 157 prisoners stayed in RM and did not make it as far as the SIU. All but one of them completed their RM stay prior to 31 August. We have removed these stays from our sample, but we have provided a brief look at those who stayed in RM and never transferred to an SIU (N=156) in Appendix A.

In addition to the RM-only stays, there is another special group to consider: those for whom ‘end dates’ of the stay in SIUs were not available for a simple reason: they were, apparently, still in the SIU at midnight on 31 August. For these prisoners (N=143), their stay in the SIU cannot be fully described since it was ongoing at the time of the collection of the data. We therefore also removed them from our sample.

This left us with 1,666 instances (or more accurately 1666 *person-stays*) involving people who went to an SIU (directly or via a RM cell in a non-SIU institution) and who completed their time in the SIU on or before 31 August 2020. They will be the focus of most of our attention in this first report. As we will see below, these 1,666 “person-stays” involved 1,037 discrete individuals.

***A description of SIU person-stays.*** Most of the person-stays in SIUs are for relatively short periods of time.<sup>6</sup> But it is important to look at the full distribution of “days in” since they varied in length from one day (in 20 cases) to 291 days (in one case). These are described in Table 1.

Table 1: Time in the SIU (for stays that ended on/before 31 August 2020)

Number of days in the SIU	Person-stays of this length	% of the 1666 person-stays that were this length	% of all SIU person-days that this “time group” accounts for
1-5 days	429	25.8%	2.8%
6-15 days	418	25.1%	7.1%
16-31 days	286	17.2%	11.9%
32-61 days	265	15.9%	22.2%
62-291 days	268	16.1%	56.0%
Total	1,666	100%	100%

<sup>6</sup> “Days in” can be defined in various ways. In this case, if a person goes in one day and leaves that same day, it is counted as one day in. If the person goes in one day and is released the next, it is two days. Essentially, then, this is the number of calendar days in which a person was wholly or partially in an SIU, including the days (if any) spent in RM prior to being moved to an SIU.

As can be seen in Table 1, 51% of the person-stays in the SIUs are for 15 days or fewer. But it is worth examining the final column of this table: Roughly 78% of the cells, on a given day, are housing those who have been in an SIU (in this person-stay) for more than a month.

The easiest way to reconcile these two sets of percentages is to consider a hypothetical example. Think of a unit with three SIU cells. Imagine that in a one-year period, two of the cells were occupied by four prisoners – each for six months. Imagine also that the third cell was used for 52 prisoners, each of whom was there for a week. This would mean that 52 of 56 (about 93%) of the prisoners were there for a week, but on a given day 2 of the 3 prisoners (about 67%) would be long-stay (6- month) prisoners.

One of the problems in looking only at those who have *completed* their stays in the SIU (by the end of August 2020) is that those still in the SIU on 1 September 2020 are ignored. This *could* be a problem if many of them had been in for a very long time; or it might not be a problem if they had entered the SIU at the very end of August.

As we see in Table 2, they do not constitute a large number. However, 41 of them (28.7% of the group) had been in the SIU for more than two months. We raise this issue because the analyses that we present in this report – those who have *completed* their visits to the SIU – ignore the fact that there is a group of people who, as of 1 September 2020, had been in the SIU for a relatively long period of time. Said differently, looking exclusively at those who have completed their stays in an SIU *under-estimates* in important ways the length of time people stay in an SIU. We can see this very easily by the following comparison: About 51% of those who had completed their time in an SIU were there for 15 days or less (Table 1). Only about 29% of those who were still in the SIU at the end of our time period had been in for 15 days or less (Table 2).

Table 2: Length of time in the SIU for those not released by the end of August 2020.

**Days in for those still in at the end of 31 August 2020**

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 thru 5	16	11.2	11.2
	6 thru 15	26	18.2	29.4
	16 thru 31	31	21.7	51.0
	32 thru 61	29	20.3	71.3
	62 thru 275	41	28.7	100.0
	Total	143	100.0	

A one-day census count of all inmates in Federal correctional institutions was done on 20 September 2020 and it showed the of the 12,525 people in federal institutions on that day, 210 (1.6%) were in SIUs and 1 person in RM. Additionally, however, we asked for, and were provided with, weekly ‘snapshot’ data of the total imprisoned CSC (penitentiary) population so that we could get an idea of how the SIU population compared to those in the penitentiary population as a whole. There was relatively little change in the characteristics of the total imprisoned population during the time period of interest to us for this report. For example, the overall proportion of Indigenous prisoners

varied between 29.9% to 31.3% in this 9-month period. Hence an overall snapshot of the prisoners during this 9-month period provides a good comparison.

Table 3, then, compares the characteristics of those in each of the 1,666 person-stays to the population in CSC penitentiaries during this same period. There are relatively small amounts of missing data on some variables that, we believe, are unimportant.

Table 3: Characteristics of the Person-Stays in SIU compared to the Penitentiary Population  
(December 2119 through August 2020)

	Proportion of all completed SIU Person-stays	Proportion of all Prisoners
Female	2.3%	4.9%
Male	97.7%	95.1%
Total	100%	100%
<b>Age:</b>		
18-19	0.4%	0.3%
20-24	16.7%	8.0%
25-29	31.8%	15.8%
30-39	34.6%	30.9%
40-49	12.2%	19.9%
50-59	3.7%	15.4%
60-97 <sup>7</sup>	0.7%	9.6%
Total:	100%	100%
Indigenous	39%	30.4%
Non-Indigenous	61%	69.6%
Total	100%	100%
<b>Race/Indigenous</b>		
White	38.4%	Not available (not originally requested)
Indigenous	39.0%	
Black	13.0%	
Other/missing	9.6%	
Total	100%	

These findings (above) can be easily summarized.

(a) Compared to the CSC penitentiary population as a whole, women are under-represented among the person-stays in the SIUs.

---

<sup>7</sup> Though there was one prisoner in the general population who was age 97, apparently, the oldest person who stayed in an SIU during this period was 'only' 72.

(b) The SIU population tends to be much *more* likely to include those who are young (under 40 years old) and much *less* likely to include those who are older (40 and over) than the general population.

(c) When looking at Indigenous prisoners we see that compared to their already high proportion in the penitentiary population (30.4% during this period, compared to 4.9% in the Canadian general population<sup>8</sup>), Indigenous people are over-represented in SIUs, accounting for about 39% of the person-stays.

Although in this preliminary report we are not focusing much attention on individual institutions, there are two findings that we noticed when examining the data that we thought might be of interest. As noted above (Table 3) 2.3% of the person-stays (39 person-stays in all) in the SIUs involved women. Thirty-two of these 39 women (or 82%) were placed in SIUs in one institution: Edmonton Institution for Women. Said differently, the other four SIUs in Women's penitentiaries accounted for 7 person-stays *in total*. All 32 of these person-stays in the SIU in the Edmonton Institution for Women identified the Edmonton Institution for Women as the institution requesting authorization to transfer to the SIU. That is, these 32 person-stays did not appear to originate from other institutions.

Looking only at the federally imprisoned women in the five regional women's institutions in Canada, Edmonton Institution in the period December 2019 through August 2020 had about 28.7% of the women prisoners. Thus, while they were responsible for roughly 28% of the federal inmate population of women in regional women's institutions, they were responsible for 82% of women's stays in SIUs.

During the period that this report focuses on (November 2019 through August 2020), we estimate that 59.4% of the prisoners in Edmonton Institution for Women were Indigenous. Twenty-five of the 32 person-stays in SIUs (78%) involved Indigenous women. This is fairly consistent with the overall finding noted above in Table 3: Indigenous people are, in general, even more over-represented in SIU person-stays (compared to the regular penitentiary population) by about twenty-eight percent (Overall in SIUs/Overall in CSC in-custody population:  $39\%/30.4\%=1.28$ ; Applying this ratio to the Edmonton Institution for women, we might expect to find  $1.28 \times 59.4\% = 76\%$  of person-stays to be women. This is lower, but not dramatically so, than the actual percent Indigenous of 82%).

One might conclude the obvious: most of these women transferred to SIUs in Edmonton Institution for Women are Indigenous, but that is largely due to two facts: The overall population (SIU and non-SIU) in that facility has a high proportion of Indigenous women, and Indigenous people (women and men), in general, are more likely than others to be transferred to SIUs.

The second finding relates to region. It would appear, from Table 4 (below), that the use of SIUs is higher in Quebec than would be expected given the proportion of all prisoners who are housed in

---

<sup>8</sup> An estimate from the 2016 census <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-CAN-eng.cfm?Lang=Eng&GK=CAN&GC=01&TOPIC=9>

that province/region. And the use of SIUs is lower in Ontario and to some extent in the Prairies than one might expect given the CSC custodial population in those regions.

Table 4: Distribution of completed person-stays (n=1,666) by region compared to total (in custody) penitentiary population.

Region	Proportion of all completed SIU person stays	Proportion of all prisoners
Atlantic	11.5%	9.5%
Quebec	38.4%	20.6%
Ontario	8.0%	22.3%
Prairie	23.3%	30.0%
Pacific	18.8%	17.5%
Total	100%	100%

Table 5 demonstrates that the distribution of length of stay in the SIU also varied by region. Quebec and the Pacific region tended to be more likely to have “short stay” SIUs visit and less likely to have long stays.

Table 5: Regional variation in the length of person-stays in the SIUs/RM.

**Region in which SIU is located \* Total days in SIU/RM Crosstabulation**

			Total days in SIU/RM					Total
			1 thru 5	6 thru 15	16 thru 31	32 thru 61	62 thru 291	
Region in which SIU is located	Atlantic	Count	23	53	28	46	41	191
			12.0%	27.7%	14.7%	24.1%	21.5%	100.0%
	Quebec	Count	250	153	83	70	83	639
			39.1%	23.9%	13.0%	11.0%	13.0%	100.0%
	Ontario	Count	22	37	21	20	33	133
			16.5%	27.8%	15.8%	15.0%	24.8%	100.0%
	Prairies	Count	46	90	84	93	76	389
			11.8%	23.1%	21.6%	23.9%	19.5%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	88	85	70	36	35	314
			28.0%	27.1%	22.3%	11.5%	11.1%	100.0%
	Total	Count	429	418	286	265	268	1666
			25.8%	25.1%	17.2%	15.9%	16.1%	100.0%

Note: Chi square = 170.2, df=16 p<.001

*A brief glance at those who completed more than one stay in an SIU (30 November 2019 through 31 August 2020).* As shown in Table 6, there were a fair number of people who were transferred to an SIU more than once. Although there was one person who had been placed in an SIU a total of 12 times in this 9-month period, all of the others had been placed between 1 and 7 times.

Table 6: Multiple stays in SIUs (completed stays from November 2019 through August 2020).

	Frequency	Percent
One	675	65.1
Two	207	20.0
Three or Four	120	11.6
Five or more	35	3.4
Total	1,037	100

Not surprisingly, women were less likely than men to have been repeat visitors to SIUs (Table 7).

Table 7: Repeat transfers to SIUs by prisoner's sex.

			Number of full terms in an SIU, 30 November 2019 to 31 August 2020, for those transferred to an SIU at least once			
			One	Two	Three or more	Total
Sex of Prisoner	Male	Count	648	204	153	1005
			64.5%	20.3%	15.2%	100.0%
	Female	Count	27	3	2	32
			84.4%	9.4%	6.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	675	207	155	1037
			65.1%	20.0%	14.9%	100.0%

Chi square (One vs. Two or more) = 4.56,  $p < .05$

Prisoners who had an indication of a mental health concern at the start of their first transfer to an SIU were slightly, but statistically significantly, more likely to be transferred again.

Table 8: Relationship of an identified mental health issue at the time of the first transfer to an SIU and repeated transfers to an SIU

			Number of full terms in an SIU, 30 November 2019 to 31 August 2020, for those transferred to an SIU at least once			
			One	Two	Three or more	Total
Prisoner had mental health need at start of SIU stay	NO	Count	501	144	100	745
			67.2%	19.3%	13.4%	100.0%
	YES	Count	174	63	55	292
			59.6%	21.6%	18.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	675	207	155	1037
			65.1%	20.0%	14.9%	100.0%

Chi square = 6.53, df=2, p<.05

There was considerable variability in the distribution of multiple SIU stays by region (see Table 9), with Quebec most likely to have multiple stay prisoners and the Prairies least likely.

Table 9: Repeat transfers to SIUs by Region.

			Number of full terms in an SIU, 30 November 2019 to 31 August 2020, for those transferred to an SIU at least once			
			One	Two	Three or more	Total
Region in which the SIU is located	Atlantic	Count	75	26	22	123
			61.0%	21.1%	17.9%	100.0%
	Quebec	Count	188	76	72	336
			56.0%	22.6%	21.4%	100.0%
	Ontario	Count	70	18	10	98
			71.4%	18.4%	10.2%	100.0%
	Prairies	Count	232	41	18	291
			79.7%	14.1%	6.2%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	110	46	33	189
			58.2%	24.3%	17.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	675	207	155	1037
			65.1%	20.0%	14.9%	100.0%

Chi square = 51.8, df=8, p<.001

There was little variation in the distribution of repeat transfers to the SIUs by the age of the prisoners except for the fact that none of the 12 prisoners, age 60 and over, who were transferred once to an SIU were transferred again during this period.

Perhaps more interesting is the fact that multiple visits did not appear to be significantly related to any of the following factors:

- The reason for transferring the prisoner to the SIU (see discussion of this issue, below) in the first transfer.
- Ethnicity (variation across groups: White, Black, Indigenous, Other/Mixed/Missing data).
- Whether the prisoner was Indigenous.

***Reasons for transferring people to the SIUs.*** The *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* lists three reasons for placing people in an SIU. Specifically, it states that:

**34 (1)** A staff member may authorize the transfer of an inmate into a structured intervention unit under subsection 29.01(1) only if the staff member is satisfied that there is no reasonable alternative to the inmate's confinement in a structured intervention unit and the staff member believes on reasonable grounds that

(a) the inmate has acted, has attempted to act or intends to act in a manner that jeopardizes the safety of any person or the security of a penitentiary and allowing the inmate to be in the mainstream inmate population would jeopardize the safety of any person or the security of the penitentiary;

(b) allowing the inmate to be in the mainstream inmate population would jeopardize the inmate's safety; or

(c) allowing the inmate to be in the mainstream inmate population would interfere with an investigation that could lead to a criminal charge or a charge under subsection 41(2) of a serious disciplinary offence.

Looking at the 1,666 person-stays in SIUs, it would appear that person-stays in the SIUs occur for somewhat different officially recorded reasons across Canada's five regions. The safety of the prisoner seemed to be a more commonly stated reason in the Atlantic, Ontario, and Prairie regions. The safety/security of the institution appeared to be more common in Quebec and the Pacific regions (Table 10).



Table 10: Regional variation in the legal justification for the use of the SIU

			Reason for the transfer to the SIU			Total
			Prisoner may jeopardize safety/security of the Institution (34.1a)	Concerns about safety of the prisoner (34.1b)	Prisoner may interfere with investigation (34.1c)	
Region in which the SIU is located	Atlantic	Count	92	87	12	191
			48.2%	45.5%	6.3%	100.0%
	Quebec	Count	452	187	0	639
			70.7%	29.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	Ontario	Count	62	59	12	133
			46.6%	44.4%	9.0%	100.0%
	Prairies	Count	199	180	10	389
			51.2%	46.3%	2.6%	100.0%
	Pacific	Count	210	104	0	314
			66.9%	33.1%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	1015	617	34	1666
			60.9%	37.0%	2.0%	100.0%

Note: Overall chi-square (with 2 cells with low expected values) =122.5 df=8, p<.01.

Pooling issues (a) and (c) : chi-square = 41.8, df=4, p<.001.

Interestingly, it would appear that those transferred to an SIU because of concerns about their own safety were more likely to have a recorded mental health need at the start of their stay in the SIU than did those transferred for other reasons (Table 11).

Table 11: Mental health needs of those transferred to SIUs for different reasons.

**Reason for the transfer to the SIU \* Prisoner had mental health need at start of SIU stay Crosstabulation**

			Prisoner had mental health need at start of SIU stay		
			NO	YES	Total
Reason for the transfer to the SIU	Concerns about safety of the prisoner (34.1b)	Count	417	200	617
			67.6%	32.4%	100.0%
	Prisoner may jeopardize safety/security of the Institution or interfere with investigation (34.1a or c)	Count	804	245	1049
			76.6%	23.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	1221	445	1666
			73.3%	26.7%	100.0%

Chi square = 15.83, df=1, p<.01

Being transferred into an SIU because of concerns about the prisoner's own safety appears to be associated with considerably longer stays in the SIU (Table 12)

Table 12: Length of the person-stay in the SIU as a function of the justification for the transfer.

			Total days in SIU/RM					
			1 thru 5	6 thru 15	16 thru 31	32 thru 61	62 thru 291	Total
Reason for the transfer to the SIU	Concerns about safety of the prisoner (34.1b)	Count	71	129	114	157	146	617
			11.5%	20.9%	18.5%	25.4%	23.7%	100.0%
	Prisoner may jeopardize safety/security of the Institution or Interfere with Investigation (34.1a or c)	Count	358	289	172	108	122	1049
			34.1%	27.6%	16.4%	10.3%	11.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	429	418	286	265	268	1666
			25.8%	25.1%	17.2%	15.9%	16.1%	100.0%

Chi-square = 176.0 df=4, p<.001

**Time Outside of Cells.** The Commissioner's Directive (CD 771) on the Structured Intervention Units (SIUs) states that:

Inmates confined in an SIU must be provided with the opportunity to be out of their cell for a minimum of four hours daily, of which a minimum of two hours must include opportunities for meaningful human contact. Staff must explore all reasonable options to provide inmates with as much time out of their cells, beyond the minimum required number of hours (SIU Overview, #5<sup>9</sup>)

This section of our preliminary report begins an examination of whether the total four-hour minimum and the specific two-hour minimum for "meaningful human contact" is being met. Of course, an important caveat is that we have no details around what qualifies for four hours outside of the cell or, importantly, two hours of "meaningful human contact". If someone were taken from their cell and placed in an small empty room for four hours, one might question whether this should count as four hours out of the SIU cell. Similarly, if, during this time, the prisoner was forced to endure humiliation or threats from another person, we would not want this to count as "meaningful human contact." Clearly more information is needed to evaluate the "real" meaning of these data.

The standard way in which CSC counts days is to include both the start and end date in the calculation. This counts *any portion* of a day as a full day. As an example, if an inmate's start date was 23:00 on January 1, and the end date was 08:00 on January 2, this would be counted as two days.

For understanding time outside of cell however, this way of counting days may not be optimal for our purposes. In the above example, for instance, the person would be counted as being in an SIU for two days and thus requiring two days where four hours (or two hours for the other 'requirement') outside of the cell was achieved. Obviously, however, that would be impossible to achieve within that scenario. Therefore, for the analyses that follow — the analyses that attempt to understand "time outside the cell" — we remove one day from the "total days" calculations. This removes those who were only in an SIU for part of one day (N=20) and, with the example above,

<sup>9</sup><https://www.csc-ccc.gc.ca/politiques-et-lois/711-cd-en.shtml#t1>

instead of counting that person as being in the SIU for two days (and thus requiring two days where there was 4hrs (or 2hrs) outside of cell) the person would be counted as being there for one day and thus requiring one day with 4hrs (or 2 hrs) outside of the cell. We also removed one day from the two variables in the data set which counted the days where 4hrs (or 2hrs of meaningful human contact) outside of the cell were not achieved for the same reasons.

Removing those (N=20) person-stays where the prisoner was only in an SIU for part of one day leaves us with 1,646 person-stays to examine, 51.8% of which were in SIUs for 15 days or less.

Table 13: Number of Days in SIU

Number of days in SIU					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 thru 5 days	496	30.1	30.1	30.1
	6 thru 15 days	356	21.6	21.6	51.8
	16 thru 31 days	266	16.2	16.2	67.9
	32 thru 61 days	267	16.2	16.2	84.1
	62 thru 291 days	261	15.9	15.9	100.0
	Total	1646	100.0	100.0	

We next estimate the proportion of time spent in an SIU where four hours outside of the cell was *not* achieved.

We estimate this by calculating the number of days where four hours outside of the cell was not achieved divided by the total number of days spent in an SIU. This provides an estimate of the proportion of time in the SIU where this 4-hour benchmark was not met. So, for example, if someone was in an SUI for 10 days and did not achieve four hours outside of the cell in 6 of those days, we would classify him/her as having not achieved 4 hours outside of the cell for 60% of his/her time ( $6 / 10 = .60$ ).

Across all 1,646 person-stays, only 5.7% achieved 4-hours outside of the cell every day. Roughly 6% missed up to 20% of their days being outside of their cell for four hours. The majority (66.3%) missed their four hours outside of their cell in over three-quarters of their time spent in an SIU. Roughly 39% did not receive 4 hours outside of the cell every day for the entirety of their stay – that is, there was no day during their stay where they achieved 4 hours outside of their cell.

Table 14: Proportion of SIU days where four hours outside of cell was not achieved

**Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
missed zero days (0%)/got out for 4 hrs every day in SIU	94	5.7	5.7	5.7
missed up to 20% of their days	100	6.1	6.1	11.8
missed 21% to 50% of their days	149	9.1	9.1	20.8
missed 51% to 75% of their days	211	12.8	12.8	33.7
missed 76% to 99% of their days	451	27.4	27.4	61.1
missed 100% of their days	641	38.9	38.9	100.0
Total	1646	100.0	100.0	

In order to further understand these results, however, it is necessary to “control for” the time spent in an SIU. Failure to be out of the cell for 4 hours a day for over 75% of an SIU stay means something very different for those in an SIU for somewhere between 1 to 5 days vs. those who have been in for over two months.

The following table shows, for each time range spent within an SIU, the proportion of the time where four hours outside of the cell was not met. We would suggest that the longer the time spent in an SIU, the more concerning the portion of missed days might become.

As an example, looking at the longest stay group (from 62 to 291 days), 65.2% missed their four-hour benchmark in 76% *or more* of their time in the SIU. Taking the low end of this grouping – i.e., someone who was in the SIU for 62 days and missed 76% (not more) of their days – means that they missed their 4 hours outside of their cell in 47 of their 62 days and thus only had 15 days within a two-month period with four hours outside of the cell. This is happening to roughly 65% of the group with these longer SIU stays (62-192 days).

There were 261 person-stays in the SIUs that lasted more than two months (i.e., between 62 to 291 days). Of this group, 170 (150 + 20) missed more than three quarters of their promised “four hours out of cell”. This group alone constitutes about 10% of the 1,646 stays.

Table 15: Length of time in SIU by proportion of time where four hours outside the cell was not achieved

**Number of days in SIU \* Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved Crosstabulation**

		Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved						Total
		missed zero days (0%)/got out for 4 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	
Number of days in SIU	1 thru 5 days	29	6	54	44	26	337	496
		5.8%	1.2%	10.9%	8.9%	5.2%	67.9%	100.0%
	6 thru 15 days	22	19	38	46	64	167	356
		6.2%	5.3%	10.7%	12.9%	18.0%	46.9%	100.0%
	16 thru 31 days	14	24	22	32	99	75	266
		5.3%	9.0%	8.3%	12.0%	37.2%	28.2%	100.0%
	32 thru 61 days	23	32	14	44	112	42	267
		8.6%	12.0%	5.2%	16.5%	41.9%	15.7%	100.0%
	62 thru 291 days	6	19	21	45	150	20	261
		2.3%	7.3%	8.0%	17.2%	57.5%	7.7%	100.0%
	Total	94	100	149	211	451	641	1646
		5.7%	6.1%	9.1%	12.8%	27.4%	38.9%	100.0%

We next examine – in the same way – the proportion of time spent in an SIU where the minimum of two hours of meaningful human contact outside the cell was not achieved. This benchmark appears to be met in a larger proportion of the stays as compared to the four-hour benchmark. That said, the concern is still focused on the longer stay groups. Roughly 28% of the longest stay group (those over 2 months -- 62 to 191 days) did not achieve two hours of meaningful human contact outside of their cell in 76% or more of their days in the SIU.

A quarter of those in an SUI for 32 to 61 days, did not meet the minimum two hours of meaningful human contact in over 75% of their days within the SIU. This means, for example, that someone who was in an SIU for 32 days and missed 76% of their days only had 8 days within that month-long period with two hours of meaningful human contact outside of the cell.

Table 16: Length of time in SIU by proportion of time where two hours of “meaningful contact” outside the cell was not achieved

**Number of days in SIU \* Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved Crosstabulation**

		Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved						
		missed zero days (0%)/got out for 2 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	Total
Number of days in SIU	1 thru 5 days	88	11	111	55	17	214	496
		17.7%	2.2%	22.4%	11.1%	3.4%	43.1%	100.0%
	6 thru 15 days	35	39	84	64	62	72	356
		9.8%	11.0%	23.6%	18.0%	17.4%	20.2%	100.0%
	16 thru 31 days	27	28	69	62	69	11	266
		10.2%	10.5%	25.9%	23.3%	25.9%	4.1%	100.0%
	32 thru 61 days	41	33	64	61	63	5	267
		15.4%	12.4%	24.0%	22.8%	23.6%	1.9%	100.0%
	62 thru 291 days	10	40	77	61	71	2	261
		3.8%	15.3%	29.5%	23.4%	27.2%	0.8%	100.0%
Total		201	151	405	303	282	304	1646
		12.2%	9.2%	24.6%	18.4%	17.1%	18.5%	100.0%

One possible explanation for the failure to achieve the minimum daily times (4 hours out of cell; 2 hours of meaningful human contact) could be that much of the time period covered by this report was during the COVID-19 pandemic. In order to see if the presence of COVID-19 in an institution could account for these findings, we repeated the analyses for Table 15 and Table 16 looking at only those institutions that had never (by 20 October 2020) had even one confirmed COVID-19 case. These tables are in Appendix B. They suggest that the failure to achieve the 4- and 2-hour time periods was essentially the same in those institutions that had never had any COVID-19 cases.

***Regional Variation in Time out of Cell.*** Thus far we have presented an overall picture of the operation of the SIUs. However, as we have seen in some earlier parts of this report, there is considerable variability across regions on some measures. Thus we examined the proportion of days where the 4hrs (or 2hrs of meaningful human contact) outside of the cell was not achieved across the five regions.

We would assume that the concern about time out of cell (total or in ‘meaningful human contact’) is especially acute for those in SIUs for long periods of time. Therefore, in exploring the time outside of cells, we restrict our focus to the two longest stay groups – those person-stays of 32-61 days, (N=267) and person-stays of 62 to 291 days (N=261).

We looked first at the data for the 39 person-stays that involved women (32 of which were from the Edmonton Institution for Women). There were only three person-stays in an SIU that exceeded one month. Of those three stays, two stays lasted 32 to 61 days and one stay lasted 62 to 291 days. All

three of these women with relatively long stays in SIUs failed to receive four hours outside of their cell in 51% to 75% of their days. With respect to the two hours of meaningful contact outside the cell, the two stays of 32-61 days missed 76% to 99% of their days while the one longest stay (62-219 days) missed two hours of meaningful contact in 51% to 75% of her days.

The next set of analyses then, focus on the variation related to men's SIU stays. For the men who stayed in the SIUs for 32 to 61 days, the Prairie region stands out as being much more successful in meeting the four-hour benchmark than any other region. A quarter of these stays received their four hours outside of the cell every day. At the other end of the spectrum, the Pacific region stands out as having the largest proportion (36.8%) who missed their four hours outside the cell every day they were in the SIU. These patterns generally also hold for the longest stay group (those in for 62 to 291 days).

Table 17: Proportion of SIU days where four hours outside the cell was not achieved by length of time in SIU and region

**Region of SIU \* Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved \* Number of days in SIU Crosstabulation**

Number of days in SIU			Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved						Total
			missed zero days (0%)/got out for 4 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	
32 thru 61 days	Region of SIU	Atlantic	0	0	1	10	31	5	47
			0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	21.3%	66.0%	10.6%	100.0%
	Quebec		0	0	4	13	39	13	69
			0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	18.8%	56.5%	18.8%	100.0%
	Ontario		0	0	1	6	13	0	20
			0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	30.0%	65.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Prairies		23	32	8	5	13	10	91
			25.3%	35.2%	8.8%	5.5%	14.3%	11.0%	100.0%
	Pacific		0	0	0	8	16	14	38
			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.1%	42.1%	36.8%	100.0%
	Total		23	32	14	42	112	42	265
			8.7%	12.1%	5.3%	15.8%	42.3%	15.8%	100.0%
62 thru 291 days	Region of SIU	Atlantic	0	0	1	6	30	1	38
			0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	15.8%	78.9%	2.6%	100.0%
	Quebec		0	0	1	15	60	7	83
			0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	18.1%	72.3%	8.4%	100.0%
	Ontario		0	0	13	8	11	1	33
			0.0%	0.0%	39.4%	24.2%	33.3%	3.0%	100.0%
	Prairies		6	19	6	10	28	4	73
			8.2%	26.0%	8.2%	13.7%	38.4%	5.5%	100.0%
	Pacific		0	0	0	5	21	7	33
			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.2%	63.6%	21.2%	100.0%
	Total		6	19	21	44	150	20	260
			2.3%	7.3%	8.1%	16.9%	57.7%	7.7%	100.0%

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the variation ends here. *Within* region one also sees some substantial variability. We use the Prairie region as an illustration of the variation that exists. Looking first at the group who stayed in the SIUs for 32 to 61 days, Stony Mountain stands out as

being more successful in meeting the four-hour benchmark than the other institutions. Roughly 41% of this group received their four hours outside of cell every day and another 56.8% failed to achieve their four hours outside of the cell in up to 20% of their days. The Edmonton Institution is at the other end with 50% of this group missing their four hours every day and another 33.3% missing their four hours in 76% or more of their time.

Table 18: Prairie Region Only: Proportion of SIU days where four hours outside the cell was not achieved by length of time in SIU

**Prairie Region \* Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved \* Number of days in SIU Crosstabulation**

Number of days in SIU			Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved						Total
			missed zero days (0%)/got out for 4 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	
32 thru 61 days	Prairie Region	Edmonton Institution	0	0	1	1	4	6	12
			0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%
		Saskatchewan Institution	0	3	6	4	9	4	26
			0.0%	11.5%	23.1%	15.4%	34.6%	15.4%	100.0%
		Stony Mountain	18	25	1	0	0	0	44
			40.9%	56.8%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	18	28	8	5	13	10	82	
		22.0%	34.1%	9.8%	6.1%	15.9%	12.2%	100.0%	
62 thru 291 days	Prairie Region	Edmonton Institution	0	0	0	3	21	4	28
			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	75.0%	14.3%	100.0%
		Saskatchewan Institution	0	1	6	7	7	0	21
			0.0%	4.8%	28.6%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%
		Stony Mountain	5	17	0	0	0	0	22
			22.7%	77.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	5	18	6	10	28	4	71	
		7.0%	25.4%	8.5%	14.1%	39.4%	5.6%	100.0%	



The same pattern emerges when looking at the proportion of time in the SIU where the minimum two hours of meaningful human contact was not met. For both time groupings (person-stays of 32 to 61 days and 62 to 291 days in the SIU) the Prairie region again stands out as having a larger proportion receiving all or most of their days with two hours of meaningful human contact outside of their cell. Generally speaking, the Pacific region and Quebec stand out at the other end of the spectrum with having a relatively large proportion of SIUs missing a relatively large (76%+) proportion of their days with two hours of meaningful human contact.

Table 19: Proportion of SIU days where two hours of “meaningful contact” outside the cell was not achieved by length of time in SIU and region

**Region of SIU \* Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved \* Number of days in SIU Crosstabulation**

Number of days in SIU			Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved						Total
			missed zero days (0%)/got out for 2 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	
32 thru 61 days	Region of SIU	Atlantic	0	2	14	16	15	0	47
			0.0%	4.3%	29.8%	34.0%	31.9%	0.0%	100.0%
		Quebec	0	5	25	16	22	1	69
			0.0%	7.2%	36.2%	23.2%	31.9%	1.4%	100.0%
		Ontario	0	2	7	6	5	0	20
			0.0%	10.0%	35.0%	30.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Prairies	41	22	9	9	8	2	91
			45.1%	24.2%	9.9%	9.9%	8.8%	2.2%	100.0%
		Pacific	0	2	9	14	11	2	38
			0.0%	5.3%	23.7%	36.8%	28.9%	5.3%	100.0%
		Total	41	33	64	61	61	5	265
			15.5%	12.5%	24.2%	23.0%	23.0%	1.9%	100.0%
62 thru 291 days	Region of SIU	Atlantic	0	1	17	12	8	0	38
			0.0%	2.6%	44.7%	31.6%	21.1%	0.0%	100.0%
		Quebec	0	8	25	17	31	2	83
			0.0%	9.6%	30.1%	20.5%	37.3%	2.4%	100.0%
		Ontario	0	11	10	9	3	0	33
			0.0%	33.3%	30.3%	27.3%	9.1%	0.0%	100.0%
		Prairies	10	19	15	12	17	0	73
			13.7%	26.0%	20.5%	16.4%	23.3%	0.0%	100.0%
		Pacific	0	1	10	10	12	0	33
			0.0%	3.0%	30.3%	30.3%	36.4%	0.0%	100.0%
		Total	10	40	77	60	71	2	260
			3.8%	15.4%	29.6%	23.1%	27.3%	0.8%	100.0%

Again, however, variation persists *within* region. Similar to the trends with the four-hour outside of cell benchmark, Stony Mountain stands out as meeting the two-hour benchmark in a larger proportion of stays for both time groupings.

Table 20: Prairie Region Only: Proportion of SIU days where two hours of “meaningful contact” outside the cell was not achieved by length of time in SIU

**Prairie Region \* Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved \* Number of days in SIU Crosstabulation**

Number of days in SIU			Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved					Total	
			missed zero days (0%)/got out for 2 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days		missed 100% of their days
32 thru 61 days	Prairie Region	Edmonton Institution	0	1	2	4	4	1	12
			0.0%	8.3%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	8.3%	100.0%
		Saskatchewan Institution	1	8	7	5	4	1	26
			3.8%	30.8%	26.9%	19.2%	15.4%	3.8%	100.0%
		Stony Mountain	35	9	0	0	0	0	44
			79.5%	20.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total		36	18	9	9	8	2	82
			43.9%	22.0%	11.0%	11.0%	9.8%	2.4%	100.0%
62 thru 291 days	Prairie Region	Edmonton Institution	0	0	7	10	11		28
			0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	35.7%	39.3%		100.0%
		Saskatchewan Institution	0	5	8	2	6		21
			0.0%	23.8%	38.1%	9.5%	28.6%		100.0%
		Stony Mountain	8	14	0	0	0		22
			36.4%	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		100.0%
	Total		8	19	15	12	17		71
			11.3%	26.8%	21.1%	16.9%	23.9%		100.0%

**Ethnicity.** Keeping our focus on the two longer time periods (32 to 61 days and 62 to 291 days) we next explore ethnicity and the proportion of time where the four (or two) hours outside the cell was not achieved. Looking first at the proportion of days where four hours outside the cell was not achieved, one sees that over 50% of each ethnicity grouping (and both time groupings) miss 76% or more of their days – the sole exception is Indigenous people who stayed for 32 and 61 days where “only” about 45% did not get their promised four hours out of the SIU cell in 76% or more of their time in the SIU).

Indigenous people appeared to have a lower proportion of missed days. Whites, followed by Blacks, had the largest proportion of missed days. For the 31 to 61 days group, 69.7% of white people, 64.3% of black people and 44.8% of Indigenous people missed 76% or more of their days with four hours outside of the cell. For the 62 to 291 days group, 75% of white people, 70% of black people and 54.2% of Indigenous people missed 76% or more of their days with four hours outside of the cell.

Table 21: Proportion of SIU days where four hours outside the cell was not achieved by length of time in SIU and ethnicity

		Crosstab						
		Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved						
Number of days in SIU		missed zero days (0%)/got out for 4 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	Total
32 thru 61 days	White	1	4	8	17	52	17	99
		1.0%	4.0%	8.1%	17.2%	52.5%	17.2%	100.0%
	Inidgenous	19	22	6	17	37	15	116
		16.4%	19.0%	5.2%	14.7%	31.9%	12.9%	100.0%
	Black	3	2	0	5	14	4	28
		10.7%	7.1%	0.0%	17.9%	50.0%	14.3%	100.0%
	Other/Missing	0	4	0	5	9	6	24
		0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	20.8%	37.5%	25.0%	100.0%
62 thru 291 days	White	23	32	14	44	112	42	267
		8.6%	12.0%	5.2%	16.5%	41.9%	15.7%	100.0%
	Inidgenous	2	1	6	17	69	9	104
		1.9%	1.0%	5.8%	16.3%	66.3%	8.7%	100.0%
	Black	3	15	9	16	44	7	94
		3.2%	16.0%	9.6%	17.0%	46.8%	7.4%	100.0%
	Other/Missing	1	1	5	5	24	4	40
		2.5%	2.5%	12.5%	12.5%	60.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	Total	0	2	1	7	13	0	23
		0.0%	8.7%	4.3%	30.4%	56.5%	0.0%	100.0%
		6	19	21	45	150	20	261
		2.3%	7.3%	8.0%	17.2%	57.5%	7.7%	100.0%

A similar pattern emerges when looking at the proportion of time where two hours of meaningful contact was missed. For the 31 to 61 days group, 30.3% of white people, 17.9% of black people and 21.5% of Indigenous people missed 76% or more of their days with two hours of meaningful human contact outside of the cell. For those who had SIU stays of between 62 to 291 days, 33.7% of white people, 30% of black people and 23.4% of Indigenous people missed 76% or more of their days with two hours outside of the cell.

Table 22: Proportion of SIU days where two hours of “meaningful contact” outside the cell for meaningful contact was not achieved by length of time in SIU and ethnicity

		Crosstab						
		Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved						
Number of days in SIU		missed zero days (0%)/got out for 2 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	Total
32 thru 61 days	White	2	10	32	25	28	2	99
		2.0%	10.1%	32.3%	25.3%	28.3%	2.0%	100.0%
	Indigenous	35	15	19	22	23	2	116
		30.2%	12.9%	16.4%	19.0%	19.8%	1.7%	100.0%
	Black	3	3	7	10	5	0	28
		10.7%	10.7%	25.0%	35.7%	17.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	Other/Missing	1	5	6	4	7	1	24
		4.2%	20.8%	25.0%	16.7%	29.2%	4.2%	100.0%
62 thru 291 days	White	41	33	64	61	63	5	267
		15.4%	12.4%	24.0%	22.8%	23.6%	1.9%	100.0%
	Indigenous	2	12	25	30	34	1	104
		1.9%	11.5%	24.0%	28.8%	32.7%	1.0%	100.0%
	Black	7	17	33	15	21	1	94
		7.4%	18.1%	35.1%	16.0%	22.3%	1.1%	100.0%
	Other/Missing	1	6	10	11	12	0	40
		2.5%	15.0%	25.0%	27.5%	30.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	0	5	9	5	4	0	23
		0.0%	21.7%	39.1%	21.7%	17.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	Total	10	40	77	61	71	2	261
		3.8%	15.3%	29.5%	23.4%	27.2%	0.8%	100.0%

We also looked at whether total time out of cell was related to another important characteristic of the prisoner: whether a mental health need had been identified at the start of the stay in the SIU. As shown in the following two tables, the likelihood of receiving the promised 4- and 2-hours out of cell was unrelated to this indicator.

Table 23: Proportion of SIU days where four hours outside the cell was not achieved by length of time in SIU and mental health need

			<b>Crosstab</b>						
			Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved						
Number of days in SIU			missed zero days (0%)/got out for 4 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	Total
32 thru 61 days	Mental Health Need?	NO	13	20	12	32	73	28	178
			7.3%	11.2%	6.7%	18.0%	41.0%	15.7%	100.0%
	YES		10	12	2	12	39	14	89
			11.2%	13.5%	2.2%	13.5%	43.8%	15.7%	100.0%
	Total		23	32	14	44	112	42	267
			8.6%	12.0%	5.2%	16.5%	41.9%	15.7%	100.0%
62 thru 291 days	Mental Health Need?	NO	6	14	18	37	108	15	198
			3.0%	7.1%	9.1%	18.7%	54.5%	7.6%	100.0%
	YES		0	5	3	8	42	5	63
			0.0%	7.9%	4.8%	12.7%	66.7%	7.9%	100.0%
	Total		6	19	21	45	150	20	261
			2.3%	7.3%	8.0%	17.2%	57.5%	7.7%	100.0%

Table 24: Proportion of SIU days where two hours of “meaningful contact” outside the cell for meaningful contact was not achieved by length of time in SIU and mental health need

			<b>Crosstab</b>						
			Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved						
Number of days in SIU			missed zero days (0%)/got out for 2 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	Total
32 thru 61 days	Mental Health Need?	NO	23	26	44	41	41	3	178
			12.9%	14.6%	24.7%	23.0%	23.0%	1.7%	100.0%
	YES		18	7	20	20	22	2	89
			20.2%	7.9%	22.5%	22.5%	24.7%	2.2%	100.0%
	Total		41	33	64	61	63	5	267
			15.4%	12.4%	24.0%	22.8%	23.6%	1.9%	100.0%
62 thru 291 days	Mental Health Need?	NO	9	35	56	46	51	1	198
			4.5%	17.7%	28.3%	23.2%	25.8%	0.5%	100.0%
	YES		1	5	21	15	20	1	63
			1.6%	7.9%	33.3%	23.8%	31.7%	1.6%	100.0%
	Total		10	40	77	61	71	2	261
			3.8%	15.3%	29.5%	23.4%	27.2%	0.8%	100.0%

**Conclusion.** As stated earlier, we are offering, in this report, only a bare minimum of ‘interpretation’ of the findings. Instead, we believe it would be better for each reader to assess the evidence for themselves. After those interested in the operation of the SIUs have some basic information about their operation, we think that there are two avenues open for future work understanding the SIUs.

First of all, there are likely to be additional types of analyses of the current (or perhaps updated) data that would be useful. One could, for example, “drill down” into some of the findings to try to understand some of the variation that has been uncovered in this report. For example, one might want to know whether there are more possible analyses of the current data that might help explain better some of the variation in length of time that people spend in SIUs. More work could certainly be done to understand the “multiple stays” in SIUs.

Second, these data may demonstrate the need to collect additional types of data – perhaps from existing administrative data sources in CSC, or from new sources (e.g., interviews by independent researchers of those in the SIUs or who have recently been released from the SIUs).

To use just one example, the data show that a large number of people did not routinely receive their four hours out of cell or their two hours of meaningful human activity. Overall, 79% (or 1,303 person-stays in SIUs) did not get the ‘required’ four hours out of their cell on half or more of their days. A little over half (54%; 889 person-stays in SIUs) did not receive their two hours of meaningful human contact outside of their cell on half or more of their days. We are not suggesting that we have examined the existing data to the fullest extent possible, but we are not confident that these findings (described in the latter part of the report) can be adequately explained with the kind of administrative data that we had access to.

For example, let us assume that most of these failures to have the requisite time out of cell are recorded, administratively, as reflecting a refusal to leave the cell on the part of the prisoners for reasons that are allowed in paragraph 127<sup>10</sup>. However, to understand what a ‘refusal’ means requires one to know what the circumstances were that led to the refusal, or what, actually, was refused (i.e., what was the alternative to staying in the cell that was offered to the prisoner). One does not need much of an imagination to understand why prisoners might prefer, in some circumstances, to stay in their cells.

Without belaboring the point, we note that the Commissioner’s Directive on this matter states that

117. All inmates in an SIU and those subject to restricted movement will be provided opportunities to be out of their cells for a minimum of four hours daily. All reasonable

---

<sup>10</sup> Paragraph 127 states that: “Exceptions to providing daily inmate out of cell entitlements include:

- a. if the inmate refuses to avail themselves of the opportunities to spend time outside of their cell
- b. if the inmate, at the time the opportunity is offered, does not comply with reasonable instructions to ensure their safety or that of any other person or the security of the penitentiary
- c. in exceptional circumstances, as identified in section 19(1) of the CCRR, and only where required for security purposes. In these circumstances, the Institutional Head will ensure, on the date the entitlements are not provided, a written notification in a "Memo to File" in OMS is completed indicating the reasons why, and share it with the applicable inmates.

efforts will be made to provide inmates with as much time out of their cells beyond the minimum of four hours as is operationally feasible without affecting the security of the institution or the safety of any person.

....

124. When an inmate is not availing themselves of opportunities to be out of their cell for the minimum required time or is not interacting with others, the conditions of confinement may be amended to support and encourage the inmate to avail themselves of those opportunities.

125. Amendments to the conditions of confinement must not negatively impact the inmate entitlements but are in response to the specific needs of the offender in order to support their engagement in programs, interventions, cultural, religious and spiritual practice, leisure, family or community contact.

126. The time an inmate spends out of their cell and the time they engage in meaningful human contact, as well as any refusals and the reasons for their refusals, must be documented in the LTE-SIU Module.

These directives suggest an avenue of inquiry that might be taken and even suggest data that might be helpful in understanding this issue. However, we strongly suspect that the administrative recording of ‘reasons’ in paragraph 126 will not be sufficient to give a full explanation of the findings in Tables 14 to 23. Moreover, even when the time outside of cell has been achieved, it would be useful to know what that time outside entailed. The administrative data that we have cannot answer these questions.

In addition, to understand fully what kinds of “special restrictions” might be placed on federal prisoners, one may well need to explore the operation of our penitentiaries beyond the operation of the SIUs. The data that we have analyzed for this report are not adequate to understand whether there are other types of restrictions placed on prisoners that have similarities to segregation but which are not part of the SIU system.

Generally, however, we would suggest that the findings presented earlier in this report demonstrate that it is possible to gain some insights into the operation of the SIUs from the administrative data that CSC has made available. For example, those who have concerns about the operation of the SIUs might well want to look carefully at some of the regional and institutional differences that we have presented. Given the variability that exists, one approach to understanding the operation of the SIUs might be to try to understand why some CSC facilities are able to accomplish things that others apparently are not. Issues around the “time out of cell” data is just one example.

But there are other examples as well. Commissioner’s Directive 711 on SIUs states that the purpose of the directive is

To ensure an inmate’s transfer to a Structured Intervention Unit is used as the least restrictive measure necessary and for the shortest time possible, consistent with the

protection of society, staff and inmates when there are no reasonable alternatives that could address the inmate's risk and to ensure an effective correctional planning process that responds to the inmate's specific need and risk.

An organization given the responsibility for oversight of the SIUs – and CSC itself – might well want to ponder, for a few minutes, the data in Table 4 suggesting that the use of SIUs varies considerably across regions. The quote immediately above implies that placing a prisoner in an SIU is not seen as an ideal solution to a problem. That being the case, one might want to explore why some correctional institutions are more successful than others in finding “reasonable alternatives that could address the inmate's risk and to ensure an effective correctional planning process that responds to the inmate's specific need and risk.”

These data also showed (Table 15) that 170 people who were in an SIU for more than two months missed getting out of their cell for four hours on more than three quarters of their days in the SIU. It would be easy to say that this was “only” 170 people. Or one could say that there were “only 20” people who, for at least 62 consecutive days, did not get their four hours out of cell. After all, this is “only” 20 out of 1,646 person-stays in SIUs, and only 20 out about 12,000 to 14,000 prisoners in federal institutions. The regional and institutional variation in the operation of the SIUs, however, tell us that this is not an adequate answer. Why, for example, is this number “zero” for two institutions (Table 18)? Said differently, what is it that apparently allows some institutions to have fewer of these “failures” than others? What can be learned from the institutions that are apparently more successful than others? It would be too simplistic to dismiss this variation as due solely to differing populations. That 82% of the transfers of women to SIUs in Canada originate from the Edmonton Institution for Women is noteworthy.

And, to use one final example, it would appear that Indigenous people are over-represented at all stages of the criminal justice system including federal correctional facilities. CSC has limited responsibility for their over-representation in admissions to federal corrections. But why, one might ask, are Canada's Indigenous people over-represented in the transfers to SIUs? This is not a new finding: *The Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview* for 2019 suggests (p. 71) that 38.3% of the admissions to administrative segregation in 2018/19 were of Indigenous people. That year, it would appear (page 59) that about 29.5% of the CSC in-custody population were Indigenous. So the over-representation of Indigenous people in segregation/SIUs *compared to the in-custody population* is not new. Looking in more detail at this issue may well involve not only further exploration of the data that we used in this report but other administrative data that are available from CSC. But it may also require the independent collecting of new data.

This takes us back, we think, to where the SIU Implementation Advisory Panel began in November 2019. These data demonstrate a need, we believe, for an Independent Oversight body to monitor the use of SIUs. We, as researchers, were pleased to have been given the opportunity to provide the Canadian community with its first systematic glimpse of the operation of the SIUs. It is, however, more than a bit disappointing that our report appears to be the first such report to be made public on the operation of this part of the correctional system. One might have hoped that releasing the first set of findings on the operation of the SIUs in its penitentiaries would have been embraced by Correctional Service Canada itself.



## Appendix A: Overview of Restrictive Movement Stays (N=156)

All but one of the Restrictive Movement (RM) stays had been completed by 31 August 2020. Looking at the 156 who completed RM stays, all were male with an average age of 35 (sd=10.5). Roughly 51% (N=80) were white; 26% (N=40) were Indigenous; 12% (N=18) were black; 8% (N=13) were multi-racial; and 3.2% (N=5) were missing ethnicity information. Roughly 32% (N=51) had a mental health need identified at the start of their RM, a figure that appears to be somewhat higher than those who went on, ultimately, to stay in an SUI (where of the 1,666 SIU stays, 27% (N=445) had a mental health need identified at the start of their stay). For the majority (86.5%; N=135) of this group, this was their first stay in RM (from 30 November 2019 to 31 August 2020). Another 10.3% (N=16) had been in the RM/SIUs once before this current RM only stay. The remaining 3.2% (N=5) had been in RM/SIUs between two and four times before this current RM-only stay.

Table A1 shows that a little over half of these RM stays were located in three institutions (Dorchester (Atlantic), Drummond (QB), and Cowansville (QB)). Overall, 72% of RM stays were located in Quebec (N=63; 40%) and the Atlantic region (N=50; 32%).

Table A1: Facility where RM stay Occurred

<b>'Identifies the most recent facility the offender was at during their period, as identified in the SIU application'</b>			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY (Atlantic)	35	22.4	22.4
DRUMMOND INSTITUTION (Quebec)	26	16.7	39.1
COWANSVILLE INSTITUTION (Quebec)	21	13.5	52.6
SPRINGHILL INSTITUTION (Atlantic)	14	9.0	61.6
GRANDE CACHE INSTITUTION (Prairie)	12	7.7	69.3
WARKWORTH INSTITUTION (Ontario)	11	7.1	76.4
COLLINS BAY INSTITUTION (Ontario)	10	6.4	82.8
DRUMHELLER INSTITUTION (Prairie)	10	6.4	89.2
FEDERAL TRAINING CENTRE (Quebec)	8	5.1	94.3
LA MACAZA INSTITUTION (Quebec)	7	4.5	98.8
SHEPODY HEALING CENTRE (Atlantic)	1	0.6	99.4
ARCHAMBAULT INSTITUTION (Quebec)	1	0.6	100.0
Total	156	100.0	

The Commissioner's Directive 711 on Structured Intervention Units outlines how long one can be held in RM:

Restricted movement can be used for a maximum of five (5) working days. The five-working day period begins after the day the authorization to transfer to an SIU is completed (#14, Restrictive Movement Overview<sup>11</sup>).

It's not exactly clear when the clock starts towards the five-day maximum. Section 23.d says that the decision about an SIU transfer must be made within 5 days. Presumably then, one could be in RM waiting for five days for that decision. The clock would then start to tick towards the "five working days" maximum one day after that decision. This could then add on another 5 days, or 7 days if weekend days do not count. This policy, then, may allow for a total of up to 13 days in RM (five days waiting for the decision + one day + five "working days" which may in some circumstance result in seven actual days spent in RM). We have, therefore, looked at time spent in RM in groupings of 1 through 5 days; 6 through 13 days; 14 thru 24 days and, given the distribution of days spent in RM, the next category runs 50 through 128 days.

Table A2 shows that overall, 65.4% of those in RM were back in the general population after 5 days. Another 26.9% were back in the general population after staying 6 to 13 days. Roughly 8% were in RM for 14 days or longer. Again, however, there was considerable regional variation. Within Ontario, 95.6% of RM stays were completed within five days whereas in the Prairie region only 45.5% were. Quebec has the largest proportion of longer RM stays – 12.7% were in RM for 14 days or longer compared to 9.1% in the Prairies, 4% in the Atlantic region and 0% in Ontario.

Table A2: Length of Stay in RM by Region

**Facility Location \* Length of RM stay Crosstabulation**

		Length of RM stay				
		1 thru 5 days	6 thru 13 days	14 thru 23 days	50 thru 128 days	Total
Facility Location	Atlantic region	33	15	0	2	50
		66.0%	30.0%	0.0%	4.0%	100.0%
	Quebec	39	16	2	6	63
		61.9%	25.4%	3.2%	9.5%	100.0%
	Ontario	20	1	0	0	21
		95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Prairies	10	10	2	0	22
		45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		102	42	4	8	156
		65.4%	26.9%	2.6%	5.1%	100.0%

Looking next at the proportion of days where four hours outside of the cell was not achieved, overall, 47.3% of the RM stays did not meet that benchmark every day of their stay (Table A3).

<sup>11</sup><https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/politiques-et-lois/711-cd-en.shtml#t2>

This is a larger proportion than what as seen with SIU stays were, overall, 38.9% did not meet that benchmark every day of their stay (See Table 14).

Table A3: Proportion of RM days where four hours outside of cell was not achieved

**Number of days in RM \* Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved Crosstabulation**

		Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved						
		missed zero days (0%)/got out for 4 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	Total
Number of days in RM	1 thru 5 days	18	1	31	10	1	50	111
		16.2%	0.9%	27.9%	9.0%	0.9%	45.0%	100.0%
	6 thru 13 days	1	2	5	4	3	12	27
		3.7%	7.4%	18.5%	14.8%	11.1%	44.4%	100.0%
	14 thru 22 days	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	49 thru 127 days	0	0	0	0	2	6	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Total		19	3	36	14	7	71	150
		12.7%	2.0%	24.0%	9.3%	4.7%	47.3%	100.0%

**Note:** Six people who were in RM for a portion of one day were removed. See explanation on page 17-18 around the counting of days for this analysis

Table A4 shows the proportion of days where two hours of meaningful human contact was not achieved. Here a slightly larger proportion (overall) missed every day with 50.7% not receiving their full two hours of meaningful contact every day they were in RM. This proportion is far higher than what was seen within SIU stays. “Only” 18.5% (overall) of those in SIUs failed to receive their two hours of meaningful human contact every day (see Table 16)

Table A4: Proportion of RM days where two hours of “meaningful contact” was not achieved

**Number of days in RM \* Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved Crosstabulation**

		Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved						
		missed zero days (0%)/got out for 2 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	Total
Number of days in RM	1 thru 5 days	23	1	20	6	3	58	111
		20.7%	0.9%	18.0%	5.4%	2.7%	52.3%	100.0%
	6 thru 13 days	2	0	1	3	11	10	27
		7.4%	0.0%	3.7%	11.1%	40.7%	37.0%	100.0%
	14 thru 22 days	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	49 thru 127 days	0	0	0	0	2	6	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Total		25	1	21	9	18	76	150
		16.7%	0.7%	14.0%	6.0%	12.0%	50.7%	100.0%

**Note:** Six people who were in RM for a portion of one day were removed. See explanation on page 17-18 around the counting of days for this analysis

## Appendix B: Removing Institutions with positive COVID cases for four-hour and two-hour outside of cell calculations

The impact of positive COVID cases within institutions could, obviously, impact time outside of cell. During this time, three institutions (Joliette, Port-Cartier and Grand Valley Institution for Women) had positive COVID tests. Of our 1,646 stays that we examined, 119 were stays at the above institutions (2 from Joliette; 116 from Port-Cartier and 1 from Grand Valley). Removing those 119 stays leaves us with 1,527 stays. Tables B1 and B2 show the proportion of days where four hours outside of cell, or two hours of meaning contact, was missed. Little changes from the results presented in Tables 15 and 16 with respect to the proportion of missed days.

Table B1: Length of time in SIU by proportion of time where four hours outside the cell was not Achieved – (Institutions with Positive COVID Cases Removed)

Number of days in SIU * Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved Crosstabulation								
		Percent of days that 4 hours out of cell was not achieved						
		missed zero days (0%)/got out for 4 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	Total
Number of days in SIU	1 thru 5 days	29	6	54	43	23	308	463
		6.3%	1.3%	11.7%	9.3%	5.0%	66.5%	100.0%
	6 thru 15 days	22	19	35	41	60	148	325
		6.8%	5.8%	10.8%	12.6%	18.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	16 thru 31 days	14	24	22	32	90	70	252
		5.6%	9.5%	8.7%	12.7%	35.7%	27.8%	100.0%
	32 thru 61 days	23	32	13	40	100	40	248
		9.3%	12.9%	5.2%	16.1%	40.3%	16.1%	100.0%
62 thru 291 days	6	19	21	45	130	18	239	
	2.5%	7.9%	8.8%	18.8%	54.4%	7.5%	100.0%	
Total		94	100	145	201	403	584	1527
		6.2%	6.5%	9.5%	13.2%	26.4%	38.2%	100.0%

Table B2: Length of time in SIU by proportion of time where two hours of “meaningful contact” outside the cell was not Achieved – (Institutions with Positive COVID Cases Removed)

**Number of days in SIU \* Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved Crosstabulation**

		Percent of days that 2 hours out of cell was not achieved						Total
		missed zero days (0%)/got out for 2 hrs every day in SIU	missed up to 20% of their days	missed 21% to 50% of their days	missed 51% to 75% of their days	missed 76% to 99% of their days	missed 100% of their days	
Number of days in SIU	1 thru 5 days	85	11	106	52	14	195	463
		18.4%	2.4%	22.9%	11.2%	3.0%	42.1%	100.0%
	6 thru 15 days	35	37	80	53	56	64	325
		10.8%	11.4%	24.6%	16.3%	17.2%	19.7%	100.0%
	16 thru 31 days	27	28	68	52	66	11	252
		10.7%	11.1%	27.0%	20.6%	26.2%	4.4%	100.0%
	32 thru 61 days	41	31	60	55	56	5	248
		16.5%	12.5%	24.2%	22.2%	22.6%	2.0%	100.0%
	62 thru 291 days	10	40	76	54	57	2	239
		4.2%	16.7%	31.8%	22.6%	23.8%	0.8%	100.0%
	Total	198	147	390	266	249	277	1527
		13.0%	9.6%	25.5%	17.4%	16.3%	18.1%	100.0%

### Appendix C: Email from CSC (24 October 2020)

**Subject:**RE: Draft report on the operation of the operation of CSC's Structured Intervention Units

**Date:**October 24, 2020 8:06PM

**From:**Covo Pierre (NHQ-AC) [REDACTED]

**To:**Anthony Doob <anthony.doob@utoronto.ca>, Jane B. Sprott <jsprott@ryerson.ca>

**CC:** [REDACTED]

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** Treat content with extra caution.

Hi Dr. Doob and Dr. Sprott,

Thank you very much for sending the draft report and providing us an opportunity to share some information for consideration. At this point, we are not providing comments on your preliminary findings. However, we would like to offer further information on the data that was provided and the limitations inherent within it that may perhaps influence analysis and interpretation.

The SIU Implementation Advisory Panel's (IAP) request for data was converted into a list of 62 questions or items. On September 29, there was a phone call between CSC, Dr. Doob, and Public Safety Canada to discuss the availability and delivery of the data requested. CSC delivered the first 38 out of 62 data points on September 30, 2020 with a commitment to provide more of the data to the IAP by December 31, 2020. Dr. Doob indicated that items 48 and 49 were of particular relevance to contextualizing data within the 38 points. CSC undertook that it would look into the possibility of providing items 48 and 49 before December 31, 2020. Additional data on IEDM reviews can also be provided.

Since delivering the 38 data points on September 30, work has continued on the rest of the IAP's data request, as well as interpreting the data that was shared on September 30. As a result of this ongoing work, we are in a better position to address data integrity issues (e.g. start and end dates of an inmate's confinement in SIU; time out of cell, some of which are outlined below) impacting the first offset of data.

While there was ready acceptance by front-line staff for the new method of gathering SIU-related information via a hand-held mobile application, it has now become apparent that a number of technical challenges exist with respect to exporting data in a useable format from the new application to the OMS data warehouse. Of note, a few issues remain with the integrity of some records, which may be attributed to the inputs made by staff as they continue to adapt to a new system. These issues include start and end dates of an inmate's confinement in an SIU. In addition, there are some overlapping or duplicative records in respect of the same inmate. Given this, the accuracy of data points related to an inmate's time out of cell and interactions with others is also affected, since the inmate may not have actually been in the SIU for the period covered by the

record. We remain available to discuss these issues with you more fully if you should wish. In the meantime, we continue to work on these challenges and expect improvements to the integrity of the data.

Your report provides valuable insight to support CSC's ongoing work to monitor the operation of SIUs, recognize trends and make adjustments to policy, procedures and practices. It will complement the continuous feedback received from the case-specific reviews and determinations by IEDMs. To support the ongoing operation of SIUs, it is crucial that the data that enables reporting and analytic functions is gathered and stored in accessible, consistent, and reliable ways. Both consultation and collaborative efforts have been ongoing to solidify the data elements and other requirements essential to reporting and analytics. From the experience of working through the data requested by the IAP, CSC has formed a project team to examine, assess and address SIU data management. Composed of representatives across all sectors and regions, the project team will focus on three interlinked themes: fostering an operational culture of data stewardship, through engagement with frontline staff; optimising outcomes by reviewing SIU business requirements and aligning technology solutions; and, strengthening corporate resources to support performance and compliance reporting.

CSC appreciates the acknowledgement in your report that the launch of this new and historic operational model will inevitably encounter challenges. In particular, the COVID-19 pandemic presented very serious operational challenges to protect offenders and staff in accordance with public health guidelines. This included the implementation of extensive infection prevention and control measures, medical isolation for inmates that are symptomatic or positive for COVID-19, suspending several services and volunteer activities and modifying operational routines. We expect these challenges to continue in the coming months and we will work to better understand the full impact this has had on our operations, including SIUs.

Thanks

Pierre Covo  
Executive Director, Implementation of Structured Intervention Units  
Correctional Service Canada / Government of Canada  
[pierre.covo@csc-scc.gc.ca](mailto:pierre.covo@csc-scc.gc.ca) Tel.: 613-947-7446 Cell.: 343-572-5875

Directeur exécutif, mise en oeuvre des unités d'intervention structurée  
Service correctionnel Canada / Gouvernement du Canada  
[pierre.covo@csc-scc.gc.ca](mailto:pierre.covo@csc-scc.gc.ca) Tel.: 613-947-7446 Cél.: 343-572-5875

-----Original Message-----

From: Anthony Doob <anthony.doob@utoronto.ca>

Sent: October 16, 2020 4:23 PM

To: Covo Pierre (NHQ-AC [REDACTED])

Cc: Jane B. Sprott <jsprott@ryerson.ca>

Subject: Draft report on the operation of the operation of CSC's Structured Intervention Units

Hello:

Attached is the draft report that Jane Sprott and I have prepared on the operation of the Structured Intervention Units using data I received from you folks on 30 September 2020. It is obviously a "preliminary report" and only touches the surface of what can be looked at. But we felt it was important to get something out sooner rather than later.

We decided not to include much "interpretation" of the findings. To a large extent, the findings speak for themselves.

We realize that people are busy. But because we'd like to create a final version of this report, we would ask that if you have any suggested changes/corrections for us that these be communicated to us by Saturday 24 October. I realize that this is a rather tight schedule, and I can fully understand it if you can't meet our deadline. So please don't feel any obligation to get comments back to us. We would appreciate any comments you have, but we do understand that this is a busy time.

Thank you. We were both very pleased to be given the opportunity to work with these data.

Best,

Tony

Anthony N. Doob

Centre for Criminology and Sociolegal Studies University of Toronto Toronto, Ontario,  
CANADA M5S 3K9





Centre for Criminology & Sociolegal Studies  
**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**Anthony N. Doob, C.M., Ph.D., FRSC**  
*Professor Emeritus of Criminology*

The Structured Intervention Unit – Implementation Advisory Panel (SIU-IAP)

19 August 2019

The SIU-IAP no longer exists. Members were appointed for terms of one year. Some of these terms have expired. All will expire within a few weeks.

The panel prepared a report on its activities (attached to this memo). It was submitted to Correctional Service Canada (CSC) in July 2020 for any reaction it might have. CSC had agreed to give comments, if they had them, within three weeks. Six days after the deadline for comments, we received a letter from the acting commissioner (dated three days prior to its being emailed to us). It, too, is attached. This memo should be read in the context of the details contained in these other (attached) documents.

Very simply, this panel has not been allowed to do its work for reasons outlined in our report and confirmed by the acting commissioner.

- We knew we had to rely, at least initially, on systematic administrative data from CSC. We requested the data necessary to carry out our job in November 2019. The first set of data was to be delivered in February 2020. CSC indicated in February (for the first time) that it had not decided whether they would allow us the systematic information we had requested about the operation of the SIUs. We expressed our concerns to CSC in mid-March and wrote to the Minister at the end of that month, since we had heard nothing from CSC. We never heard from the Minister. In late April, CSC's Commissioner spoke to the panel chair on the telephone and in May we were told we would get the data we requested. In late May, CSC delivered to us what we initially assumed was the bulk of the data we had requested. It turned out to be inadequate (incomplete, unspecified, and nearly impossible to use) in many ways. This was later acknowledged by CSC. A data analyst was assigned to work on delivering our data and, until late June, she seemed to be making remarkable and rapid progress in getting us the majority of what we had asked for in November 2019. On 17 August, we were told (see letter from the acting commissioner) that the data we requested could not be delivered until, perhaps, later this year.
- To summarize, then, we were told for the first time, 9 months after requesting systematic data on the operation of the SIUs that the data do not exist at this time and we would not be getting anything until late this year. We had never been told this before and we had always made it clear to CSC that "some data" immediately/soon was better than "no data."
- We note that CSC delivered to us some data files in May 2020 (on a computer lent to the panel) that "did not yield the expected quality" (their words). We would agree with that characterization of the information we received from CSC.

- We also note that the data we requested were exactly the kind of information that CSC should want and need in order to examine, evaluate, and improve the operation of its SIUs. For example, we asked about the number of hours out of the cell and the number of hours of meaningful human contact (both important aspects of the SIU regime). We were not asking for obscure information.
- As a substitute, CSC offered to allow us to speak to CSC staff about the SIUs and to examine their policies and notes of meetings, etc. We are, of course, interested in CSC policies (and have spent considerable time examining them) and we were expecting to need to follow up our analysis of the overall operation with discussions with CSC staff. But conversations with staff are not going to tell us things like the distribution of time spent in SIUs, details about the number of hours out of the cell, the institutions that are most likely to send prisoners to SIUs, and a myriad of other information that we requested for each case in November 2019. Time spent out of the cell and in meaningful human contact were factors that were supposed to distinguish the new SIU regime from what preceded it.
- To put in context CSC's stated inability to provide the panel with the information in a timely manner, it is important to consider two things.
  - First, the data we requested are necessary to understand the operation of the SIUs – by the panel, or CSC itself.
  - Second, CSC has over 18,000 employees. One might have thought that it would not take them until the SIUs had been operating for close to a year to produce data necessary to evaluate this important aspect of its operation. If they do not have the information about the operation of these units, it was clearly CSC's decision not to give this a high enough priority.

In conclusion, then, this panel is powerless to accomplish the job that it was set up to do without cooperation from CSC. Furthermore, the issues raised by CSC's apparent inability to monitor and evaluate its own operation are not issues solely about its cooperation and support for this panel of unpaid volunteers. Much more important is the fact that CSC is telling us that it does not have systematic information on the operation of its Structured Intervention Units and apparently never made the gathering of this information a priority.

As we pointed out in the first paragraph, our panel no longer exists. That is the result of decisions made by Public Safety Canada. We sincerely hope that the Ministry and CSC will allow some external body access to information about the operation of the SIUs. We were willing to be that external body and regret that we were not given the opportunity to do the work we agreed to do.

-----

Note: This statement and the panel's report have been circulated among all those who were active panel members until their terms expired. No dissents were received.



Centre for Criminology & Sociolegal Studies  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Anthony Doob, C.M., Ph.D., FRSC  
*Professor Emeritus of Criminology*

Structured Intervention Unit – Implementation Advisory Panel  
First Year Report (11 August 2020)

In May 2019, in connection with Bill C-83 (42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament, 1<sup>st</sup> session), Public Safety Canada started work creating its “Structured Intervention Unit - Implementation Advisory Panel” (SIU-IAP). It was charged with the responsibility of doing exactly what is described by the panel’s name.

Members of the panel agreed to serve, without remuneration, because we saw the establishment of the committee as the Ministry’s commitment to openness and accountability. We understood from the beginning that Correctional Service Canada (CSC) did not have to follow our advice. We have tried hard, since the panel was formed, to carry out our responsibilities as best we could.

We met twice in the fall of 2019. The first meeting was essentially an ‘orientation’ meeting organized by CSC. At our second meeting, we met with various (external) expert stakeholders. And at that same meeting (in October) we agreed that we would request information on each case associated with the SIUs in order to be able to assess, at least as far as official records would allow, how the SIUs were operating.

In order to make it possible for CSC to collect the data that we required (if it had not already planned to do so), we made our formal request in mid-November 2019 – before the SIUs opened. This request was acknowledged – and not questioned or challenged at that time – by CSC staff.

Our workplan was straightforward. A number of panel members planned on visiting the SIUs at around the time of their opening. We expected to be receiving our first set of data about the operation of the SIUs at the end of February. We planned on doing some initial analyses of those data in early-mid March. We then planned on developing a plan to examine issues that might have been uncovered by this overview of the operation of the SIUs. The exact method of investigating these issues would depend, of course, on what was found. But a key part of the plan was to use the data we expected to receive to guide our subsequent inquiry.

In addition, the panel and CSC quickly agreed to a procedure for the release of panel reports. Essentially, the procedure is that reports are submitted to CSC for comments (which have to be made within a fixed period of time). The panel has an obligation to *consider* any

Canadiana Gallery • 14 Queen’s Park Crescent West • Room 207  
Toronto • Ontario • Canada M5S 3K9  
Tel: +1 416.946.7429 • Fax: +1 416.978.4195  
anthony.doob@utoronto.ca • www.criminology.utoronto.ca

comments it receives from CSC. But in the end, the content of the panel's report is determined by the panel itself, not CSC.

Between our October meeting and the end of 2019, a number of panel members, as planned, made visits to the SIUs. In all, 5 institutions were visited by one or more members of the panel.

As mentioned, our plan was to look at the implementation by using the administrative data we had requested. The request for information that we made was very specific. We asked for a fair number of indicators on each SIU case. What constituted a 'case' was defined carefully. The indicators we needed on each case were also carefully laid out. We expected that there might be some details to work out on exactly what some of our indicators were designed to measure. Again, this is why we made our request early – even before the SIUs opened at the end of November.

Part of the reason to have systematic data in a situation like this is obvious: without such data, we and CSC have no way of knowing whether problems that are brought to our attention are general, unusual, unique, or misinformation.

Our request was for data to be delivered to us every 2 months. The first set of data (for the first two months of the operation of the SIUs ending 31 January 2020) was to be delivered to us by the end of February 2020. Every two months thereafter the data were to be delivered to us (e.g., February and March 2020 data would be delivered by the end of April 2020). At the time we made this request, we were never told that any of this was going to be a problem. Hence we assumed that everything was in order.

The plan was that we would receive the first set of data at the end of February. Initial analyses could be carried out quickly (because of the form that we had requested the data). We then expected that in March, or perhaps early April, we would be able to release our initial findings and plan other steps necessary to carry out our mandate.

It should be pointed out, perhaps, that the data we were requesting would be likely to be the kind of data that the organization itself (CSC) would need in order to get an overview of the operation of the SIUs. CSC, as we understand it, needs data in order to understand individual cases (e.g., in the case of disputes or legal actions). But it also needs systematic data on the overall operation of the SIUs in order to understand generally how they are being used, and how they are operating.

Hence we did not see our data request as something that CSC should have found surprising since, to cite part of the name of our panel, we were supposed to be advising on the implementation of the SIUs.

**CSC's Response to our request for data.** We heard nothing more from CSC until mid-February when the panel chair wrote to CSC to arrange details of the transfer of the data to us. Soon after that, we were told that CSC had not then (mid-February 2020) decided

whether it would give us the information we had requested. No reason for their hesitation on this issue was offered. This revelation by CSC came to the panel as complete surprise. It should be remembered that our data request had been submitted 3 months earlier. Nothing had been communicated to us, in the intervening 3 months, that there would be any problem in providing us with the data we requested.

To put these dates in context, it is important to consider that the conflict over the data (and the ensuing delays) could not initially be attributed to the COVID-19 crisis. We made it clear, a number of times, that we needed these data to carry out our mandate. This was done, in writing, in mid-March, in communication with the panel's main contact at CSC. The Commissioner was copied on this correspondence.

The panel wrote to the Minister of Public Safety at the end of March bringing him up-to-date with the challenges facing the panel in carrying out its mandate. The panel indicated the importance of having the data we requested in order to be able to understand how the SIU regime was being implemented. We made it clear, we think, that without the data, we could not carry out our job. Essentially, the data were a necessary step in understanding and giving advice on the implementation of the SIUs.

In late April, there was a telephone conversation between the CSC commissioner and the chair of the panel in which the Commissioner questioned the panel's need for the information it had requested. The panel chair indicated that it was necessary for the operation of the panel. No explicit decision about the data was communicated at that time.

However, in mid-May 2020 CSC made a commitment to provide us the data we had requested in November 2019.

To be fair, it should be pointed out that we always expected that some of the data would be more difficult to collect or to specify than others. The commitment that was made, therefore, was not to deliver exactly what we had asked for. Rather it was to give us as much as was possible.

The panel was led to believe that the data could be gathered and shared with us quite quickly. Arrangements were made, therefore, for the panel chair to be given access to a CSC computer on which the data could be downloaded and worked on securely. This computer was picked up (in Toronto) by the panel chair on 27 May and some CSC data were downloaded on that date.

Unfortunately, however, a very quick examination of the data that were given at that time indicated three quite independent problems that made it impossible for us to move forward.

First there were some unexplained inconsistencies with the data (e.g., the number of cases on which data were available). In addition, some indicators that should have been easy to obtain were missing.

Second, certain key indicators were not adequately defined. For example, it became clear in further discussions (see below) that the date on which the data were gathered or recorded was crucial to understanding whether certain indicators were placed on a prisoner's file before, during, or after experience with the SIU.

Third, the data were not in the form that was necessary for us to use them. For us to make them usable would have involved hundreds of hours of work made necessary because the data were not delivered in the form we had expected. To be specific on this, we had asked for a number of separate indicators on each person-stay in the SIU. Each person-stay was to be a 'line' in a data file, with all of the indicators contained on that row for each person-stay. Instead, we were given approximately 900 separate files, some with multiple spread sheets within a single file.

CSC was told of these problems on or about 27 May and responded very quickly and, from our perspective, very effectively in that a 'data person' was assigned the responsibility of working with us. The chair of the panel spoke to her a number of times from late May through the end of June. All indicators would lead us to believe that she is excellent and knowledgeable about both the SIUs and, equally important, she was excellent in understanding and handling data. It was clear to us that she understood our request. She also identified problems (e.g., under-specifications of what we were looking for) with our request. From our perspective, she asked the right questions, made useful suggestions, and appeared to be making progress on getting the panel the majority of the indicators it had asked for in November 2019. She looked for ways of working around problems that inherently occur when trying to extract the kind of data we needed. In all ways, she was exactly what we needed.

We never thought that the task of putting together the data we needed was going to be easy. That is one of the reasons we made our request in November 2019 even before the SIUs were opened. We do not know what other tasks 'our' data person at CSC has to carry out. Hence, it is important to keep in mind that all of our interactions with her were productive. It is entirely reasonable that she did not get us a working data set in the six weeks that she was working on the project before a draft of this report was sent to the Commissioner for CSC's reactions to it. From our perspective, it appears that she was working hard at trying to get us the data we need to carry out our mandate.

But the fact remains: we do not have the data we requested in November.

**The data in the context of other investigations by the panel.** As already mentioned, we always saw the individual SIU person-stay 'data' as a necessary *first* step for carrying out our mandate. It was never seen as being the only line of inquiry.

But it is also clear that even if we had received the data we requested at the time that we expected to receive it, we would likely have been hampered in any follow-up (using other methods of inquiry) by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Hence, the unfortunate fact is that because of the delay in getting the data, we have essentially not been able to examine any aspect of the SIUs during their first 7-8 months of operation. Had we received the data when we expected it, we would have been able to understand the implementation of the SIUs but almost certainly would have been delayed in subsequent more direct (in person) forms of data collection because of COVID-19.

Finally, we think it important to repeat an important point. The data we have requested are exactly the kind of data that CSC *should* want to have to understand, and properly evaluate, the operation of the SIUs. Hence, any costs of gathering these data should be seen as important to the responsibility of CSC, not just costs associated with setting up a voluntary panel. But as of the date that this report was originally submitted to the Commissioner (21 July 2020), the fact remains that we have no systematic information on the operation of the SIUs.

-- Anthony N. Doob (for the panel)

11 August 2020 administrative addendum: This report was submitted to the Commissioner of CSC on 21 July 2020. In line with our agreement on the releasing of all our reports, CSC had 3 weeks to provide the panel with comments on it. We received no reply to the draft report. A few cosmetic changes were made to the original report. As of this date, we have not received the data we requested on the operation of the SIUs. This data request was initially made approximately 9 months ago.



Correctional Service Canada    Service correctionnel Canada

Commissioner  
Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0P9

Commissaire

Your file    Votre référence

Our file    Notre référence

**AUG 14 2020**

Dr. Anthony Doob, C.M., Ph.D., FRSC  
14 Queen's Park Crescent West, Room 207  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5S 3K9

Dear Dr. Doob,

Thank you for your First Year Report, dated August 11, 2020 (Report), on the implementation of Structured Intervention Units (SIU) as part of the Government of Canada's Transforming Federal Corrections initiative.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the challenges described in your letter and speak to how we are moving forward.

CSC manages data through the Policy Sector, and more specifically, the Performance Measurement and Management Reports (PMMR) division, using a variety of tools and software, including the Offender Management System (OMS). This platform, created more than twenty years ago, is not the optimal application to support the operational requirements of the SIUs. As part of a broader business vision to support current and future needs, CSC developed and launched a new and innovative mobile and desktop application, the Long Term Evolution (LTE), to support the implementation of the SIUs.

The LTE application, however, uses a different data model from the existing OMS platform. This data model enables the LTE application to perform certain functions, such as the daily tracking of activities in an SIU through the medium of a handheld device, that are essential to the operation of SIUs. The data that is gathered in the LTE is migrated into the Data Warehouse. Several divisions within Information Management Services (IMS), PMMR and the SIU Implementation Team are working to structure the data in a usable format in the Data Warehouse. In order for PMMR to extract data from the Data Warehouse, a data dictionary is the next key step required to define the data elements and map the data points from one system onto another.

Faced with your outstanding request, CSC proceeded to extract SIU data from the LTE in May 2020. The data extraction was carried out by the LTE developers. CSC anticipated that the extracted data would meet the needs of the IAP. As noted in the Report, however, the data provided on May 27, 2020 did not yield the expected quality. A data person has been assigned to work with the IAP, which you note in the Report has been valuable. I advise that the data person will continue to work with the IAP.



Concurrently, work continues to complete the data dictionary. I am pleased to report that the several divisions working on this initiative have identified solutions to accelerate the completion of the data dictionary. At this time, I expect that PMMR will be in a position to begin extracting data in Fall of 2020.

Work also continues to enhance functionality of the LTE. Among other upgrades, the new release will capture national and regional SIU population management data and SIU decision data. In addition, work is ongoing to develop a portal for Independent External Decision Makers (IEDM), which will enable the capture of IEDM decision data.

I commit to providing you monthly updates as to the status of the development of the data dictionary, and in the data collection to ensure that the IAP is aware of the progress that CSC continues to make, as well as the challenges for which CSC continues to find innovative solutions as it implements a novel and transformative correctional model.

I also offer and invite you to consider qualitative sources of SIU information that may assist IAP in its work, such as SIU policies and guidelines, the opportunity to speak with staff, and results and outcomes of meetings and future planning.

Again, I thank the IAP for its commitment to this project.

Sincerely,



Alain Tousignant  
A/Commissioner