



## ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

### Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

## ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

### Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Research Report** \_\_\_\_\_

**A Profile of Women under  
Community Supervision**

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.



**A Profile of Women under Community Supervision**

Ashley McConnell

Sara Rubenfeld

Jennie Thompson

&

Renée Gobeil

Correctional Service of Canada

May 2014



## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank Janelle Beaudette and Stephanie Clarke for their assistance inputting and verifying our tabular data. We would like to acknowledge and extend our gratitude to Dena Derkzen for her help in editing and also for her guidance throughout the process. Finally, we would like to thank Jenelle Power and Andrea Moser for their feedback on the final versions of this report.



## Executive Summary

**Key words:** *women offenders, community supervision, Aboriginal women*

Women under community supervision are a growing population, with an increase of 20% recorded between 2002-03 and 2011-12. Given the extent of the growth of this population, examining their profile is an important part of ensuring that the policies created and programs offered continue to support their reintegration. To this end, a profile of the 509 women under community supervision on March 30, 2014 was completed. In addition to demographics, sentence, and release-related information, the profile focuses on risk and needs across a number of domains: institutional education, employment, and correctional programming; special parole conditions; community employment; and post-release suspension.

Overall, most community-supervised women were Caucasian and single, had committed a drug or homicide offence, and were serving a determinate sentence, most commonly of less than three years. They generally demonstrated considerable need in the personal and emotional domain as well as with substance abuse, and had limited previous educational and employment attainment. Within their period of incarceration, most women were employed, but there is an opportunity for improvement in the number who completed an educational or employability skills program. After release, almost two-thirds of women who were seeking work were employed.

Notably, most women were successful after release, with rates of suspension on the current sentence quite being modest at about 10%. In most cases where a suspension occurred, the suspension was due to a failure to report rather than to a criminal activity, suggesting that some women may be experiencing difficulty in adapting to the expectations of community supervision.

Relative to their non-Aboriginal counterparts, Aboriginal women tended to demonstrate less extensive educational and employment histories and lower rates of employment post-release. During their periods of incarceration, they were typically assessed as presenting greater risk and criminogenic need than their non-Aboriginal counterparts. They also had greater substance abuse problems and were more frequently imposed a special condition at release requiring them to abstain from drugs and/or alcohol. Aboriginal women were also more frequently suspended – typically due to failure to report. Together with the fact that they were less likely to be granted discretionary release, relative to their non-Aboriginal counterparts, Aboriginal women spent shorter proportions of their sentences in the community and were, overall, less frequently successful in their reintegration.

Being able to better identify and target specific areas where women are experiencing challenges provides CSC with the opportunity to better address the identified need areas through the development of gender-informed policy and programs and strengthen its continuum of care for women offenders. A better understanding of women's risk and need areas is critical as Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC's) ability to successfully strengthen community corrections will, in large part, depend on having the capacity to manage these risks and support the needs of women, both during their incarceration and upon release to the community.



## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Challenges to Community Reintegration.....	1
Differences Associated with Ethnicity.....	3
The Current Study.....	4
Method.....	5
Participants.....	5
Data Source.....	5
Measures.....	5
Analyses.....	9
Results.....	11
Demographic and Sentence Characteristics for Women under Community Supervision.....	11
Overall Risk Rating and DFIA Domain Scores.....	12
Education, Employment, and Correctional Programming.....	16
Community Characteristics for Women under Community Supervision.....	16
Discussion.....	21
Women under Community Supervision.....	21
Differences Associated with Ethnicity.....	23
Changes over Time.....	24
Conclusion.....	26
References.....	27
Appendix A: Detailed Description of Variables.....	32



## List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Demographics and Sentence Characteristics of Women under Community Supervision</i> .....	12
Table 2 <i>Static Risk, Dynamic Risk, Motivation, and Reintegration Potential Assessed Closest to Release</i> .....	13
Table 3 <i>Dynamic Risk Domain Scores Assessed Closest to Release</i> .....	15
Table 4 <i>Percentage of Women Completing Education, Employment, Correctional or Community Programming</i> .....	16
Table 5 <i>Type and Length of Supervision</i> .....	17
Table 6 <i>Parole Conditions of Women under Community Supervision</i> .....	18
Table 7 <i>Community Employment</i> .....	19
Table 8 <i>Suspension and Reason for Suspension for Women under Community Supervision</i> .....	20



## **Introduction**

The vast majority of federal women offenders (FWOs; i.e., women sentenced to serve two years or more) will be released on some form of community supervision during their sentence. As such, the integral role of community corrections and the continuum of care model in successfully reintegrating women back to the community has become a central focus in women's corrections. The paramount function of community corrections is to ensure that the gradual release of offenders poses no risk to society while assisting offenders to successfully reintegrate back into society (CSC, 2010a). Since March 31, 2003, the number of women being admitted to federal jurisdiction has increased 70% and the federal population of women under supervision in the community has grown by 20% (Public Safety, 2012). This increase in population supports the need for well-developed community correctional practices for women.

A gradual, structured, and supervised release of offenders is critical as this approach has been found to decrease recidivism (CSC, 2010b; Solicitor General of Canada, 1998). More specifically, gradual and structured release allows for an understanding of individual risk factors and needs of offenders that can then be addressed throughout the process of reintegration. Criminogenic factors and/or needs are changeable attributes of an offender or his/her situation; decreasing criminogenic needs via correctional interventions is associated with lowered recidivism rates (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Blanchette & Brown, 2006). Previous research has identified several factors related to successful reintegration, including but not limited to correctional programming (Brown, 2004; Scroggins & Malley, 2010); substance abuse treatment (Grella & Greenwell, 2007; Robbins, Martin, & Surratt, 2009); family support (Loucks & Zamble, 2000; Visher, La Vigne, & Travis, 2004); and employment and education (Brown, 2004; Soloman, 2006; Visher, 2006).

### **Challenges to Community Reintegration**

Although studies have indicated that several factors are relevant for men and women offenders' successful integration, the focus of the current investigation is on the factors that have been previously noted as areas that are high need for women. In previous research, women offenders have been identified as having high needs in the criminogenic areas of personal and emotional orientation (e.g., self concept, cognitive problems, cognitive problems; Chesney-Lind,

2000; Koons, Burrow, Morash, & Bynum, 1997), marital and family relationships (Austin, Bloom, & Donahue, 1992; Covington & Bloom, 2000), and substance abuse (Boe, Nafekh, Vuong, Sinclair, & Cousineau, 2003; Lightfoot & Lambert, 1992). For instance, a previous profile of Canadian FWOs by Taylor and Flight (2004) demonstrated that personal and emotional orientation and substance abuse were the greatest need domains for women under community supervision. They are, therefore, included in the current profile.

The profile also includes education and employment histories. Both education and employment have been shown to play a large role in successful reintegration (Boe, 1997; Graffam, Shinkfield, & Hardcastle, 2007). Higher education has been found to be associated with decreased recidivism (Gottfredson, Wilson, & Najaka, 2002; Report of the Correctional Service of Canada Review Panel, 2007). Overall, offenders are less educated and have fewer skills than the general Canadian population (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Harlow, 2003). Although only 18% of Canadians 15 years of age and over were without a high school diploma in 2014 (Statistics Canada, no date), over half of Canadian FWOs (60%) have previously been found not to have a high school diploma (Taylor & Flight, 2004). Moreover, many women offenders demonstrate high levels of need in the areas of education and employment upon intake to correctional facilities (Bloom, Owen, & Covington, 2003; Delveaux, Blanchette, & Wickett, 2005). Targeting employment, vocation, and work programs has been identified as instrumental to women's successful re-entry to the community (Blanchette & Brown, 2006). Studies have shown women with unstable employment are more likely to recidivate (Brown & Motiuk, 2005; Rettinger, 1998). Moreover, Gobeil (2008) identified employment as a particularly critical protective factor in women's reintegration process, providing them with the ability to support themselves financially, keep themselves busy, and be surrounded by pro-social associates. Taylor and Flight (2004) found that 65% of FWOs were unemployed directly preceding incarceration and Gillis and Nafekh (2005) reported women taking an average of four months longer to obtain employment in comparison to men upon their release. As such, examining employment in the current profile is vital to a better understanding of its role in successful community reintegration.

Another important element in an offender's transition from a correctional institution to the community is correctional programming. Offenders who participate in programming and services during their incarceration are often better prepared for reintegration upon release as

exemplified by improved post-release outcomes and reduced recidivism (Visher et al., 2004). A meta-analysis on the effects of rehabilitation treatment on recidivism reported that many rehabilitative programs were associated with up to a 20% reduction in recidivism (Lipsey & Cullen, 2007). Additionally, Grella and Rodriguez (2011) found that women who completed an aftercare program in addition to an in-prison program or who had longer treatment duration had reduced risk of recidivism. Others have also found participation in community maintenance programs, in addition to institutional treatment, to be associated with reduced rates of return to custody (Matheson, Doherty, & Grant, 2009; Robbins et al., 2009; Tripodi, Bledsoe, Kim, & Bender, 2011).

An under-studied area is women's special parole conditions<sup>1</sup> while under supervision in the community. Although research has not extensively explored this area, Taylor and Flight (2004) reported that the three most common special parole conditions women received were: abstinence related to an addiction (33%; e.g., alcohol, intoxicants, drugs, and gambling), avoidance of certain places and people (31%), and attending counselling (13%; e.g., psychological and psychiatric). Further research in this area is warranted.

### **Differences Associated with Ethnicity**

Notably, Aboriginal women have been found to have more pronounced challenges in community reintegration than their non-Aboriginal counterparts. For example, research indicates that Aboriginal women demonstrate greater need relating to educational attainment and employment (Bell, Trevethan, & Allegri, 2004; Trevethan, Moore, & Rastin, 2002), correctional programming (Hoffman & Law, 1995; Morin, 1999), and dynamic risk, including in the areas of employment, marital family, associates, substance abuse, community functioning and personal/emotional orientation (Bell et al., 2004; Trevethan et al., 2002). They have also been found to have poorer post-release outcomes (Dowden & Serin, 2000). As such, it is important to consider both similarities and differences between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women when discussing challenges to community reintegration.

---

<sup>1</sup> Special parole conditions are those imposed by the Parole Board of Canada when granting discretionary release or determining the parameters of legislatively-required statutory release, and reflect each offender's unique crime-related need areas. They differ from standard conditions, outlined in legislation, that apply to all offenders (e.g., to not travel outside of one's supervision area without supervision, to not leave Canada).

## **The Current Study**

Though women under community supervision have previously been profiled (Taylor & Flight, 2004), the provision of an up-to-date profile is timely given growth in this population. Understanding the characteristics of this population and their specific reintegration risks and needs will assist the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) by informing the development of gender-informed policy and programs for these women. As such, this study will update knowledge of the demographic and incarceration characteristics, needs, and risks of women in the community. Additionally, this study will also explore other areas of community reintegration for which there is limited knowledge including types of employment in the community, reasons for leaving previous employment, and suspension of community supervision and the reasons for such suspensions. In keeping with previously-found differences in the reintegration-related needs of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women, findings will be presented for both groups.

## Method

### Participants

The sample consisted of 509 women who were under community supervision<sup>2</sup> on March 30, 2014. All of the women were on either discretionary release (i.e., day parole or full parole granted by the Parole Board of Canada) or statutory release<sup>3</sup> (i.e., legislatively-mandated release granted to almost all offenders at two-thirds of their sentence), including those who had their release suspended but not revoked. There were 132 Aboriginal and 376 non-Aboriginal women.

### Data Source

The study retrieved data from the Offender Management System (OMS), CSC's automated offender data system. Data pertaining to the following areas were retrieved: women's demographics, sentence, and community characteristics, as well as their levels of risk and need, program completion, and suspensions.

### Measures

**Demographics.** Several demographic characteristics were examined: ethnicity, age, marital status, region and level of education prior to incarceration.

**Ethnicity.** This variable was collapsed into four main groups: Caucasian, Aboriginal (Inuit, Métis, and First Nations), Visible Minorities (Black, Chinese, Filipino, East Indian, Hispanic, Korean, Latin American, South East Asian, and South Asian) and Other/Unknown. Most analyses were conducted using Aboriginal self-identification which includes only two groups: Aboriginal (Inuit, Métis, and First Nations) and non-Aboriginal women (all other groups as well as those whose ethnicity was unknown).

**Age upon release to the community.** This variable indicates the age of offenders at the time of their release to the community. This variable was created by subtracting an offender's

---

<sup>2</sup> The women with the following statuses were included: supervised, suspended temporarily detained and suspended unlawfully-at-large. The last two groups were maintained for analyses in order to allow for the inclusion women who had been suspended in the profile. Women who had been deported or revoked on March 30, 2014 were not included.

<sup>3</sup> All offenders are eligible for consideration for day and full parole after serving pre-specified portions of their sentences. The Parole Board of Canada determines whether or not to grant parole (known as discretionary release). If offenders are not granted parole, in most cases, they are legislatively required to be released after serving two-thirds of their sentence (this release is known as statutory release).

birth date from her supervision start date.

**Relationship status.** This variable divided women into two groups: (1) married and common-law and (2) single, which includes divorced, separated, and widowed. All participants with an unknown relationship status ( $n = 6$ ) were categorized as missing and were removed from the descriptive analysis of this variable only.

**Region.** This variable represents CSC regional divisions to which women were released in the community on supervision: Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Prairies, and Pacific.

**Education.** This variable indicates whether or not an individual attained a high school diploma prior to their current incarceration. This information is collected in the intake process; however, this information was missing for the majority of women ( $n = 253$ ).

**Sentence characteristics.** Numerous sentence characteristics of women under community supervision were examined, including type of major offences, aggregate sentence length, sentence type, and initial and final offender security level.

Participants' most serious offence types on their sentences were classified using seven binary variables that include: homicide (e.g., murder or attempted murder), robbery, drugs (e.g., possessing drugs or trafficking/importing drugs), major assault, property (e.g., break and enter, fraud, theft, possession of stolen property or property damage/mischief), other violent (e.g., sexual assault, sexual abuse and other sexual offences, kidnapping, abduction, weapons and explosives, common assault or arson) and other non-violent offences (e.g., gaming and betting, public order offence, criminal code traffic offences, offences of administration of justice, impaired driving, other criminal federal statutes, provincial offences for traffic, provincial offences or municipal bi-law offences).

**Sentence type.** There are two types of sentences that offenders can receive: determinate and indeterminate. The first is when a judge sets a maximum length in an offender's sentence, whereas an indeterminate sentence does not have a specific end date or predetermined length (e.g., an offender that committed an offence that is designated to be severe, such as murder, or considered to be a dangerous offender can receive a sentence without an end date).

**Aggregate sentence length.** This variable indicates the total length of an offender's sentence in years. Offenders are divided into three groups: aggregate sentence length of three years or less, aggregate sentence length greater than three years, and indeterminate sentence.

***Offender security level.*** This variable indicates the security level of an offender: maximum, medium, or minimum. This information is provided for the first level after admission and last level of security (prior to release) in which an offender was placed.

***Offender Intake Assessment.*** The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) is used to assess levels of static (i.e., criminal history) and dynamic risk (i.e., criminogenic need) as well as motivation to participate in their correctional plan and reintegration potential. In addition, Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis-Revised (DFIA-R) tool, which is a component of the OIA process, assesses seven dynamic factor domains that represent various criminogenic needs (i.e., dynamic risk). Use of the DFIA-R is to identify and prioritize factors linked to an offender's criminal behaviour that will inform her correctional plan (Brown & Motiuk, 2005). Where available, data scores pertaining to these variables were obtained from the assessment closest to release.<sup>4</sup>

***Overall static risk.*** Offenders are assessed as being of low, medium, or high risk based on an assessment of factors associated with their criminal history, offence severity, and sex offence history. These static factors are fixed because they are historical and cannot be changed by attending programs and interventions (CSC, 2007).

***Overall dynamic risk.*** Dynamic risk refers to an offender's needs which have been traditionally correlated with correctional outcomes and are used to determine the level of intervention an offender requires. These needs are considered modifiable through program participation. Offenders are assessed as low, medium, or high risk based on an assessment of these criminogenic needs (CSC, 2007).

***Criminogenic need domains.*** This variable is comprised of seven dynamic factors -- employment, marital/family, associates and social interaction, substance abuse, community functioning, personal and emotional orientation, and attitudes -- that are assessed and monitored by CSC (see Appendix A for more detail). Each domain is individually assessed and an offender is provided a rating of one of five response options: (1) Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment, (2) No immediate need for improvement, (3) Low need for improvement, (4) Moderate need for improvement, and (5) High need for improvement in the revised version.

***Motivation.*** This variable is assessed as low, medium, or high, based on an offender's drive and willingness to complete the requirements of her correctional plan (CSC, 2007).

---

<sup>4</sup> This assessment could have taken place prior to or after release from an institution.

***Reintegration potential.*** This variable is assessed as low, medium, or high. It is obtained from the assessment completed closest to the date of the final security decision, which could have been included in a correctional progress report or a correctional plan. This item assesses the probability of an offender successfully reintegrating back to the community. Non-Aboriginal women offender's reintegration potential is determined by their rating on the Custody Rating Scale (CRS) and the static factor assessment rating from the OIA. For Aboriginal women offenders, this rating is determined using the CRS, as well as both the static and dynamic factor assessments (CSC, 2003).

**Programming.** Women offenders can participate in several types of programs both within institutions and in the community during their sentence. For the current profile, successful completion of educational, employment, institutional and community correctional programs was examined. The completion of an educational program was defined as completing at least one Adult Basic Education (ABE) level (see Appendix A for further description). As well, the successful completion of the National Employability Skills Program was examined (see Appendix A) along with the assignment to institutional employment (including Corcan). Successful completions of institutional correctional programming were also explored, which consists of nationally recognized programs that include, but are not limited to, the Women Offender Correctional Program, Violent Offender Programming, Sex Offender Programming, Substance Abuse Programming, and Living Skills Programming. Finally, successful completion of community programs were also examined, which includes Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Community Maintenance Programs.

**Community characteristics.** This section provides information pertaining to an offender's type of supervision, special parole conditions, employment status, reasons for leaving prior employment, and whether they are currently suspended and the reason for the suspension.

***Information regarding Current Supervision Period.***

***Supervision type.*** This variable indicates the type of release an offender can receive. Offenders can be released on discretionary release (e.g., day parole and full parole) which are both early forms of release. As well, offenders can be released on statutory release or on long-term supervision (CCRA, 1992; see Appendix A for more detail).

***Time served in community to date on current supervision period.*** This variable represents the amount of time an offender has been under community supervision as of March 30, 2014.

*Potential time under community supervision.* This variable corresponds to the start of an offender's current supervision period until the end of her sentence. This time period encompasses the total time an offender could be supervised in the community assuming no revocations occur.

*Special parole conditions.* A total of 15 current supervision conditions were included when examining women in the community. Each parole condition indicates whether or not an offender has a current condition while under supervision (see Appendix A for more detail on special parole conditions).

*Employment.* Employment variables include an offender's community employment status, the reasons for leaving prior community employment, and the type of community employment.

*Community employment status.* This variable is composed of three categories: employed, unemployed looking for work, and unemployed not looking for work.

*Reasons for leaving prior community employment.* This variable describes the reason why an offender who is presently unemployed left their prior employment while under community supervision. It was divided into three groups: suspended/revoked (e.g., have been suspended/revoked from community supervision), employment ended (e.g., fired, laid off, quit), and other (e.g., other, deported, program participation, graduated, employed, changed job).

*Type of community employment.* This variable was created by recoding employment into one of five main job categories using the National Occupational Classification categories from Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. The five job categories include: business/finance/administration, trades/transport/equipment operators, sales and services, education/government/social community, and other (see Appendix A for further information).

*Suspension of supervision.* Supervision characteristics were examined with women under community supervision, including supervision status and reason for their suspension.

*Currently suspended.* The women were divided into two categories those who were not and those who were currently suspended (i.e., those who were unlawfully-at-large and those who were temporally detained and awaiting a decision to be made regarding their suspension).

*Reason for current suspension.* For women currently experiencing a suspension, five reasons for the suspension were examined: new criminal charge, failure to report, violation of condition, suspected violation, and other.

## **Analyses**

The profile is largely descriptive and therefore most analyses are frequencies and means.

However, given the importance of examining possible differences between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women, findings for these two groups were contrasted and reported separately. In general, all comparisons were conducted using t-tests and chi-square tests of association. In the case of chi-square, when 20% or more of the expected cell counts were less than five, Fisher Exact probabilities were used to assess significance rather than the Pearson chi-square. Cramer's Phi was used to assess the magnitude of the association between variables when the association was significant and did not require the use of the Fisher's Exact test.

## Results

### Demographic and Sentence Characteristics for Women under Community Supervision

A variety of demographic and sentence characteristics were examined to gain an understanding of the current sample of women under community supervision.

Table 1 presents an overview of the women's demographic and sentence characteristics. The majority of women were Caucasian (56%), but 26% were of Aboriginal ancestry. Notably, this finding suggests that Aboriginal women are under-represented among community-supervised women, as they comprise 34% of incarcerated women (Public Safety, 2012). Aboriginal women were most likely to be supervised in the Prairie region, which reflects the distribution of Aboriginal peoples across Canada, whereas non-Aboriginal women were more likely to be supervised in the Ontario region, which reflects the region's larger size. The majority of women were single (i.e., single, divorced, separated, or widowed) and had not completed high school. Although not shown in Table 1, Aboriginal women ( $M = 33$  years,  $SD = 9.75$ ) tended to be younger upon their community release than non-Aboriginal women ( $M = 37$  years,  $SD = 11.51$ ),  $t(268) = -3.76$ ,  $p < 0.001$ .

With regard to sentence characteristics, fewer than half of the women (41%) were serving sentences of three years or less, while an equal number of women (41%) were serving sentences of more than three years. The remaining women (18%) were serving an indeterminate sentence. The women's most serious offences on the current sentence were frequently homicide or drug-related offences. Significant differences were identified in both initial and final security levels, with Aboriginal women tending to be in higher security levels of maximum and medium security, whereas non-Aboriginal women were more likely to be in minimum security. Notably, a high proportion of women cascaded from medium to minimum security from their initial to final security level.

Table 1

*Demographics and Sentence Characteristics of Women under Community Supervision*

	Aboriginal	Non-Aboriginal	Association between variables		
	% (n)	% (n)	df (n)	$\chi^2$	$\Phi_c$
Demographic characteristics					
Ethnicity					
Aboriginal	26 (132)	-			
Caucasian	-	56 (286)			
Visible minorities	-	14 (71)			
Other or unknown	-	4 (20)			
Relationship status					
Married/common-law	38 (50)	35 (128)	1 (502)	0.46	
Single/divorced/separated/widowed	62 (82)	65 (242)			
Supervision region					
Atlantic	11 (14)	11 (43)			
Quebec	5 (7)	17 (62)			
Ontario	16 (21)	36 (137)	4 (509)	59.25***	0.34
Prairies	52 (69)	20 (74)			
Pacific	16 (21)	16 (61)			
Education level attained prior to incarceration					
No high school diploma	76 (55)	50 (98)	1 (268)	14.97***	-0.24
High school diploma	24 (17)	50 (98)			
Sentence characteristics					
Length of aggregate sentence					
3 years or less	50 (66)	38 (143)			
More than 3 years	37 (49)	42 (160)	2 (509)	6.63*	0.11
Indeterminate	13 (17)	20 (74)			
Offence type					
Homicide	27 (35)	23 (88)	1 (509)	0.54	
Drugs	21 (28)	33 (123)	1 (509)	6.10*	0.11
Robbery	14 (19)	10 (38)	1 (509)	1.83	
Property	9 (12)	16 (60)	1 (509)	3.75	
Major assault	17 (22)	2 (8)	1 (509)	37.29***	-0.27
Other violent	4 (5)	7 (25)	1 (509)	1.42	
Other non-violent	8 (11)	9 (35)	1 (509)	0.11	
Initial security level					
Maximum	10 (13)	2 (9)			
Medium	60 (78)	40 (137)	2 (474)	35.16***	0.27
Minimum	29 (38)	58 (199)			
Final security level					
Maximum	6 (7)	1 (5)			
Medium	38 (49)	22 (75)	2 (469)	20.56***	0.21
Minimum	56 (72)	77 (261)			

Note. Cells with a dash (-) indicate no offenders in category. The number of participants varies due to unknown/missing participants.  $\Phi_c$  = Cramer's phi; *df* = degrees of freedom; *n* = sample size.

\**p* < .05. \*\*\**p* < .001.

### Overall Risk Rating and DFIA Domain Scores

In addition to identifying demographic and sentence characteristics of women under

community supervision, the most recent scores<sup>5</sup> on assessments of static risk, dynamic risk, motivation, and reintegration potential were examined (see Table 2). This information provides an indication of the appropriateness of various referral options, program targets, and supervision strategies (CSC, 2007).

Table 2  
*Static Risk, Dynamic Risk, Motivation, and Reintegration Potential Assessed Closest to Release*

	Aboriginal	Non-Aboriginal	Association between variables	
	% (n)	% (n)	$\chi^2$	$\Phi_c$
Static risk level				
Low	29 (38)	62 (225)	41.69***	0.29
Medium	50 (64)	28 (103)		
High	21 (27)	9 (34)		
Dynamic risk level				
Low	18 (23)	47 (169)	33.52***	0.26
Medium	53 (68)	36 (129)		
High	29 (38)	18 (64)		
Motivation level				
Low	2 (2)	2 (6)	0.88	
Medium	28 (36)	24 (86)		
High	71 (91)	75 (270)		
Reintegration potential				
Low	10 (13)	5 (18)	27.89***	0.24
Medium	54 (70)	33 (118)		
High	36 (46)	62 (226)		

Note. Each of the chi-square analyses in the table has an  $n = 491$  and  $df = 2$ .  $\Phi_c$  = Cramer's phi;  $df$  = degrees of freedom;  $n$  = sample size.

\*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women differed importantly in terms of several of these indicators. Overall, Aboriginal women tended to be assessed as having higher levels of static risk and dynamic risk (need), and lower levels of reintegration potential. The exception was motivation: the majority of women were assessed as having a high level of motivation, regardless of ethnicity.

Table 3 presents offenders' level of need in seven dynamic factor domains. Use of the seven domains is designed to aid in the identification and prioritization of those needs requiring correctional intervention. The majority of women tended to have "no immediate needs" in the attitude domain, thereby demonstrating pro-social attitudes rather than antisocial attitudes, and

<sup>5</sup> Although the actual timing of this assessment and its proximity to an offender's release to the community can vary, most assessments had been completed within five months of the current release.

the community functioning domain, which assesses those skills necessary for daily living. Women (especially Aboriginal women) more frequently had needs in the employment, personal/emotional, and associates domains. Substance abuse needs were relatively common among Aboriginal women, but less present amongst their non-Aboriginal counterparts.

Table 3  
*Dynamic Risk Domain Scores Assessed Closest to Release*

Domain	Aboriginal % (n)	Non-Aboriginal % (n)	Association between variables		
			df (n)	$\chi^2$	$\Phi_c$
<b>Attitude</b>					
Asset to community functioning	6 (7)	13 (47)			
No immediate need	40 (51)	42 (150)			
Low need for improvement	24 (30)	23 (80)	4 (483)	8.03	
Moderate need for improvement	24 (31)	18 (65)			
High need for improvement	6 (8)	4 (14)			
<b>Community functioning</b>					
Asset to community functioning	2 (3)	9 (32)			
No immediate need	48 (61)	49 (174)			
Low need for improvement	17 (22)	25 (91)	4 (483)	19.77**	0.20
Moderate need for improvement	28 (35)	15 (52)			
High need for improvement	5 (6)	2 (7)			
<b>Associates</b>					
Asset to community functioning	2 (3)	8 (27)			
No immediate need	24 (30)	36 (129)			
Low need for improvement	20 (26)	30 (105)	4 (483)	32.14***	0.26
Moderate need for improvement	38 (48)	20 (72)			
High need for improvement	16 (20)	6 (23)			
<b>Employment</b>					
Asset to community functioning	1 (1)	10 (36)			
No immediate need	16 (20)	33 (118)			
Low need for improvement	28 (36)	31 (112)	4 (483)	46.40***	0.31
Moderate need for improvement	48 (61)	23 (81)			
High need for improvement	7 (9)	3 (9)			
<b>Marital and family</b>					
Asset to community functioning	0 (0)	10 (37)			
No immediate need	24 (30)	40 (142)			
Low need for improvement	29 (37)	26 (91)	4 (483)	37.22***	0.28
Moderate need for improvement	41 (52)	20 (73)			
High need for improvement	6 (8)	4 (13)			
<b>Personal/emotional</b>					
No immediate need	9 (11)	22 (78)			
Low need for improvement	24 (31)	30 (107)			
Moderate need for improvement	44 (56)	35 (125)	3 (483)	17.90**	0.19
High need for improvement	23 (29)	13 (46)			
<b>Substance abuse</b>					
No immediate need	16 (21)	55 (196)			
Low need for improvement	16 (20)	15 (52)			
Moderate need for improvement	42 (53)	18 (66)	3 (483)	63.57***	0.36
High need for improvement	26 (33)	12 (42)			

Note. In total, 26 women did not have DFIA-R domains and have been excluded here.  $\Phi_c$  = Cramer's phi; df = degrees of freedom; n = sample size.

\*\*p < .01. \*\*\*p < .001.

## Education, Employment, and Correctional Programming

Employment as well as a variety of correctional and community programs were examined in order to better understand the programming needs of FWOs during their incarceration and upon their release to the community (as shown in Table 4). With respect to program completion, the overall majority of women did not complete an educational, community, or national employability skills program; however, the majority of women did complete an institutional correctional program and had an employment assignment in the institution (72%).

Table 4  
*Percentage of Women Completing Education, Employment, Correctional, or Community Programming*

	Aboriginal % (n)	Non-Aboriginal % (n)	Association between variables	
			$\chi^2$	$\Phi_c$
Completed educational program				
No	72 (95)	84 (317)	9.30**	-0.14
Yes	28 (37)	16 (60)		
Had employment assignment in institution				
No	22 (29)	31 (116)	3.72	
Yes	78 (103)	69 (261)		
Completed National Employability Skill Programs				
No	86 (113)	90 (338)	1.59	
Yes	14 (19)	10 (39)		
Completed correctional programs				
No	24 (32)	25 (93)	0.01	
Yes	76 (100)	75 (284)		
Completed community correctional programs				
No	69 (91)	70 (264)	0.05	
Yes	31 (41)	30 (113)		

*Note.* Each of the chi-square analyses in the table has an  $n = 509$  and  $df = 2$ .  $\Phi_c$  = Cramer's phi;  $df$  = degrees of freedom;  $n$  = sample size.

\*\* $p < .01$ .

## Community Characteristics for Women under Community Supervision

Given that virtually all FWOs (98%) will serve some portion of their sentence under community supervision, an examination of community supervision related variables for the sample under consideration was considered particularly important. Type and length of supervision and special parole conditions, along with women's supervision, community employment, and suspensions were examined to gain insight into women's community supervision experiences. First, to provide context to this period of time, Table 5 summarizes the supervision type of women offenders in the sample along with two measurements of supervision

length. Aboriginal women tended to be on statutory release, whereas the majority of non-Aboriginal women were on full parole.

Table 5  
*Type and Length of Supervision*

	Aboriginal % (n)	Non-Aboriginal % (n)	Association between variables	
			$\chi^2$	$\Phi_c$
Supervision type				
Day parole	23 (31)	19 (71)		
Full parole	18 (24)	51 (194)	47.91***	0.31
Statutory release and long term supervision	58 (77)	30 (112)		
Time served in community on current supervision period				
Less than 1 year	83 (109)	63 (238)		
Between 1 year & less than 3 years	9 (12)	16 (62)	17.33**	0.18
3 years or more	8 (11)	20 (77)		
Potential time under community supervision <sup>a</sup>				
Less than 1 year	42 (55)	22 (83)		
Between 1 year & less than 2 years	35 (46)	28 (105)	33.30***	0.26
2 years or more	10 (14)	30 (115)		
Indeterminate	13 (17)	20 (74)		

Note. Each of the chi-square analyses in the table has an  $n = 509$  and  $df = 2$ .  $\Phi_c$  = Cramer's phi;  $df$  = degrees of freedom;  $n$  = sample size.

<sup>a</sup> Assumes that no revocation will occur between the date on which community supervision began and their projected date for the end of their sentence.

\*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

By design, those released on statutory rather than discretionary release (i.e., day or full parole) will serve smaller portions of their sentence in the community; this pattern was reflected in the data. Aboriginal women were more likely to be on statutory release than non-Aboriginal women and as a result to have been in the community for a shorter period of time. For instance, 83% of Aboriginal women compared with 63% of non-Aboriginal women had spent less than one year in the community. Moreover, Aboriginal women had shorter total potential time to be supervised than non-Aboriginal women, which influences the extent of gradual and supervised community reintegration that can occur.

During supervision, many offenders are subject to specific parole conditions in addition to those which are standard to all offenders. Overall, almost all women (90%) had at least one special parole condition, with the most common being abstaining from drugs and alcohol (especially for Aboriginal women) and avoiding certain persons (see Table 6). No women had special conditions requiring them to report to police.

Table 6  
*Parole Conditions of Women under Community Supervision*

	Aboriginal % ( <i>n</i> )	Non-Aboriginal % ( <i>n</i> )	Association between variables	
			$\chi^2$ or Fisher's Exact <sup>a</sup>	$\Phi_c$
Any condition	92 (122)	89 (334)	1.54	
Categories of conditions				
Abstain from substances and establishments	(109)	54 (205)	32.90***	-0.25
Avoid situations or persons	77 (101)	66 (248)	5.23*	-0.10
Restrictions	5 (7)	6 (24)	$p = 0.16$	
Treatment or intervention	50 (66)	41 (156)	2.95	
Obligations	44 (58)	53 (201)	3.44	
Residency condition	12 (16)	4 (16)	10.30**	-0.14
Other condition	14 (18)	22 (82)	4.08*	0.09

*Note.* Each of the chi-square analyses in the table has an  $n = 509$  and  $df = 1$ .  $\Phi_c$  = Cramer's phi;  $df$  = degrees of freedom;  $n$  = sample size.

<sup>a</sup>Probability ( $p$ ) values obtained with Fisher's Exact test are reported directly in the table when 20% or more of the expected cell counts were less than 5. <sup>b</sup>The details of the conditions listed as "other" were not readily accessible and were not examined, but can include such requirements as to report financial details, to report romantic relationships, to abstain from the use of telephones or computers, or to abstain from the use of pornography.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Employment is a key component of women's successful reintegration. Overall, 48% of women were employed, with Aboriginal women being less likely than non-Aboriginal women to be employed (see Table 7). Among those who were employed, the vast majority were in sales and services or in a trade, although there was a large number of Aboriginal women in the trades. Among those who were unemployed, the most common reason for women to leave their prior employment was due to being suspended or revoked, particularly among Aboriginal women.

Table 7  
Community Employment

	Aboriginal % (n)	Non-Aboriginal % (n)	Association between variables		
			df(n)	$\chi^2$ or Fisher's Exact <sup>a</sup>	$\Phi_c$
Employment status					
Employed	37 (42)	52 (180)			
Unemployed looking for work	30 (35)	19 (67)	2 (459)	9.80**	0.15
Unemployed not looking for work	33 (38)	28 (97)			
Type of employment <sup>b</sup>					
Business/finance/administration	17 (7)	21 (38)			
Education/government/social community	12 (5)	5 (9)			
Sales and services	36 (15)	49 (89)	4 (222)	$p = 0.04^*$	
Trades/transport/equipment operators	33 (14)	17 (30)			
Other	2 (1)	8 (14)			
Reasons for leaving prior employment <sup>c</sup>					
Suspended/revoked	84 (21)	65 (24)			
Employment ended	0 (0)	16 (6)	2 (62)	$p = 0.09$	
Other	16 (4)	19 (7)			

Note. Column totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.  $\Phi_c$  = Cramer's phi; df = degrees of freedom; n = sample size.

<sup>a</sup>Probability (p) values associated obtained with Fisher's Exact test are reported directly in the table when 20% or more of the expected cell counts were less than 5. <sup>b</sup>Refers to those who are currently employed. <sup>c</sup> Refers to those who are unemployed.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

One indicator of a woman's difficulties while under supervision is whether or not she is suspended. Although the majority of women were not currently suspended (at the time of data extraction), of those suspended, a greater proportion were Aboriginal women than non-Aboriginal women (see Table 8). Overall, women who were suspended while under community supervision tended to receive this suspension because of a failure to report, deteriorating behavior or suspicion of criminal activity, or a violation of a parole condition. These findings indicate that Aboriginal women are more likely than non-Aboriginal women to have their community supervision periods interrupted because of suspension. These findings, in combination with the previously discussed differences in the types of releases received, indicate that Aboriginal women were spending significantly less time in the community for reintegration than non-Aboriginal women.

Table 8

*Suspension and Reason for Suspension for Women under Community Supervision*

	Aboriginal % (n)	Non-Aboriginal % (n)	Association between variables		
			df (n)	$\chi^2$ or Fisher's Exact <sup>a</sup>	$\Phi_c$
Currently suspended					
No	80 (105)	93 (350)			
Yes	20 (27)	7 (27)	1 (509)	18.22***	-0.19
Reason for suspension					
Failure to report	74 (20)	31 (8)			
Deterioration behavior	11 (3)	19 (5)			
New criminal charge	4 (1)	15 (4)	4 (53)	$p = 0.01^*$	
Violation of condition	7 (2)	31 (8)			
Other	4 (1)	4 (1)			

Notes.  $\Phi_c$  = Cramer's phi; df = degrees of freedom; n = sample size.

<sup>a</sup>Probability (p) values associated obtained with Fisher's Exact test are reported directly in the table when 20% or more of the expected cell counts were less than 5.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## **Discussion**

The ability to address the reintegration risks and needs of federal women offenders is paramount to their successful re-entry into the community. To do so effectively, however, a comprehensive understanding of these risks and needs is required. In support of this requirement for additional information, the current report provides a profile of women under community supervision. In addition to increasing understanding of the characteristics of women in the community, these findings may assist in the development of gender-informed policy and programs.

### **Women under Community Supervision**

The profile of women under community supervision was, in many ways, consistent with previous examinations of women under community supervision. Women were most frequently convicted of homicide or drug-related offences. The former is in line with the finding that almost one in five women in this sample was serving an indeterminate sentence; homicide offences frequently result in indeterminate sentences, and women serving such sentences, by definition, never complete their periods of community supervision. Determinately-sentenced women in the community tended to be serving sentences of less than three years.

This study's results aligned with previous research in finding that women exhibited considerable need in the personal and emotional domain (e.g., Chesney-Lind, 2000; Koons et al., 1997; Taylor & Flight, 2004) and with respect to substance abuse (e.g., Boe et al., 2003; Taylor & Flight, 2004). Both of these would be consistent with theories of women's pathways to crime whereby experiences of abuse and trauma in childhood and later life influence girls' and women's personal and emotional development (e.g., self-esteem, self-schema, cognitions), sometimes leading to substance abuse as a maladaptive coping strategy and ultimately to criminal activity in order to support addictions, support oneself, or escape from a negative situation (e.g., Belknap, 2001).

Also in keeping with this theory, women were found to have limited previous educational attainment and were assessed as presenting needs relating to employment; again, these patterns were consistent with those found by others (Barrett, Allenby, & Taylor, 2010; Bloom et al., 2003; Delveaux et al., 2005; Taylor & Flight, 2004). Unfortunately, while most women were employed within the institution during their incarceration, the majority did not complete an

educational program or an employability skills program. That does not mean, however, that they did not participate in such programs – it is possible, for instance, that a woman completed a period of educational upgrading but did not remain in the program long enough to reach the next educational milestone; this situation would be coded in CSC’s administrative systems as non-completion. Though the extent of participation (as opposed to completion) was not examined, it seems likely that this occurred in at least some cases, given the fact that women were generally serving relatively short sentences.

Overall, post-release, almost half of the women in the cohort were employed. When only women who were seeking work were considered (i.e., excluding students and those for whom employment was non-applicable, for example due to pursuing full-time parenting), almost two-thirds were employed. Women most frequently worked in the area of sales and service or in trades. Given that Gobeil (2008) found that women identified employment as being essential component to their successful reintegration, supporting women in their pursuit of employment is essential. It appears that women can be further supported in terms of both their educational and employability upgrading and in finding work. A focus on this type of support is reflected in CSC’s dissemination of a revision of the *National Community Strategy for Women Offenders* (CSC, 2010a), which includes a particular emphasis on employment. In addition, CSC has focused on this area over the last decade and has implemented Community Employment Coordinators to provide employment services to offenders in the community. The role of the Coordinators is to work in partnership with local community-based groups and agencies to provide a range of services, including orientation to employment-related community resources, employment counselling, employment search assistance, and work placement. Since 2012, there has been a shift in the Community Employment Coordinators’ focus, with a greater emphasis on job development through the expansion of networks of potential employers. Preliminary results suggest this shift has resulted in increases in job placements (Nolan, Power, & Woods, under review). Given this shift in focus occurred after the time of data collection for the present report, it is possible that future research in the area may find different results.

Virtually all women in the current profile were imposed at least one special condition at release by the Parole Board of Canada. Most frequently, these conditions were to avoid certain persons, to abstain from drugs, or to abstain from alcohol. During their period of community release, most women did not return to custody. In keeping with findings that, relative to male

offenders, women tend to be more successful after release (e.g., Public Safety, 2012) rates of current suspension were about 10%. Moreover, in most cases where a suspension occurred, it was due to a failure to report. Suspensions due to new criminal charges reflected less than one in five of the total number of suspensions. This pattern suggests that, upon release, some women may be experiencing difficulty in adapting to community living and the expectations of them, and that this challenge may be more of a factor in returns to custody than is a direct return to criminality. Indeed, in an earlier survey, women who had been successful in the community reported the period immediately after release to pose significant challenges in terms of adjusting to life in the community and, possibly, residence in a community-based residential facility (Gobeil, 2008). In that study, most women reported that as time elapsed after their release, the reintegration process became easier. This finding underscores the importance of provision of timely support to women during their transition to the community.

### **Differences Associated with Ethnicity**

Echoing the findings of other studies (e.g., Bell et al., 2004; Blanchette & Taylor, 2005; Dowden & Serin, 2000), the results of the current profile demonstrate that “Aboriginal women present with higher risks and needs than non-Aboriginal women and this is also reflected in their lower success rates upon release” (CSC, 2010c, p. 21). Relative to their non-Aboriginal counterparts, Aboriginal women tended to demonstrate less extensive educational and employment histories and lower rates of employment post-release. Consistent with addressing needs in the correctional plan, while in a federal institution, Aboriginal women had higher rates of completion of education and employment programs and higher rates of employment assignments.

During their periods of incarceration, Aboriginal women tended to be classified to higher security levels. They also demonstrated more problematic risk, criminogenic needs, and reintegration potential profiles. Consistent with previous findings, Aboriginal women tended to demonstrate more extensive substance abuse problems (e.g., Bell et al., 2004; Derkzen, Booth, McConnell, & Taylor, 2012; Trevethan et al., 2002). It is interesting to find that both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women were predominately highly motivated to pursue their correctional plan despite different levels of risk and reintegration potential found between these two groups. This finding suggests positive opportunity for rehabilitation among those with varying potential for reintegration.

In keeping with their greater substance abuse needs, Aboriginal women were more frequently imposed a special condition at release requiring them to abstain from drugs and/or alcohol. They were also more frequently suspended – typically due to failure to report. Together with the fact that they were less likely to be granted discretionary release, Aboriginal women spent shorter proportions of their sentences in the community and were less frequently successful in their reintegration relative to their non-Aboriginal counterparts. As discussed previously, Aboriginal women’s higher rates of return to custody, relative to their non-Aboriginal counterparts, have also been reported elsewhere (e.g., Gobeil & Barrett, 2008).

CSC, and the federal government as a whole, have acknowledged and made attempts to close the gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders in terms of both their over-representation in the criminal justice system and their post-release outcomes (e.g., Rojas & Gretton, 2007; R. v. Gladue, 1999). CSC has identified an enhanced capacity to provide effective interventions and services for Aboriginal offenders as one of its key strategic priorities, and, to do so, has developed a vision and approach that incorporates Aboriginal culture and spirituality into correctional operations and interventions. For example, CSC provides both Aboriginal offenders and interested non-Aboriginal offenders the opportunity to participate in Aboriginal-specific programs and spiritual ceremonies, to reside in culturally-informed living environments, and to access and utilize the services of a range of staff with culturally-specific roles, such as Elders, Aboriginal Community Liaison Officers, and Aboriginal Community Development Officers. This approach, formalized in 2006 under the name *Strategic Plan for Aboriginal Corrections*, reflects the Aboriginal Corrections Continuum of Care model and aims to facilitate Aboriginal offenders’ healing process and reintegration (CSC, 2006). An evaluation of the Aboriginal-specific interventions and services falling within this plan was completed in 2012 and concluded that many of these components are associated with positive outcomes (CSC Evaluation Division, 2012).

### **Changes over Time**

Comparison of the present results with those in Taylor and Flight’s (2004) profile of women in the community allowed examination of changes over time. These comparisons indicate that differences associated with ethnicity are compounded by the fact that, community-supervised Aboriginal women, as a proportion of the total community-supervised population, increased by 5% over about a decade. While this is in keeping with patterns found elsewhere

(Public Safety, 2012), the changes over time underscore the need to continue to address the needs of Aboriginal offenders, both while under community supervision and earlier during the sentence.

Contrasting the present results with those of Taylor and Flight (2004) reveals additional differences over time. Relative to the women included in this earlier profile, those included in the present study were more likely to be convicted of drug offences, which is in keeping with other research demonstrating an increase in the number of women convicted of such offences (Gobeil, 2009). Women in the current profile also tended to be assessed as presenting higher levels of need, though assessed motivation and reintegration potential levels were similar at both time points. In addition, more women had special parole conditions imposed. This difference may reflect differences in need levels, offence types, or in approaches to parole decision-making. Indeed, it has now been recognized for over a decade that most correctional jurisdictions have been increasing the number and breadth of conditions imposed on parolees, regardless of changes in the offender population (e.g., Burke, 2004); the extent to which this general trend explains the current findings is not known. Despite the greater use of special conditions amongst the women included in the current profile, the types of conditions remain similar, with conditions related to avoiding certain persons and abstinence from drugs, alcohol, and gambling found to be the most frequently imposed in both studies.

Many other areas, such as limited educational and employment attainment and pronounced need in areas such as the personal and emotional domain and substance use, were similar across both time points. Given these areas are assessed at intake, these findings demonstrate that limited change may have occurred in the time between the two profiles with respect to women's pre-incarceration community experiences. In other words, not surprisingly, similar life experiences and characteristics appear to continue to contribute to women's criminality. Though pre-incarceration experiences are beyond the scope of what CSC can address directly, these findings highlight the key role and importance of community service agencies that work with women at various stages of their involvement in the criminal justice system, including periods where they may not yet have become involved in crime but are at risk to do so. CSC works to liaise with such agencies as much as possible (see Thompson, Trinneer, McConnell, Derkzen, & Rubinfeld, under review), but this may nonetheless be an area where continued focus is possible.

## **Conclusion**

This profile adds to the limited literature on FWOs' risks and needs upon their community reintegration and begins to provide a better understanding of the variety of challenges women experience while in the community. Being able to better identify and target specific areas where women are experiencing challenges provides CSC with the opportunity to better address the identified need areas through the development of gender-informed policy and programs and strengthen its continuum of care for women offenders. A better understanding of women's risk and need areas is critical as CSC's ability to successfully strengthen community corrections will, in large part, depend on having the capacity to manage these risks and support the needs of women, both during their incarceration and upon release to the community.

## References

- Andrews, D., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Austin, J., Bloom, B., & Donahue, T. (1992). *Female offenders in the community: An analysis of innovative strategies and programs*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- Barrett, M., Allenby, K., & Taylor, K. (2010). *Twenty years later: Revisiting the task force on federally sentenced women* (Research Report R-222). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Belknap, J. (2001). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime, and justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bell, A., Trevethan, S., & Allegri, N. (2004). *A needs assessment of federal Aboriginal women* (Research Report R-145). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Blanchette, K., & Brown, S. (2006). *The assessment and treatment of women offenders: An integrative approach*. Chichester, West Sussex: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Blanchette, K., & Taylor, K. (2005). *Development and field test of a gender-informed security reclassification scale for women offenders* (Research Report R-167). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Bloom, B., Owen, B., & Covington, S. (2003). *Gender-responsive strategies: Research, practice, and guiding principles for women offenders*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- Boe, R. (1997). Unemployment risk trends and the implications for Canadian federal offenders. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 17(1), 3-5.
- Boe, R., Nafekh, M., Vuong, B., Sinclair, R., & Cousineau, C. (2003). *The changing profile of the federal inmate population: 1997 and 2002* (Research Report R-132). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Bonta, J., Pang, B., & Wallace-Capretta, S. (1995). Predictors of recidivism among incarcerated female offenders. *The Prison Journal*, 75, 277-294.
- Brown, J. (2004). Challenges facing Canadian federal offenders newly released to the community. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 39, 19-35.

- Brown, S., & Motiuk, L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process: A meta-analytic, psychometric and consultative review* (Research Report R-164). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Burke, P. (2004). *Parole violations revisited: A handbook on strengthening parole practices for public safety and successful transition to the community* (NIC Accession Number 019833). Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2000). "What to do about girls? Thinking about programs for young women" in M. McMahon (Ed.), *Assessment to assistance: Programs for women in community corrections* (pp. 139–170). Arlington, VA: American Correctional Association.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2003). *Reintegration potential: A guide for determining and entering an offender's reintegration potential into the offender management system*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service Canada (2006). *Strategic plan for Aboriginal corrections: Innovation, learning & adjustment: 2006-07 to 2010-11*. Ottawa, ON: Internal Document.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2007). *Commissioner's directive 705-6: Correctional planning and criminal profile*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2010a). *Revised national community strategy for women offenders*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2010b). *Transforming community corrections*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2010c). *The revised national community strategy for women offenders*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada Evaluation Division. (2012). *Evaluation report: The strategic plan for Aboriginal corrections* (394-2-49). Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act*. (1992).
- Covington, S., & Bloom, B. (2000). *Gendered justice: Programming for women in corrections settings*. Paper presented at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology.
- Delveaux, K., Blanchette, K., & Wickett, J. (2005). *Employment needs, interests, and programming for women offenders* (Research Report R-166). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Derkzen, D., Booth, L., McConnell, A., & Taylor, K. (2012). *Mental health needs of federal*

- women offenders* (Research Report R-267). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Dowden, C., & Serin, R. (2000). Assessing the needs of Aboriginal women offenders on conditional release. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 12(1), 57-60.
- Gillis, C., & Nafekh, M. (2005). The impact of community-based employment on offender reintegration. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 17, 10-14.
- Gobeil, R. (2008). *Staying out: Women's perceptions of challenges and protective factors in community reintegration* (Research Report R-201). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Gobeil, R. (2009). *Profile of federally sentenced women drug offenders* (Research Report R-204). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Gobeil, R. & Barrett, M. R. (2008). *Rates of recidivism for women offenders* (Research Report R-192). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Gottfredson, D., Wilson, D., & Najaka, S. (2002). *School-based crime prevention*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., & Hardcastle, L. (2007). The perceived employability of ex-prisoners and offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 52(6), 673-685.
- Grella, C., & Greenwell, L. (2007). Treatment needs and completion of community-based aftercare among substance-abusing women offenders. *Women's Health Issues*, 17(4), 244-255.
- Grella, C., & Rodriguez, L. (2011). Motivation for treatment among women offenders in prison-based treatment and longitudinal outcomes among those who participate in community aftercare. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 43(1), 58-67.
- Harlow, C. (2003). *Education and correctional populations. Special report*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. U.S Department of Justice. Retrieved January 15, 2013 from: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf>
- Hoffman, L., & Law, M. (1995). *Federally sentenced women on a conditional release: A survey of community supervisors*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Koons, B., Burrow, J., Morash, M., & Bynum, T. (1997). Expert and offender perceptions of program elements linked to successful outcomes for incarcerated women. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43(4), 512-532.
- Lightfoot, L., & Lambert, L. (1992). *Substance abuse treatment needs of federally sentenced women*. Kingston, ON: Correctional Services of Canada.

- Lipsey, M., & Cullen, F. (2007). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: A review of systematic reviews. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3, 297-320.
- Loucks, A., & Zamble, E. (2000). Predictors of criminal behaviour and prison misconduct in serious female offenders. *Empirical and Applied Criminal Justice Review*, 1, 1-47.
- Matheson, F., Doherty, S., & Grant, B. (2009). *Women offender substance abuse programming and community reintegration* (Research Report R-202). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Morin, S. (1999). *Federally sentenced Aboriginal women in maximum security: What happened to the promise of creating choices?* Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Nolan, A., Power, J., Woods, M., & Cousineau, C. (in press). *Assessment of the transfer of Community Employment Services (CES) from CORCAN to community corrections infrastructure* (Research Report R-324) Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Public Safety. (2012). *Corrections and conditional release statistical overview 2012*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- R.v. Gladue, (1999) 1 S.C.R. 688.
- Report of the Correctional Service of Canada Review Panel. (2007). *A roadmap to strengthening public safety*. Ottawa, ON: Ministry of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Rettinger, J. L. (1998). *A recidivism follow-up study investigating risk and need within a sample of provincially sentence women*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Robbins, C., Martin, S., & Surratt, H. (2009). Substance abuse treatment, anticipated maternal roles, and reentry success of drug-involved women prisoners. *Crime & Delinquency*, 55, 388-411.
- Rojas, E. Y., & Gretton, H. M. (2007). Background, offence characteristics, and criminal outcomes of Aboriginal youth who sexually offend: a closer look at Aboriginal youth intervention needs. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 19, 257-283.
- Scroggins, J. R., & Malley, S. (2010). Reentry and the (unmet) needs of women. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 49, 146-163.
- Solicitor General of Canada. (1998). *Corrections population growth: Second progress report for the federal/provincial/territorial ministers responsible for justice*. Retrieved from <http://www.sgc.ca/epub/corr/e199810c/e199810c.htm>

- Soloman, A. (2006). *Does parole supervision work? Research findings and policy opportunities*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved from [http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1000908\\_parole\\_supervision.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1000908_parole_supervision.pdf)
- Statistics Canada. No date. *Table 282-0040*. Labour force survey estimates (LFS), by educational attainment, sex and age group (table). CANSIM (database). Last updated January 1, 2014.  
<http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&retrLang=eng&id=2820004&tabMode=dataTable&srchLan=-1&p1=-1&p2=9> (accessed April 28, 2014).
- Taylor, K., & Flight, J. (2004). A profile of federally-sentenced women on conditional release. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 16(1), 24-27.
- Thompson, J., Trinneer, A., McConnell, A., Derkzen, D., & Rubenfeld, S. (under review). *Community services for women under supervision: 2011 overview* (Research Report R-311). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Trevethan, S., Moore, J., & Rastin, C. (2002). A profile of Aboriginal offenders in federal facilities and serving time in the community. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 14(3), 17-19.
- Tripodi, S., Bledsoe, S., Kim, J., & Bender, K. (2011). Effects for correctional-based program for female inmates: A systematic review. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 21, 15-31.
- Visher, C. (2006). *Effective reentry programs*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved from [http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1001016\\_reentry\\_programs.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1001016_reentry_programs.pdf)
- Visher, C., La Vigne, N., & Travis, J. (2004). *Returning home: Understanding the challenges of prisoner reentry, Maryland pilot study: Findings from Baltimore*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved from [http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/410974\\_ReturningHome\\_MD.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/410974_ReturningHome_MD.pdf).

## Appendix A: Detailed Description of Variables

*Completion of education program.* The possible certificate/diploma types include: Adult Basic Education I completion (equivalent to grade 6), Adult Basic Education II completion (equivalent to grade 8), Adult Basic Education III completion (equivalent to grade 10), Adult Basic Education IV completion (equivalent to high school), General Education Diploma, College of General and Vocational Education, Community College Diploma or University Degree.

*National Employability Skills Program (NESP).* The NESP program assists offenders in their development or enhancement of their employability skills by preparing offenders for employment upon release, building their self confidence and developing realistic goals for employment. The program concentrates on offenders' skills in three areas which include: fundamental skills, personal management skills and teamwork skills.

*Criminogenic need domains.* There are seven criminogenic need domains which include: *Employment* (values concerning education and work), *marital/family* (support derived from family and community), *associates and social interaction* (value of interacting with non-criminal peers), *substance abuse* (value of abstaining from substances), *community functioning* (the use of skills necessary for daily living), *personal and emotional orientation* (control exerted over one's life), and *attitudes* (living in a pro-social manner).

*Supervision types.* *Full parole* eligibility occurs when an offender has served one-third of her sentence, permitting an offender to serve her remaining sentence under community supervision while adhering to conditions and regulations. *Day parole* can be granted six months prior to full parole eligibility and allows an offender to be released during the day and restricts her to custody at night. *Statutory release* is similar to full parole but is granted after an offender has served two-thirds of her sentence or is required to be released in to the community. Finally, *long term supervision* is when an offender has a court-imposed order whereby she remains under CSC supervision after her warrant expiry date and for a period no longer than ten years.

*Special parole conditions.* There are several special parole conditions which can be imposed. These conditions were grouped together in the following categories: abstain from substances and

establishments (*abstain from alcohol; abstain from drug, abstain from intoxicant, avoid drinking establishments, do not consume alcohol, do not consumer drugs*); avoid situations or persons (*avoid certain persons, avoid certain places, do not go to areas with children, avoid children, avoid sex work, avoid victims*); restrictions on behaviour (*do not access a computer network, abstain from driving, motor vehicle restriction, do not access pornography, do not use telecommunication devices*); follow treatment or participate in interventions (*follow treatment, take medication as prescribed, counselling with psychologist or psychiatrist, follow psychiatric treatment*); obligations (report to police, report relationships, report for curfew, provide urinalysis, find employment, disclose financial information); residential requirements; other conditions (*avoid gambling establishment, abstain from gambling, do not gamble ,deportation and other*). An “any condition” variable was created to capture whether any of the special conditions were imposed during their supervision. In all cases, zero represented “no condition.”

*Type of community employment.* The following provides a breakdown of the five main job categories based off of the National Occupational Classification categories from the Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. Although other job categories exist, these are the ones included in the current analyses. *Business/finance/administration:* clerical occupations, clerical supervisors, administration and regulatory, clerical/general office skills, secretary record distribute. *Sales and services:* chefs/cooks, creative design, butcher/baker, travel and accommodation, child/home, food centre attendant, cleaners, retail sales/clerk, food/beverage, personal service, animal care, other sales relations, agriculture/horticulture, travel/accommodation/amusement. *Trades/transport/equipment operators:* other construct trade, mason/plaster, machine operator fabric/fur/ leather, machine operator food/beverage/tobacco, machine operator textile, mechanic electric assemblers, processing manufacturer utility laboratory, other assembly, longshore/material handler, personal service technical, trade helpers/labourers, primary production labourer, carpenter/cabinetmaker, auto service technician, other installation/repair service. *Education/government/social community:* professional occupation, policy/program research consultant, psychology/sociology/counselling/probation, public works/other labourers, paralegal/sociology/education/religion, managers, other elemental service. *Other:* Health service assistant and other. Health Services was combined in this category as cell sizes were too small.