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Abstract

Sexual offending is a complex and disturbing phenomenon. The effects on its victims are severe and long lasting. A perceived rise in sex offences throughout the 1980s prompted the British Columbia Corrections Branch to implement new strategies to respond to sex offenders under provincial jurisdiction. The immediate correctional response involved the implementation of treatment programs for both custodial and probationed offenders. The most recent correctional initiative in sex offender management has focused on probation practice.

In 1987, the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit was the first British Columbia probation office established specifically to provide supervision of persons convicted of sexual offences. The primary characteristics which distinguish this program from traditional or regular probation practice includes adoption of a relapse prevention model, case management groups, and intensive supervision. Both researchers and program managers suggest that the new probation program provides a coordinated approach to sex offender management which is superior to traditional probation practice in protecting the community from sexual victimization.

This thesis explores and compares the nature of probation supervision received by sex offenders in both types of probation practice. Specific attention is paid to variations in service delivery and recidivism of the probationers during
the supervision period and during a three year follow-up period. To accomplish this task, fifty specialized probationers and fifty regular probationers who had completed supervision during a specific two year period were randomly selected. Statistical comparisons of social and criminal characteristics, service delivery practices and recidivism rates in the two probation groups are described.

This research indicates that the actual operation of the specialized unit appears to have closely matched the program's original intentions. In doing so, the level and type of supervision received by sex offenders reporting to the specialized unit differed significantly from that received by sex offenders subjected to traditional probation practices. Despite the contrast in services, there were no significant differences in recidivism rates between the two groups during supervision and follow-up periods.

Future research efforts might explore the many potentially positive impacts of the program which could not be examined because of the methodological limitations of the study.
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Introduction

The Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit (V.S.S.U.) was the first probation office in British Columbia directed towards the intensive supervision and management of sex offenders in British Columbia. This probation office is the focus of the research described below. Specifically, this innovative form of intensive probation supervision was subjected to a comparative examination of service delivery practices as well as an exploration of its relative effectiveness in protecting the public (as measured by recidivism). To accomplish this task, a naturally occurring group of sex offender probationers who completed supervision at regular probation offices was utilized for comparison purposes.

Prior to reporting details of this study, however, it is necessary to set the stage for the project. The first chapter of this thesis will offer a brief historical look at the justice response, both federally and provincially, to sex offenders. Within that context, the approach taken by the British Columbia probation service to sex offender management is described. In doing so, the development of the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit is described.

The second chapter will detail the history of innovative practices in probation, including specific approaches which have been incorporated within the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit: relapse prevention, group
management practices, and intensive supervision. The effectiveness of each of these probation practices with the general offender population as well as with sex offenders will be reviewed. This is necessary as a literature search revealed that there were no published studies which either described or evaluated a probation practice identical to the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit. For those already familiar with these practices, attention to this lengthy review might be unnecessary.

The third chapter begins with a general review of issues which relate to the evaluation, including the measurement and assessment of effectiveness in probation. Following this, the development and specification of research questions is addressed. The primary research goal of the thesis is conceptualized as follows:

To determine and compare the recidivism rates of sex offenders who received the intensive probation supervision and services of V.S.S.U with that of sex offenders who received regular probation supervision only.

It was hypothesized that offenders who completed the V.S.S.U. supervision program would have lower re-offence rates than those who had completed supervision at regular probation offices.

A secondary goal was to examine the differences in service delivery practices between the specialized and regular probation groups. With respect to this research objective, it was hypothesized that offenders reporting to V.S.S.U. would receive greater surveillance and collateral
services than would the offenders on regular probation. In addition, the level of service delivery of the special supervision unit was to be compared with the program standards in place for the unit.

The fourth chapter is a comprehensive description of the methods employed in this study.

The presentation and examination of the study’s findings is the subject of the fifth chapter.

The final chapter contains the discussion and interpretation of the findings and includes associated implications which might have impacted on the results.

Appendix A of this thesis covers topics for those unfamiliar with probation practice, such as a cursory history of probation, current forms of probation, and probation effectiveness.

Appendices B and C contain a comprehensive description of the operation of the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit. While this represents a lengthy exercise, it is considered necessary as there are no comparable probation offices of this type in other provinces in Canada, nor is there available published literature to refer for a review of operations such as those in place at V.S.S.U. Palmer (1991) is particularly supportive of the need for comprehensive program descriptions, believing the task to be useful for building knowledge in corrections. He elaborates:

Intervention processes, for instance, specific techniques, strategies, and program features, should be examined closely and described more
fully, so that researchers may obtain clues or strong evidence as to which of those factors substantially contribute to growth-centered intervention. If researchers could identify such "key elements", correctional knowledge and practice would be on firmer grounds and might advance more rapidly than by any other means (Palmer, 1991, p.341).

Other researchers have also recognized the absence of detailed published descriptions of probation practices which utilize innovative methods. Cowburn (1990), for example, criticized the lack of information on the style, nature and content of what appeared to be a growing use of group work with sex offenders in British probation. He called for researchers to attend to the task of comprehensively describing this work so that practitioners across North America could learn from each other (Cowburn, 1990, p.8).

The program description focuses on the day-to-day operations of V.S.S.U. and describes how the defining features of the specialized probation office are employed in practice.

Appendix D briefly outlines some of the major differences between probation practice at V.S.S.U. and regular probation.

Appendix E contains the coding forms used in the research project.
"Sex offence" is an umbrella term which can refer to a wide range of behaviors. O'Connell (1990) suggests that it could be applied to situations such as forcible sexual assault, peeping or exhibitionism as well as in circumstances where the victim does not consent to be involved. O'Connell (1990) explains this latter circumstance as involving situations where the difference in power between the two parties is such that one is not in a position to make a truly free choice, such as when one party is an adult and the other a child (O'Connell, 1990, p.11).

In Canada, sexual offences are defined in the Criminal Code. The definition of what type of conduct might be reflective of a sexual offence is left for the courts to resolve.¹

The prevalence of sex offences in Canada have been described as "...more common than reported credit card fraud, shoplifting and armed robbery" (LaTorre, 1991, p.6). The rate of sexual offences in British Columbia, ¹On August 4, 1982, Bill C-127, An Act to Amend the Criminal Code in Relation to Sexual Offences and Other Offences Against the Person, was passed by the House of Commons. On January 4, 1983, it became Canadian law. The sexual assault provisions of Bill C-127 made fundamental amendments to the Criminal Code with respect to the substantive, procedural and evidentiary aspects of Canada's rape and indecent assault laws. The laws relating to the offences of rape, attempted rape and indecent assault were expunged from the Criminal Code and replaced with a trilogy of sexual assault offences: sexual assault (s.271, Level I), sexual assault with a weapon, threats to a third party or bodily harm (s.272, Level II); and aggravated sexual assault (s.273, Level III).
however, has been depicted as "...higher than the average rate in Canada (LaTorre, 1991, p.6).

In British Columbia, there has been a significant increase in the bed load counts in both provincial institutions and probation caseloads of sex offenders (see Table 1). There has also been an increase in the number of police reports to Crown Counsel Offices alleging sexual offences in British Columbia (see Table 2). During the past several years, the number of persons charged with and convicted of sex offences has risen rapidly. Specifically, in 1985 in British Columbia, 3669 sex offence charges were laid. This is an average of about ten charges every day. These charges were laid against 1211 different individuals - 1006 of whom were adults. By contrast, 495 adults were charged for sex offences in British Columbia in 1980. By 1989, that number had risen to 1,486 - a 200% increase within a decade. (LaTorre, 1991, p.6).
### Table 1

**Adult Offenders Convicted of Sexual Offences under B.C. Corrections Branch Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Custodial Admissions</th>
<th>Institutions Sentenced</th>
<th>Community Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prob-Bail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>200 (4.5)</td>
<td>266 (2.1)</td>
<td>414 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>214 (4.8)</td>
<td>330 (3.1)</td>
<td>446 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-1987</td>
<td>266 (5.3)</td>
<td>410 (3.8)</td>
<td>730 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>233 (4.5)</td>
<td>433 (4.4)</td>
<td>731 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: B.C. Correction Branch Headquarters, Research Division, 1991

(If a single criminal incident contains a number of violations of the law, then only the most serious one is recorded for statistical purposes. The number in parentheses represents the percentage of sexual offenders compared to the total offender population in that category. The years are recorded in fiscal years commencing in April. Note: In B.C. prior to April 1985, a juvenile was defined as under 17 years and over six years of age.)
Table 2

Number of Police Reports to Crown Counsel Alleging a Sexual Offence Committed by Adult Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Is.</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Munic.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo Munic.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver City</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Munic.</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam Munic.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Van.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total)</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsqui</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Munic.</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack Munic.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total)</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelowna</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (con't)

Number of Police Reports to Crown Counsel Alleging a Sexual Offence Committed by Adult Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North (total)</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Lake</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. John</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George Munic.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. James</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Rupert</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(The regions represent the five regions of the B.C. Corrections Branch. The cities with the most reports in each region have been documented. The offence data shown above have been recorded by the police on Uniform Crime Survey (UCR). If a single criminal incident contains a number of violations, then only the most serious one is recorded for UCR purposes. Prepared by Police Services Branch, Ministry of Attorney General.)
Various theories have been offered in explanation of sex offending. The development of pedophilia, for example, has been attributed to abusive and traumatic childhood experiences (Groth, Hobson and Gary, 1982; Seghern, Prentky and Boucher, 1987; Marshall, 1988), biological predisposition (Langevin, 1990), psychodynamic factors (Finkelhor, 1984; West, 1978), physiological abnormalities (Hucker, Langevin, et al., 1986; Berlin and Meinecke, 1981; Marshall, Barbaree and Christophe, 1986), victim characteristics (Brant and Tisza, 1977; Waterman and Foss-Goodman, 1984), as well as a combination of theoretical models (Finkelhor and Araji, 1986; Marshall, et al.,1990).

Other theorists have espoused explanations for sexual deviancy which are less readily accepted by the therapeutic community. For example, Brongersma (1984) has suggested that pedophilia constitutes a nearly normal component of the sexual impulse and that the "...bad effects of sexual confrontation...are quite imaginary" (p.83).

These varied points of view attest to the diversity of factors which may play a role in the genesis of sexually assaultive behavior. Perhaps one of the few points of agreement among practitioners concerned with sex offences is Berlin and Meinecke's (1981) observation that "...the causes of sexual cravings are definitely multifactorial and are often unknown"(p.602). Indeed, explanations of what causes
sexual offending are as varied and obscure as are explanations of what causes normal sexual behavior.

The lack of understanding of the etiology of sexually deviant behavior has not, however, discouraged the justice system from seeking ways to manage and treat sexual offenders. In fact, although heightened popular press and professional discourse in recent years might suggest that sex offenders are a recent addition to the repertoire of deviants addressed by Canada's justice apparatus, sex offender management and treatment issues have actually represented ongoing concerns in the justice community. Historically, sex offenders in Canada have been recognized as a special group of offenders to which the justice system should pay intensified attention. Generally speaking, sex offenders under federal correctional jurisdiction (e.g. offenders sentenced to jail terms of over two years) were the first to receive special recognition by justice authorities.

**Federal Response to Sex Offenders**

The Archambault Report of 1938 is perhaps the first federal inquiry which took even peripheral interest in the sex offender\(^2\). Although the Archambault Report had no special mandate to investigate or make recommendations with

\(^2\)Report of the Royal Commission to Investigate the Penal System of Canada, Ottawa. King's Printer, 1938. The Archambault Commission (1938) was established to conduct a comprehensive examination and review of federal correctional services in Canada.
respect to the sex offender criminal population, the Commission did have occasion to comment on "habitual offenders", which included those committing sexual offences. The Commission characterized these prisoners as "...the costly worthless dregs of society, for whom no adequate arrangements have been provided in Canadian prisons" (p.218). In recognizing that the lack of services was a significant problem, the Commission recommended that special legislation be developed in relation to these offenders, that special prisons be established for their custodial needs, that they receive thorough medical assessment and treatment and that "accurate statistical information" be assembled to permit assessment of "recidivism, the success or failure of probation, ticket-of-leave or parole and other kindred matters" (p.174).

The recommendations of the Archambault Commission (1938) with respect to the sex offender were reiterated in the next two major federal inquiries into Canadian correctional practices, namely the Fauteaux Committee (1956)\(^3\) and the McRuer Commission (1958)\(^4\). Generally speaking, these government reports called for an intensification of research on the causes of sexual

---


abnormality, the provision of specialized treatment services and separate custodial facilities for those convicted of sex offences. The recommendations of the three major federal inquiries, however, were largely ignored by the justice community. As will be explored later in the thesis, the first programs for sex offenders in Canada were not introduced until the 1970s.

A subsequent federal government inquiry into sexual abuse and the treatment of sex offenders in Canada, The Badgley Commission (1984) criticized the justice community for their failure to respond to the recommendations of these early inquiries but had few answers for the phenomenon:

It is evident that, for whatever reasons, correctional services have shown little enthusiasm or disposition to act upon the recommendations of a series of government appointed inquiries in relation to the need to obtain comprehensive and adequate documentation concerning the needs of convicted sexual offenders and the treatment services provided for them....(Badgley Commission, 1984, p.885)

The professional denial of the problem of sexual abuse and sexual offenders throughout the 1920s - 1970s, however, is not an unrecognized phenomenon. In fact, several researchers have referred to this circumstance as the "...the order of the century" (Rush, 1980; Masson, 1984). Masson (1984) explains that the professional communities ignored the large numbers of adult women complaining of sexual abuse as children because they were viewed not as victims of sexual offenders but of "Oedipal fantasies". Adults and children who were found to have been abused were
frequently blamed for the attacks. Throughout the twentieth century, young child victims were described as "seductive" or "provocative". Under such circumstances, O'Connell (1990) theorizes that it is not surprising that there was minimal interest in researching issues surrounding sexual abuse or sexual offenders.

The late 1970s and 1980s, however, saw an explosion of professional, public, and ultimately, correctional attention to sex offender management and treatment issues in Canada. An indepth examination of why the sex offender field dramatically broadened at this point in time is beyond the scope of this paper. However, some researchers have addressed this issue through adoption of various macro theoretical perspectives, including the change in attitudes towards child/adult sexuality (Masson, 1984), the availability of research funds for investigation of sexual abuse issues (Bullough, 1990) and the emergence of the feminist movement (Darke, 1990; Marshall, Laws and Barbaree, 1990).

Notwithstanding the validity of these explanations, of equal import in influence in spawning change in criminal justice policy and programming surrounding the sex offender has been the response in the academic arena. The intensified correctional interest in the sex offender also corresponded with the expansion of professional literature on sexual abuse through the 1970s and 1980s. While the relationship between correctional policy and academic research is tenuous
at best, the conclusions of the sexual abuse researchers were arguably too significant to be ignored by justice communities.

Specifically, epidemiological studies and victim surveys reported alarmingly high rates of sexual victimization among women and children (Russell, 1983; Badgley Report, 1984; Kilpatrick, 1987; Daugherty, 1989; Koss, et al., 1989). In addition to the prevalence of sexual abuse, the research documented what represented even more disturbing characteristics of sexual victimization such as the chronicity, frequency and duration of offending (Abel, et. al, 1988; Marshall, 1990; Rice, et al., 1991; Lotringer, 1988), its cyclical nature (Finkelhor and Browne, 1985), and its devastating emotional and physical effects (Barbaree and Christophe, 1986; Seng, 1986; Leslie Young, 1990; Browne and Finkelnhhor, 1986).

In addition to the volume of literature on the prevalence and devastation of sexual abuse, there was an increasing professional consensus through the 1970s and 1980s that paraphilias represented manifestations of medical/psychiatric/psychological conditions for which people should be treated\(^5\), rather than simply punished.

\(^5\)Numerous modalities are currently utilized for the treatment of sex offenders. The literature is saturated with excellent reviews and comprehensive descriptions of the variety of sex offender treatment programs in use. See Sapp & Vaughn, 1991; Borzecki & Wormith, 1987; Marshall, Laws & Barbaree, 1990; Maletzky, 1991; Becker and Hunter, 1992. It is beyond the scope of this discussion to review these.
Several sex offender treatment specialists contended that the provision of sex offender treatment was necessary because prison punishment alone was not only unproductive in changing an offender’s deviant sexual orientation (West, Roy and Nichols, 1978) but could even increase and reinforce a sex offenders’ pathology to a level where the offender leaves the institution with worse fantasies than before the incarceration (Seely, 1981 & Freeman-Longo, 1983 in Knopp, 1984; Groth, 1983). Other researchers suggested that custodial punishment was of benefit only in assisting the sex offender to learn advanced skills to evade capture (Marcus and Priestley, 1980, in Dominelli, 1991, p.59). Later arguments were made for the provision of treatment to sex offenders based on economic and humanitarian grounds. Cost-benefit analyses were presented which outlined the savings to the justice system if sex offenders could be rehabilitated (Prentky and Burgess, 1990; Marshall, et al., 1991). In light of the academic "validation" of the usefulness of sex offender treatment, it is not surprising that the justice system would be persuaded to commit resources to the control and/or treatment of sex offenders.

Federally incarcerated sex offenders (e.g. sentences of two years of more) were the first to benefit from the introduction of institutionally based treatment programs in Canada. While the majority of these programs were implemented in the 1970s, Borzecki and Wormith (1987) have suggested that specialized group therapy programmes were
available for selected sexual offenders as early as 1961 (Hartman, 1965). The Mental Health Centre in Penetanguishene is credited with introducing the first institutional program in the early 1970s (Borzecki and Wormith, 1987, p.32). British Columbia’s Regional Psychiatric Center in Abbotsford, British Columbia was also a forerunner in developing sex offender treatment for federal offenders, instituting their program in 1973 (Trono Committee, 1975,). The remaining provinces in Canada did not institute specialized services for their federally incarcerated sex offenders until the late 1970s or early 1980s (Borzecki and Wormith, 1987).

Throughout the 1980s, the Correctional Service of Canada expanded treatment services for sex offenders. This expansion in service was partly motivated by the release of several federal government reports which had been charged solely with investigating issues of sexual abuse and sexual offending in Canadian society (Badgley Report, 1984; Daubney Report, 1988; The Management and Treatment of Sex Offenders, 1990). Without exception, each of these inquiries called for the increase of resources allocated to sex offender treatment programs in the federal correctional system.

In addition to the impact of these recommendations, the expansion of service was also necessary because of an expanding sex offender population. The number of sex offenders incarcerated in Canadian federal prisons increased by 59% between 1984 and 1988 (Canada, 1990). In 1990, sex
offenders accounted for 13.1% of new admissions to federal prisons, while a decade earlier the figure was 8.5% (Gordon, Holden & Leis, 1992, p. 7.). The Correctional Service of Canada has attempted to respond to this increase by expanding services available at its Regional Psychiatric Centres, by introducing formal sex offender treatment programs in several of its federal institutions across Canada (e.g. Kingston, Warkworth, Mission, Dorchester, Westmorland, Bath, Mountain), as well as increasing the number of community-based sex offender programs across Canada for those released into the community under conditional release programs (e.g. Pacific Region Community Sex Offender Program, Nova Scotia Sexual Behavior Clinic, Ontario Region Community Sex Offender Program). Despite these increased resources, in 1991 only one quarter of sex offenders under the jurisdiction of the Correctional Service of Canada were reported to, or have received, treatment (Gordon, Holden and Leis, 1992, p. 7).

Being convicted of a sexual offence in Canada, however, will not necessarily result in a federal sentence (e.g. two years or more). In fact, individuals who are incarcerated for sex-related offences are more likely to be committed to provincial facilities for a period of less than two years (Correctional Service of Canada, 1992). Similarly, McGrath (1991) observed that a significant number of American convicted sex offenders never serve any jail time (p. 346). The more likely judicial processing of sex offences,
according to Brannon and Troyer (1991) ends with sentencing recommendations incorporating probation and mandatory "professional treatment" (p.225).

**Provincial Response to the Sex Offender in British Columbia**

Unlike the federal response to the sex offender, the provincial response to the sex offender in British Columbia is not characterized by a lengthy history of published government inquiries or reports which have addressed the issues of sex offender treatment and management in provincial corrections. However, similar to the federal response to the sex offender, British Columbia had few specialized services or treatment programs available for sexual offenders under its jurisdiction prior to the 1980s. Beginning in the 1980s, however, the Ministry of the Attorney General experienced a dramatic intensification of interest in sex offender management and treatment issues.

While the proliferation of sexual abuse research was undoubtedly influential in this regard, probably the most pressing reason which forced provincial correctional authorities to take notice of sex offenders was their increasing numbers (refer to beginning of this Chapter for a review of this issue).

It is not clear whether this increase was due to an actual increase in the number of sexual offences or to changes in reporting, police practices, court functioning, or sentencing patterns. Any number of factors might conceivably have contributed to the sharp rise in the number
of charges laid since 1980. These factors might include child abuse prevention programs in the schools, greater public awareness of abuse and willingness to report, improved reporting procedures, more aggressive investigation and prosecution, and the substantially amended definitions of sexual offences in the 1983 Criminal Code.

Arguably, all of those factors could contribute to some extent to the observed increase in sex offence charges, but the possibility could not be ignored that the sharp increase in sex offenders might be due, in large part, to a rising incidence of sex offences. The possibility that the actual number of sexual offences being committed was increasing, heightened concern within the correctional community, especially when combined with the results of offender-based research. Generally speaking, this research suggested that there is a wide discrepancy between rates of criminal conviction and actual perpetration, suggesting a substantial degree of under reporting of sex offences (Abel, Becker, et al., 1987; Burgess, et al., 1988).6

As sex offences appeared to be rising in frequency and the prevalence and devastation of sexual abuse became public knowledge, demand for the justice agencies to take whatever steps necessary to protect public safety increased. The Ministry of Attorney General responded to the sex offender

---

6There are numerous reasons for why sex offences are not reported such as victim's fear of retaliation or the ordeal of testifying (Marshall, 1990).
"crisis" with the implementation of specialized treatment resources for incarcerated sex offenders. Several custodial facilities evolved into specialized institutions, accepting the sex offender only. The B.C. provincial correctional facilities located at Stave Lake and Kamloops represent but two custodial institutions which implemented comprehensive sex offender treatment programs in the mid 1980s. In addition to the development of specialized "in-house" treatment for incarcerated offenders, there was also an expansion in the level and type of services offered by B.C. Corrections using contracted mental health resources. The Forensic Psychiatric Services Commission, the Ministry of Health department responsible for the provision of mental health services to B.C. Corrections, expanded its outpatient program from a two-group, Vancouver based sex offender program in 1982 to a comprehensive and multifaceted sex offender program, which in 1993 spans most of the province of British Columbia (LaTorre, 1991)\(^7\).

While the provision of community and institutional mental health services for sex offenders represented significant improvements in how the provincial correctional authorities responded to the sex offender problem in the early 1980s, the practices surrounding how sex offenders on

---

\(^7\)Refer to Appendix of this report for a more thorough review of Forensic Psychiatric Services, including its mandate and program description.
probation were supervised and managed within the corrections branch had received little attention.  

**Probation and Sex Offenders**

Historically, sex offenders on probation in British Columbia were treated in the same manner as any other offender on probation. Perhaps the only characteristic which began to distinguish the sex offender probation population from other individuals on probation was their increased access to specialized sex offender treatment in the 1980s, through contracts with Forensic Psychiatric Services (See Appendix of this project for review of the role of Forensic) and other selected agencies.

These treatment resources, however, were often inadequate to meet the needs of the growing population of sex offenders in the 1980s. Vancouver area probation officers seeking treatment for sex offenders on their caseloads were usually faced with long waiting lists. Probation officers seeking treatment for sex offenders in the rural areas of the Province found that there were no treatment resources available. For those probation officers who found treatment for offenders, there were other problems which complicated effective management and treatment of sex offenders in the community.

---

8Refer to Appendix A of this thesis for a general discussion of probation. This includes a cursory review of the history of Canadian probation, the current forms of probation, and probation effectiveness.
Specifically, the protocols relating to information sharing between agencies were not well defined. Both treatment and probation personnel were unclear about what information concerning an offender involved in treatment or supervision could be shared with the other party without breaching confidentiality provisions. As a result, a coordinated management of sex offenders was difficult and effective management of sex offenders in the community suffered.
THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW APPROACH IN PROBATION: RELAPSE PREVENTION, GROUP WORK AND INTENSIVE SUPERVISION

Veteran line level probation officers were not only discouraged by the problems with information sharing, but were dissatisfied with probation's standard supervisory practices with sex offenders (e.g. lack of home visitation, few checks with offender's place of employment, bi-weekly or monthly reporting requirements). Their concern was also motivated by knowledge of some of the more startling conclusions emanating from research on sex offenders. Of particular interest was the life-long nature of sexual offending, the frequency and duration of offences committed by offenders, the devastating emotional and physical impact of offences, the inability of treatment to "cure" offenders and the necessity for on-going counselling and support in the community (these latter two factors are more thoroughly condensed in later sections). In light of these findings, probation officers questioned how regular probation practices could fulfill the mandate of protecting the community utilizing regular probation practices with an offender group who appeared substantially more problematic and multifaceted than the "average" probationer. Thus, while sex offenders made up a small proportion of all offenders on probation, their impact was substantial.

As a result of these concerns, a proposal was submitted in 1986 to correctional management for the establishment of an innovative Sexual Offender's Attendance Programme
The S.O.A.P. was proposed as a cost effective alternative for the more effective handling of sex offenders in the provincial correctional system. A specialized probation office, as proposed, offered the potential for reduced sex offender recidivism through close supervision, surveillance, and programs which helped the participants establish some measure of self-control (McKenzie, 1986, p.1). The specialized probation officer’s role in the S.O.A.P. program would be to work closely with mental health personnel to ensure accountability in treatment, to provide intensified supervision, surveillance and monitoring of offenders, within a small caseload framework and in collaboration with local police, and to implement a specialized group attendance program. The program model for this specialized office would be based on a relapse prevention model. The proposal for the Sexual Offender’s Attendance Programme was accepted by the Ministry of Attorney General and in March 1987, the first specialized probation office for sex offenders on probation in British Columbia opened its doors. The Vancouver Specialized Unit

9This proposal was authored by probation officers, Mr. Ken Leinweber and Mr. Neil McKenzie.

10The relapse prevention approach is described in the Appendix of this thesis.

11Accounts of the development of sex offender treatment and groupwork methods with sex offenders in Britain’s probation service suggest that the first initiatives were practice-led. Barker and Morgan (1992) for example, inform that the initiators of groupwork programmes for sex offenders on
represented an innovation in the management and supervision of sex offenders on probation in British Columbia\textsuperscript{12}.

A review of the literature revealed no studies which either described or evaluated a probation practice identical to the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit. As a result, the three most significant components of the V.S.S.U. program are identified and separately reviewed. A brief history of each practice, its effectiveness, and applicability to sex offenders will be addressed (where the data is available). The reader is referred to the Appendix B of this project for a comprehensive discussion of how these components have been implemented at the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit. Following this description, Appendix D presents a table of differences between the probation practice of V.S.S.U. and regular probation.

\textsuperscript{12}Specialists, according to Latessa, et al. (1977) are defined as those probation officers and/or units which purport to predominately handle one type of offender. Generalists, according to Latessa, et al. (1977) are those officers and/or units who handle a cross-section of cases, irrespective of their special characteristics, and deliver a full range of service both to the probationer and the agency. The issue of generalized vs. specialized probation caseloads has been encountered since the 1950s and implies differing opinions about the philosophy, management techniques, and resource utilization patterns in probation. A full explanation of these issues, however, is beyond the scope of this thesis and is fully reviewed in other works (Latessa, et al., 1977).
Relapse prevention: Model Evolution, Description and Effectiveness

The relapse prevention model for the management and supervision of sex offenders has found increasing academic and professional support in recent years, because it offers an alternative in view of the perceived failure of sex offender treatment programs to cure offenders.

Evolution of Relapse Prevention

Relapse prevention was originally devised as a method for enhancing and encouraging the maintenance of change in substance abusers. Marlatt and colleagues (Chaney, O’Leary and Marlatt, 1987; Marlatt, 1982; Marlatt and Gordon, 1980; 1985) describe the original components of the first relapse prevention model as follows:

...strengthen self-control by providing clients with methods for identifying problematic situations, analyzing decisions that set up situations enabling resumption of substance abuse, and developing strategies to avoid, or cope more effectively with these situations. (1990, p.346)

The interest in applying relapse prevention principles to the realm of sexual offending was spurred in large part by an increasing speculation in the professional community that sex offences may not be the impulsive and uncontrollable acts of sexual psychopathic personalities, committed on impulse and without forethought or planning. Instead, many researchers found that the vast majority of sex offenders did not suffer from significant mental disorders (Adams and Fay, 1981; Bard, et al., 1987), and that sexual offenders "...carefully plan offences so that
they appear to occur without forethought" (Pithers, 1990, p.334). Furthermore, the proliferation of evidence that sex offender treatment programs could not offer a "cure" to sex offending also encouraged professionals to seek alternative intervention strategies.

Throughout the 1980s, a series of studies and publications were released which either questioned or outright refuted the efficacy of sex offender treatment for "curing" offenders and thereby reducing recidivism (Nuffield, 1982; Quinsey, et al., 1983; Borzecki and Wormith, 1987; Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw, 1989). Not only was research failing to prove efficacy of treatment, but the sex offender treatment studies which did report positive results (Nutbrown and Stasiak, 1987; Van Voorhis, 1987; Marshall and Barbaree, 1988) were criticized for their methodological inadequacies:

...are those responsible for treatment simply so overburdened as to be unable to assess what it is they are doing - or whether, to borrow Stephen Vincent Benet's phrase, careful evaluation might endanger the "burden of inconvenient knowledge. (Pallone, 1990, p.81)

Given the pessimism over sex offender treatment, it is not surprising that treatment practitioners were ready to adopt a "cautiously pessimistic" view concerning the effectiveness of sex offender treatment. The relapse prevention model, which was based on the premise that there is no cure for sexual deviancy and offenders must continue to practice intervention strategies throughout their
lifetime to avoid committing crimes, presented as the perfect solution for disillusioned practitioners. Within the framework of relapse prevention, sex offenders were not to be viewed as "curable", but rather, were compared to an alcoholic; someone who has to be constantly reminded that they cannot control their drinking. Practitioners turned away from searching for methods to completely stop sex offending (which had proved disappointing ineffective), to an approach which focused on maintenance or preventing relapse (George and Marlatt, 1989, pp.4-5). Thus, in the controversy over the efficacy of sex offender treatment in the early 1980s, a new perspective on sex offender treatment emerged. This perspective is summarized by Marshall (1990):

Treatment for sex offending is not like a vaccine for polio or the measles. It does not eliminate the possibility of the behavior occurring again...Even if these offenders are treated, they are not cured. Treatment might simply reduce the chances that it will recur. (p.162)

Description

The relapse prevention model is broadly categorized as a cognitive-behavioral approach\textsuperscript{13} which is based on the premise that there is no cure for sexual deviance and that offenders must continue to practice intervention and

\textsuperscript{13}Jackson & Griffiths (1991) define cognitive-behavioral approaches as those methods of treatment which are directed toward increasing personal and interpersonal competence, modifying distorted thinking patterns, and altering or reducing deviant sexual fixations (p.252).
maintenance strategies if they are to avoid committing other sexual crimes. Relapse prevention begins by dispelling misconceptions that the client may have regarding the possibility of being "cured" and describing more realistic goals of behavioral control. It continues with an assessment of the client's high-risk situations, which are the conditions under which a relapse has occurred or is likely to occur in the future.

George & Marlatt (1989) define the term relapse as applied to the sex offender population as "...any occurrence of a sexual offence, thus connoting full scale re-establishment of the problematic behavior" (p.6). After high-risk situations are identified, interventions are designed to train the client to minimize lapses and to keep lapses from evolving into a full-blown relapse.

George and Marlatt (1989) define lapse as "...any occurrence of willful and elaborate fantasizing about sexual offending or any return to sources of stimulation associated with the sexual offense pattern, but short of performance of the offense behavior" (p.6). Relapse prevention makes a distinction between the initial occurrence of the prohibited behavior, the fantasy (lapse), and the return to the previous pattern of habitually performing the sexual aggressive behavior (relapse). The relapse model focuses on interrupting the progression to precursors at the earliest point in order to reduce the likelihood of the sexual offence recurring. Offenders are provided with strategies to
minimize the frequency of lapses and intends to prepare them to cope more effectively with momentary breeches of self-management. An offender learns what must be done to prevent a lapse from becoming another relapse. Offenders are told that lapses do not indicate failure but are to be expected and used as a basis for learning how to control their sexual offending better.

The relapse prevention model views the majority of sexual offences as planned and purposeful activities. Accordingly, a chain of events which is thought to precede the typical offence has been proposed. Pithers (1989) has identified a common sequence of behaviors in the relapse process:

1. **Emotion**: The first change in the offender's typical functioning was emotional. Typically, offenders found themselves unable to deal effectively with a change in their emotional state.
2. **Fantasy**: The second change involved fantasies of performing sexual abuse. For example, angry offenders may attempt to deal with anger by visualizing themselves sexually degrading a person.
3. **Cognitive Distortion**: Fantasies were converted into distorted thoughts in the third step of the relapse process. Offenders frequently made up rationalizations justifying their soon-to-be committed acts.
4. **Plan**: As the relapse process evolved, offenders refined a plan in their minds that would enable them to carry out their fantasized behavior. An essential element of the plan was to establish circumstances for the offence that might make the offender appear less culpable.
5. **Act**: In the final step of the relapse process, the plan was acted out.

There are two distinct aspects of relapse prevention which are practiced with the sex offender population at the
Vancouver Specialization Supervision Unit (See Appendix for a review of application in practice). Pithers (1990) outlines these two distinct aspects as: The Internal, Self-Management Dimension and the External, Supervisory Dimension.

The Internal, Self-Management Dimension of Relapse Prevention

The Internal, Self-Management Dimension of relapse prevention, according to Pithers (1990), assists sex offenders in the following tasks:

*identify high risk-situations leading to abuse;
*analyze seemingly unimportant decisions that allow them to be put into high-risk situations;
*develop strategies to avoid, or cope more effectively with, these situations. (p.20)

A critical component of the Internal, Self-Management Dimension of the relapse process is the high-risk situation. Marques & Nelson (1989) define a high-risk situation for a sex offender as "...conditions that jeopardize the offender’s sense of control over his illicit sexual behavior and, therefore, increase his chances of slipping back into deviant thoughts, urges, or actions" (p.35). If an individual fails to cope effectively with a high-risk situation, the likelihood of lapse and relapse increases. In contrast, if an individual encounters and copes successfully with the threatening situation, self-control is reestablished and the relapse process is stopped (Marques and Nelson, 1989, p.35).
One of the primary goals of relapse prevention is to teach the offender how to better handle a high-risk situation that might otherwise motivate a lapse or relapse. The first step in this process is to assist the offender to identify the components of his particular high-risk behavior and thinking. Ultimately each client has a unique profile of high-risk situations and consequently identification of his/her high-risk situations must be an individualized process. High risk situations are comprised of both personal and environmental variables, or elements. If sex offenders are to successfully avoid relapse in the future, they must be able to identify the salient elements of high-risk situations that increase the likelihood for their reoffending. George & Marlatt (1989) identify various idiographic assessment procedures which can be applied for this purpose, including the preparation of an offender autobiography, use of structured interviews, self monitoring techniques and direct observation of sexual arousal via penile plethysmography.

Although high-risk situations are unique for each offender there has been some research focusing on identifying some of the more common elements found in the high-risk situations reported by sexual offenders. Pithers, et al., (1988) analyzed randomly selected case records of 200 convicted sexual offenders for the purpose of identifying offence precursors or risk factors that appeared to predispose toward, or precipitate, sexual victimization.
Immediate precursors to sexual aggression (defined as occurring within 6 months of the subjects' offences) which were identified by the researchers included anger towards women, anxiety, assertive-skills deficit, boredom, cognitive distortions, depression, abusive sexual fantasies, driving car alone without a destination, low self-esteem, low victim empathy, sexual-knowledge deficit, social anxiety, substance use (alcohol and other substances) and social-skills deficit (Pithers, et al., 1988, p.246). Risk factors which were noted to have occurred at least six months prior to the offence and which predisposed an individual toward deviant behavior were identified as including divorce, exposure to violent death of inhuman or infrahuman, familial chaos, maternal absence/neglect, parental marital discord, physically abused as a child, prior arrest for nonsexual offence, sexual victimization, and use of female prostitutes (Pithers, et al., 1988, p.245). The relapse prevention model assists sexual offenders to accurately recognize offence precursors involved in their own particular lapse to relapse process.

Of course, a high-risk situation is hazardous to the degree to which one is unable to handle it without jeopardizing a sense of self-control and increasing the likelihood of reoffence. The risk of relapse inherent in any situation is related to the offender's ability to provide adequate and appropriate coping responses to it. The central purpose of relapse prevention for sex offenders is to learn
to plan and prepare strategies for effectively coping with future high-risk elements in a manner that reduces their danger of reoffending (Steenman, et al., 1989, p. 182). This requires them to be able to recognize the high-risk elements, think of potentially effective coping responses, and implement the coping responses in an effective manner (Steenman, et al., 1989, p. 182).

There are a number of coping strategies which a sex offender might utilize within the relapse prevention model. Steenman, et al. outline a list of coping strategies which include (1) avoiding drug and alcohol use, (2) improving stress management through relaxation and self-monitoring techniques, (3) enhancing social skills for developing more satisfactory adult relationships, (4) augmenting assertiveness skills, (6) improving or developing anger-management techniques in order to facilitate more satisfactory conflict resolution, (7) increasing victim empathy, (8) thought stopping, identifying and disputing irrational beliefs (1989, p. 183).

Maletzky (1990) outlines how one offender explored his specific coping options if he found himself trapped in potentially dangerous high risk situation:

Two men had formed a "sex club" with three young teenage boys. The men would offer the boys gifts, alcohol and money in return for sexual activity and posing for photographs and videotapes. One man was jailed while the other was placed on probation. This latter offender identified the following alternatives to pursuing sexual activity if he encountered a handsome boy: (a) turn physically away;
(b) chew a bitter pill;  
(c) walk away from the situation;  
(d) actively fantasize his arrest, conviction and imprisonment;  
(e) call a sponsor from his support group;  
(f) call his therapist, and  
(g) write about the experience in his log, including what was learned about the situation. (p.173)

Although a significant portion of the relapse prevention process focuses on the offender's identification and avoidance of a high risk situation, an equally important part of the relapse prevention model is the identification of events leading to high risk situations. If an offender waits until he is alone with a child (a high risk situation) before he attempts to control his pedophilic tendencies, he will find it far more difficult to refrain from offending than if he had stopped himself when he first thought about travelling to a destination with children present. Within the framework of relapse prevention, offenders learn to discern the sequence of thoughts and behaviors that lead to trouble and to interrupt this process at an early point.

Relapse prevention theory assumes that the majority of sexual offenders consciously set the stage for lapses by putting themselves into high-risk situations. According to Pithers (1990), "offenders can covertly set up a lapse by making a series of "apparently irrelevant decisions", each of which represents another step toward a tempting, high-risk situation" (p.347). Many offenders make decisions that appear on the surface to be unrelated to the issue of sexual offending but in reality are significant in their relation
to the offence. The relapse prevention model focuses on helping offenders identify their own "apparently irrelevant decisions" and recognize how they can contribute to sexual offending. Marshall (1990) provides an example:

A rapist may feel bored and decide that, since it is a nice day, he will go for a drive. If this man has typically attacked hitchhikers, his decision to go for a drive is not insignificant, even if he has convinced himself that he is not thinking about offending. (p.158)

Relapse prevention focuses on defining the "apparently irrelevant decisions" which apply to each individual offender.

A major step in the process leading to relapse is the response that accompanies an initial slip or a lapse in one's pledge of abstinence from sexual offending. This pattern of reactions, referred to as the "abstinence violation effect" (AVE) (Marlatt and Gordon, 1980) represents the cognitive and affective responses that propel an individual into a full-blown relapse. For the sex offender, a lapse presents a conflict between the offender's self image as an abstainer from illicit sexual behavior and the recent experience of the prohibited deviant thought or urge (Russell, et al., 1989, p.64). How sex offenders react to lapses (e.g. deviant sexual urges, thoughts or fantasies) may determine whether they regain their commitment to abstinence or relapse by perpetrating a new sex crime (Russell, et al., 1989). Russell, et al. (1989) explain that an offender's self-statement such as, "If I am no longer a
molester, why am I getting turned on to fantasies of a child?" are representative of this state of internal conflict or cognitive dissonance. Russell, et al. (1989) explain that the offender might attempt to alleviate the cognitive dissonance by altering their self-image to conform with the experience of the lapse. Self-statements such as, "I must still be a sex offender", reduces the dissonance and its discomfort and as the statement is concordant with the offender's belief about himself, will promote a return to sexual behavior (Russell, et al., 1989, p.64). The relapse prevention model, however, accepts that lapses in self-management will occur and do not indicate failure. Lapses are to be expected and are "...to be used as a basis for learning how to control the problem better" (Marshall, 1990, p.158). By adopting this belief, offenders are better able to mitigate the negative impact of the abstinence violation effect whenever a lapse is encountered (Pithers, 1990, p.355).

The abstinence violation effect strengthens depending on the "source" to which an offender attributes his lapse. Pithers (1991) explains that a sex offender's attribution of a lapse to personal weakness will heighten the abstinence violation effect: "If lapses are considered personal

---

14 Russell, et. al. (1989) define cognitive dissonance as a characteristic of AVE. Cognitive dissonance is aroused by the discrepancy between the offender's self-image as an abstainer from the deviant sexual behavior and the occurrence of an incongruent behavior or thought.
failures, the expectation for continued failure develops, possibly ending in the ultimate defeat: relapse" (p.21). Furthermore, if an offender "...interprets a lapse as an indication that he has not profited from treatment, the push to reoffend will be even greater" (p.158). The abstinence violation effect is also amplified if the offender selectively recalls only the positive aspects of sexually abusing victims in the past, forgetting about the delayed negative consequences. Pithers (1990) describes how an angry rapist may focus on the satisfaction derived by violently releasing his hostility during past assaults or a pedophile may recall moments of perceived intimacy from prior abuse of children (p.348). Thus, if aggressors selectively remember positive outcomes of prior offences, but neglect the delayed negative consequences (e.g. arrest, incarceration), probability of relapse increases. Due to the strength of this phenomenon, it has received the title "problem of immediate gratification", or the PIG phenomenon (Pithers, 1990). To combat the PIG phenomenon, sex offenders must be continually reminded of the negative consequences of committing sexually deviant acts.

External Supervisory Dimension

The Internal Self-Management Dimension of relapse prevention has sometimes "proved inadequate" (Pithers, 1990, P.357). Pithers (1990) explains that sexual offenders may neglect to employ their acquired skills at critical moments or deny lapses to the professionals involved in their
treatment and supervision. Because sex offenders were sometimes unreliable informants regarding their own lapses and relapses, creating other methods of gaining access to information about their functioning was considered essential to enhance community safety (Pithers, 1990, p.357). This second dimension of relapse prevention was developed for use by parole and probation agencies in 1987 (Pithers, Kashima, Cumming, Beal and Buell) and is known as the external supervisory dimension of relapse prevention. This dimension of the relapse prevention model is also integrated into V.S.S.U.'s program model and is described more fully in the Appendix of this report.

Effectiveness

The application of relapse prevention techniques to sex offenders, however, is a relatively recent phenomenon. The Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Aggressors (VTPSA), created in 1982, was the first U.S. program to employ relapse prevention with sex offenders (Pithers, et al., Cumming, 1989). Most other programs began implementing relapse prevention components to their programs in the mid to late 1980s. By 1992, relapse prevention method has come to be recognized as an accepted and common component of many community and institutional programs for sex offenders15.

15 In 1991 a survey of 22 Canadian sex offender programs was undertaken by Wormith & Hanson (1991). Relapse prevention, according to the authors, represented a popular element of
There are many reasons for what appears to be a surprisingly swift incorporation of the relapse prevention model into the sex offender field. First, the compatibility of the approach is attractive. The relapse prevention system of maintenance-oriented principles and interventions could be applied regardless of the orientation or methods used in the "treatment" of sex offenders. Secondly, the literature had increasingly documented that sex offenders reported strong, seemingly uncontrollable urges to resume deviant sexual activity (akin to alcoholism) and were known to be at high risk for relapse (Jenkins-Hall, Osborn, Anderson, Anderson, and Shockley-Smith, 1989). Thirdly, recent applications of relapse prevention strategies appeared to hold considerable promise for reducing sex offender recidivism and some research has surfaced which has supported this contention.

Generally speaking, the newness of this model's application to sex offender treatment has precluded the publication of a sufficient number of studies to determine if relapse prevention is successful in reducing recidivism among sex offenders. Some of the studies have thoroughly described their programs for sex offenders which are based on the relapse prevention model, but present no data about effectiveness (Gillies, Hashmall, Hilton and Webster, 1991). Treatment programs for sexual offenders in 82% of programs. Furthermore, the vast majority of federal sex offenders are involved in treatment programs with a focus on relapse prevention (Gordon, Holden and Leis, 1992).
There are several studies, however, which have suggested that the recent applications of relapse prevention strategies appear to hold considerable promise for reducing sex offender recidivism and offer positive data in support of this contention (Sturgeon and Taylor, 1980; Marques, Day, Nelson and Miner, 1989; Pithers and Cumming, 1989; Pithers, 1990)\textsuperscript{16}. Even though the effectiveness of relapse prevention has not yet been determined, there is a high level of confidence in these techniques. For example, Rice, Quinsey and Harris (1991) speculated that the failure of behavioral treatment to affect the recidivism of child molesters in their study might have been due to the absence of a follow-up treatment program in the community. Thus, the researchers suggest that the shift in clinical practice toward a relapse prevention model might be a step in the right direction to reduce recidivism but caution that future research will be required to substantiate such optimism (p. 386). Similarly, Maletzky (1991) directs that an active program of relapse prevention should be implemented as part of each offender’s

\textsuperscript{16}There are fundamental problems facing researchers who attempt to assess the effectiveness of relapse prevention. Specifically, various components of the relapse prevention model are often employed in conjunction with various "treatment" methods for sex offenders. As a result, it will prove difficult for researchers to attribute a positive treatment effect to the relapse prevention techniques or some component of the "treatment" program employed. A further difficulty is the fact that the "relapse prevention" model is not a precise treatment model which is presented in the same manner or to the same population of offenders. Relapse prevention is a model which can mean varying things to varying programs.
treatment to encourage the persistence of therapeutic effects, but he also cautions that relapse prevention for sex offender should be more widely tested before widespread implementation (p.274).

What has been called a "significant shift" in clinical practice to relapse prevention principles with sex offenders (Rice, Quinsey and Harris, 1991), however, has obvious implications for the future role of community based agencies such as probation in the management of sex offenders. As a result of the increasing confidence in the relapse prevention model and failure of interventions to "cure" sex offenders, sex offender treatment is no longer viewed as a sufficient intervention in and of itself to control the sex offender and afford future protection of the community from deviant behavior. Instead, treatment specialists contend that follow-up programs in the community are required for those released after completing institutional sex offender treatment: "treatment must follow the man into the community" (Carney, 1989, p.134).

The widespread acceptance of this viewpoint is reflected in the recent federal Solicitor General's report on "The Management and Treatment of Sex Offenders" (1990) which revealed that 10 of the 17 experts surveyed believed that 100% of even successfully treated sexual offenders required follow-up. Thus, treatment specialists firmly believe that it is crucial to keep sex offenders under some form of scrutiny after therapy (Marshall, 1990) and to
monitor their involvement in high risk situations and adherence to therapeutic directives (Marshall and Barrett, 1990; Ryan and Lane, 1991; Becker and Hunter, 1992). The provision of this long term care and supervision, however, has not only been relegated to the mental health community. Both probation and parole agencies which are increasingly expected to provide long-term follow-up care and supervision of the sex offender.

The evolution of the relapse prevention model to one which allows for application outside of the traditional therapist-client relationship has contributed to the potential for role expansion in agencies such as probation and parole in the supervision of sex offenders. To reiterate, when relapse prevention was first modified for application with sex offenders, it remained solely a means of enhancing offenders' self control and was applied within the confines of the traditional client-therapist relationship. This dimension of relapse prevention, now referred to as the internal, self-management dimension of relapse prevention, appeared inadequate because of the tendency of sexual aggressors to neglect to employ their skills at critical moments or inform treatment personnel of lapses. As a result of these perceived problems, an external, supervisory dimension of the relapse prevention
model was developed in 1987 by Pithers, Kashima, Cumming, Beal and Buell for use by parole and probation agencies. 17

While much of the literature reviewed suggested that there are immense benefits (e.g. reduced recidivism, increased community protection) in probation/parole officers receiving specialized training in relapse prevention and applying these techniques to their supervision of sex offenders (Pithers and Cumming, 1989) there have been no studies published which have specifically evaluated the utility of using a relapse prevention model in the supervision and management of probationed sex offenders. Other researchers have also recognized this deficient database. Marshall, Laws and Barbaree (1990) inform that there have been no empirical estimates of the value of adding these posttreatment interventions (surveillance groups or relapse prevention supervision by probation/parole) to inpatient or outpatient programs. These researchers conclude that the next step in sex offender research should be the evaluation of these posttreatment interventions.

In addition to the lack of research on posttreatment interventions, it is also unclear as to how the probation/parole agencies to date have actually applied relapse prevention techniques in the supervision and management of offenders. While several treatment programs

17A more thorough review of both of these dimensions of relapse prevention and their application at the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit is found in the Appendix of this thesis.
utilize probation/parole agencies in a coordinated approach to sex offender management (see Pithers and Cumming, 1989), comprehensive program descriptions of the probation/parole experience with relapse prevention methods were not found in the literature. As a result, it is unknown as to whether the work being done at the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit is being replicated elsewhere. This lack of research is surprising in light of the increasingly significant role in which probation/parole agencies might play within the framework of the relapse prevention model in managing sex offenders. The discussion to follow on group work methods in probation/parole also addresses the expanding use of relapse prevention principles in group supervision practices with sex offenders.

Prior to examining the use of group work methods in probation, it should also be noted at this juncture that there have been other espoused role possibilities for probation officers in the management of sex offenders, other than the application of relapse prevention techniques. For example, within Maletzky's (1991) comprehensive description of techniques for treating the sex offender, he suggests that there is no reason why positive and negative operant conditioning techniques could not be applied to the sex offender population by probation officers (p.142). Carney's (1989) examination of the treatment of pedophilia also makes an observation concerning the role of probation in managing sex offenders. He suggests that probation and treatment is
the better gamble for sex offenders because imprisonment of offenders only delays the risk of offending for a year or two (1989, p.135). Carney (1989) does not elaborate on the specific role or methods that probation officers might employ in this "better gamble" model for protecting community safety. There is clearly a need for research on the role, practices and effectiveness of probation in the management and supervision of sex offenders.

**Group Work in Probation and Parole**

V.S.S.U.'s utilization of group methods in the management of sex offenders is pioneering in the realm of probation practice in British Columbia.

**History**

Historically, group methods have not played a significant role in probation, although they have been widely used in other parts of the justice system. 18 Haxby (1978) commented that the limited use of group methods is a result of their somewhat nebulous place in probation work and "at present it is seen largely as an 'optional extra' for some clients" (Haxby, 1978, cited in Senior, 1985, p. 102). According to Senior (1985), much of the group work in probation throughout the Western world has been the result of individual initiative and has only been sustained through

---

18 Group therapy has been used in the prison system since the 1940s (Goldenberg and Cowden, 1977). See Joan Martin (1990) for a recent discussion and overview on the type of group approaches used in prison settings and an overview of the effectiveness of group therapy in the American prison system.
working extra hours and stretching personal resources (Senior, 1985, p.102). Remington and Remington (1987) report that behaviorally oriented group methods have been used only infrequently in the probation context (1987, p.156). In Barker & Morgan's (1992) review of probation group work with British sex offenders, a similar observation is made: "Group work is usually in addition to standard provision for supervision of offenders, and still relies very much on the enthusiasm and commitment of individual probation officers" (p.173).

The use of group methods with probationers, while infrequently applied to the probation population to date, has found increasing support since Sheldon Glueck (1933) extolled the benefits of group methods which encouraged self-maintenance practices with probation clientele. Howard Abadinsky (1987) suggests that the use of a group within probation practice has certain advantages over conventional one-to-one methods. Specifically, he notes that "one of the advantages of groups is that stimulation toward improvement arises from a network of interpersonal influences in which all members participate" (p.250). Remington and Remington (1987) in their review of behavior modification in probation work, suggest that the use of behaviorally oriented group procedures with probation clients may be particularly useful in the management of the large caseloads typical in the Probation context (p.170).
Theory

The basic theory underlying the use of the group is that the impact provided by peer interaction is more powerful than worker-client relations within the one-to-one situation and that this approach provides a positive atmosphere which "..allows for changes in behavior and attitudes that are stronger and more meaningful" (Abadinsky, 1987, p.253). Abadinsky (1987) elaborates:

In probation/parole, groups consist of members who share a common status, in this case legally determined....The group is a mutual aid in which members are given an opportunity to share experiences and assist each other with problems in a safe, controlled environment. The groups help to confirm for each member the fact that others share similar problems, thus reducing the sense of isolation. The group can reduce the anxiety of having to report alone to a probation/parole officer; it tends to offset the more direct authority of the one-to-one situation, and it tends to lower the impact of sociocultural differences between client and worker. (p.250)

Group therapy\(^{19}\) has represented a common therapeutic method for working with sexual offenders for decades. In Quinsey's extensive review of the assessment and treatment of child molesters in 1977, it was determined that group therapy\(^{20}\) was the most widely used treatment at that time.

\(^{19}\)There are various group-work models which are employed with sex offenders, including cognitive behavioral, behavioral, feminist approach and psychodynamic. See Mark (1992) and Maletzky (1991) for a more detailed description of these methods.

\(^{20}\)Group Therapy, according to West (1987) demands that "...participants revive memories of painful episodes of the distant past, realize their continuing influence on present behavior, admit all the harm their own reactions have produced - all of this under the guidance of a skilled therapist (p.250).
Even a cursory review of the literature reveals that this technique is still a popular treatment model, being used either solely or in conjunction with other methods (Avery-Clark, 1983; Alford, Brown and Kasper, 1985; Sabor, 1992). Some researchers suggest that the group-work approach is the most effective model of intervention for working with sex offenders (Mark, 1992; Barker and Morgan, 1992). Smith and Berlin (1988) advise that the ventilation of tensions, anxieties and fears within a casework or group therapy framework may assist sexual offenders to understand the basis for their socially unacceptable actions and provide alternative and acceptable behaviors that gratify their needs.

Barker and Morgan (1992) suggest that group work is the most effective way of working with sex offenders because the presence of other sex offenders can help to reassure an individual that he is not alone in suffering this problem and, more particularly, can help to uncover the extent of an individual's offending (p.175). Other researchers extol the practical benefits of group therapy, such as the fact that it is much more cost effective than individual therapy (Alford, Brown and Kasper, 1985). Many treatment programs for sex offenders employ relapse prevention techniques within groups of sex offenders for reasons of treatment efficiency and efficacy (Marques, Day, Nelson and Miner, 1989; Jenkins-Hall, Osborn, Anderson, Anderson, Shockley-
Establishing the effectiveness of group therapy with sex offenders, however, has proved elusive to the treatment community. Generally, the success of a therapeutic group is measured by the amount of insight members acquire, and express into the influence of past emotional trauma, the way they regard their current circumstances and personal relationships, their recognition of the unreasonableness of their emotional reactions, and their awareness of the tension producing situations that trigger off their offending behavior (West, 1987, p. 251). For example, Alford, Brown and Kasper's (1985) evaluation of the effectiveness of two group treatment programs for sex offenders claims that the treatment groups were shown to be effective in producing positive changes in the sex offenders. Significant changes were defined as differences in their level of self-satisfaction, physical self, moral-ethical self, and social self (p. 86). While the personal gains for the offender through group therapy might be truly beneficial, establishing the effectiveness of group therapy has proved difficult. West (1987) comments on this issue:

...it has not been established through research whether the men will be able to make use of therapeutic gains and behave differently from before when confronted once again with real life problems outside the treatment setting. (p. 252)
A review of the literature found several examples of how group work methods have been utilized with clientele subjected to court ordered community supervision. Both the sex offender population as well as other offender groups have been subjected to group work methods within the parole and probation services of the United States and more frequently in Britain. Generally speaking, however, there have been efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of group methods within probation and even fewer studies on the use of group methods in Canadian probation populations.

**Group Work Methods With Non-Sex Offender Populations**

The 1980s witnessed the development in Britain of probation projects utilizing group methods with various offender groups with a view to achieving reductions in recidivism. For example, the "Afan Alternative" began in late 1980 as a pioneering initiative to divert young offenders from custody into an intensive groupwork programme located in England. The aims of the project were defined as providing an alternative to custodial sentences for young adult male offenders, initially in the age range 16-20, and the provision of a personally constructive and helpful experience for them. The goal of the Afan Alternative, according to Raynor (1988), being "...to help a person to be more constructively spontaneous, happier and to have the

---

21Keve (1967) offers a thorough discussion of group work methods, practices and directives for conducting group work in the United States probation service.
courage and creativity to design life closer to the way in which he would want it to be, without breaking the law" (p.59).

The Afan Alternative project required offender attendance at one or two group sessions per week for the first six to nine months of the order with normal supervision to follow. The project design is unique, involving group sessions beginning with a strenuous physical workout (martial arts training is a prominent program feature) to be led by a physical education specialist. This physical exertion was intended to act as a warm up for the later group activity. Following the physical activity, the members were required to attend group sessions. The group was intended as a forum for the examination of attitudes, feelings, and behavior and of the situations in which group members committed offences. Within group, there was encouragement of the exploring and expression of attitudes feelings and behavior through the simulation of re-enactment of problematic situations with the assistance of psychodrama and sociodrama techniques.

Raynor (1988) conducted an evaluation of the project from 1980 to 1986 (79 clients were involved in the project). According to Raynor’s results, the project’s 2 year reconviction rate among those aged 17-20 is some 13% less than that for custodial sentenced male offenders in the same age group (Raynor, 1988, p.111). Raynor elaborates on his conclusion:
The reconviction figures from the Afan project indicate that project members were reconvicted significantly less than young men with similar ages, similar criminal histories and similar current offences who received custodial sentences. The only obvious difference between these groups is that some went through the project and the other shared custody and normal after-care arrangements. It therefore seems probable that the differences in reconviction outcome are attributable either to the project or to features of the custodial experience which are absent in the project and either would count as a positive finding in relation to the project's effectiveness in achieving its original objectives. (1988, p.11)

The Driver Retraining Scheme is yet another British innovation aimed at replacing committal to detention centres by a form of intensive, community-based supervision which uses group work with offenders. The Driver Retraining Scheme works with a selected group of offenders (generally males between 18 to 21 years of age) who have histories of driving offences, notably TDA (taking and driving away a vehicle). The overall aim of the program is to keep TDA offenders in the community, through helping them to change from illegitimate to legitimate driving behavior, and to redirect their interest in driving and vehicles towards legality. The group process is touted as the key to facilitating this change in offender attitudes and behavior.

The Driver Retraining Scheme (TDA) is based on a Programme designed to open up channels for legitimate driving through group work with offenders. It consists of between 14 and 18 meetings spread over a six month period, with group size ranging between 9 and 12 clients. Each session lasts approximately 1.5 hours and each course is
jointly led by two probation officers. To date, each pair has consisted of a man and a woman officer (Harraway, 1986, p.63).

Harraway (1986) evaluated the TDA program in 1984 after the first sample of offenders had completed their courses. The results from the program were positive. He elaborates:

We would have expected 12 month reconviction rates to have been 40 per cent and 50 per cent and two year rates to have been in excess of 60 per cent. The observed reconviction rates were lower than expected, and the incident of "repeat offending", i.e. for TDA, was very low at 10 per cent. (p.69)

The probation service in Canada has also experimented with groupwork, although not as extensively as the British Probation Service. Ross, Fabiano and Ewles (1989) report on the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Project, which was an experimental project designed to assess the efficacy of an unorthodox training program for the rehabilitation of high-risk adult probationers at the Pickering Probation Offices in Ontario, Canada. The authors report:

Unlike many other correctional programs, it was based not on mere conjecture as to what might constitute an effective program, but on a series of sequential research studies on the principles and practices of effective correctional intervention. (Ross, et al., 1989, p.29)

The researchers implemented a specific program which emphasized cognitive training through group work. Specifically, the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Project comprised an experimental test regarding the value of a cognitive program in reducing the recidivism of high-risk probationers under intensive supervision. High risk
offenders were those defined as high risk by the Level of Supervision Inventory classification\textsuperscript{22}. The program's focus is outlined in the following excerpt:

...modifying the impulsive, egocentric, illogical and rigid thinking of offenders and teaching them to stop and think before acting, to consider the consequences of their behavior, to conceptualize alternate ways of responding to interpersonal problems and to consider the impact of their behavior on other people, particularly their victims. (p.31)

The modification of the thinking patterns of offenders would be accomplished through the program's 80 hours of intensive training which involved demanding but highly enjoyable exercises conducted with groups of 4 to 6 probationers taught by their probation officers (Ross, et al., 1989, p.31).

An evaluation of the program was undertaken, with the evaluators reporting reduced recidivism for those offender's participating in their project (18.1% for participants in the program as opposed to 69.5% for regular probation supervision). These recidivism data were based on a nine month follow-up period for each offender following his admission to the project. The researchers cite this data as support for their view that cognitive training can lead to a major reduction in recidivism.

\textsuperscript{22}The Level of Supervision Inventory is utilized by Probation staff in Ontario to determine the level of risk and the type of supervision required for an offender.
Group Work Methods with Sex Offenders: Probation

A review of the literature found some documentation of the use of group work methods with sex offenders in probation, but few published studies. No studies were found which were directly comparable to the work being done at the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit. The Romero and Williams (1983) study of group psychotherapy and intensive probation supervision, is reviewed in some detail due to the similarities between programs and the lack of a more suitable alternative, but significant differences in program practice, philosophy and methodological concerns limit its generalizability. Much of the available literature focused on the use of group methods with sex offenders on parole. While recognizing the many distinctions between parole and probation practices, these programs are worthy of mention in that they incorporate components similar to those included in the V.S.S.U. program (e.g. intensive supervision, home visits, group supervision).

The first study on the effect of group psychotherapy and intensive probation supervision on probationed sex offenders was completed by Dr. Peters in 1966 on probationers in Philadelphia (Romero and Williams, 1985).

23 Probation is the release of convicted offenders to supervision instead of incarceration. Parole is the release of convicted offenders to supervision following a period of incarceration.

24 "Group Psychotherapy" was not defined by Romero and Williams (1983). Thus, is unknown as to what type of therapy or treatment techniques were employed within the groups.
This research was designed to measure the effectiveness of group psychotherapy by a comparison of subsequent sex crime rearrests for two randomly assigned groups of probationed sex offenders: those assigned to the treatment group of group therapy\textsuperscript{25} and those not receiving the therapeutic intervention (probation only). Sex offenders in the probation only (control group) were required to report to their probation officers\textsuperscript{26} on a frequency of once per month and a home visit was made monthly. Probationers in the treatment group were excused from their monthly reporting obligation to the probation office but a home visit was made monthly by the probation officer. The major finding that emerged from the Peters study was that there was no significant difference in rearrest rates for treatment and control groups. Approximately 10 percent of both groups had a subsequent arrest for a sex offence in the 2 to 3 years following treatment.

Because of various methodological problems with the Peters (1966) study\textsuperscript{27}, Romero and Williams (1985) designed a

\textsuperscript{25} Therapy groups were divided into populations including homosexuals, exhibitionists, pedophiles and assaulters (rapists). The therapy groups met once a week for approximately 1 hour and were conducted by a staff psychiatrist.

\textsuperscript{26} All sex offenders on probation were required to report to an Intensive Supervision Unit. Both the treatment and control groups of probationers reported to probation officers in the ISU unit.

\textsuperscript{27} Romero & Williams (1983) cite problems such as a short follow-up period and lack of offender type-specific recidivism rates (p.38-39).
10 year follow-up to re-evaluate the long-term effects of group psychotherapy and intensive probation supervision on the sex offence recidivism rates of sex offenders participating in the Philadelphia project. The researchers re-classified Peters (1966) original research groups (probation only and probation with group therapy) to that of group psychotherapy with probation and intensive probation supervision only (the reasons for this addressed shortly).

The sample of probation participants included all sex offenders who were randomly assigned to one of the two intervention strategies (group psychotherapy with probation or intensive probation alone) between October 1966 and November 1969. The sample included 239 males (consisting of 48 pedophiles, 39 exhibitionists, and 144 sexual assaulters). During the next ten years, these offenders were followed up by the investigators who determined that 13.6% of the men in group therapy reoffended as compared to 7.2% of the men who received probation only. This difference, however, was not statistically significant. Of the offender sub-types examined in the study, exhibitionists had the highest sex offense recidivism rate among the sex offenders. The authors found that the best predictor of re-arrest was

---

28 Romero & Williams (1983) defined recidivism as an arrest for a sex offence during the follow-up period. The follow-up period began once an offender had been accepted for the original research (some time between 1966 and 1969), assigned to one of the two intervention strategies and continued to April, 1979.
rate of arrest for sex offences per year prior to intervention.

The major finding of the Romero and Williams (1985) study was that group psychotherapy in addition to probation does not significantly reduce sex offence recidivism when compared to intensive probation supervision alone (p.41). The authors caution against using these findings to either terminate or continue group therapy intervention for sexual offenders due to the presence of various methodological problems and the possibility that group psychotherapy was of a positive impact on the probationers. Specifically, Romero and Williams concluded that their data indicated that there was a possibility that group psychotherapy delays the reoccurrence of or affects the rate of subsequent sex offences (fewer sex crimes for those in group psychotherapy), but the sample size was not large enough for standard statistical test confirmation. The researchers suggested that the confirmation of these trends must be addressed by future studies. Hence, the current evaluative endeavor of a probation practice which utilizes group methods is much needed.

There are many problems with the Romero and Williams study, however, which limit it usefulness. Perhaps the most

Methodological problems outlined by Romero & Williams (1983) included the possibility that group psychotherapy delays the reoccurrence of or affects the rate of subsequent sex offences, problems with the use of recidivism measures, problems of using arrest data and official crime reporting methods (p.41-42).
significant issue surrounds why the researchers chose to reclassify Peters (1966) probation only group to an "intensive probation supervision" group and the probation with therapy group to "group psychotherapy with probation". Romero and Williams (1985) explain that this re-classification to "intensive probation supervision" was necessary because these probationers may have benefitted from potential "treatment" by contact with their probation officers at the specialized unit, "... who were experienced in assisting their clients in a variety of ways" (p.38). There are many questions surrounding this re-classification, however, as the researchers fail to specifically elaborate on how and why a probation officer's experience might have contributed to an "intensified" supervision of offenders. It appears that the requirement of two face-to-face contacts with probation officers per month (one visit in office and one visit in the probationer's home) were determining factors in the researchers classifying this as an "intensive" form of supervision. For the sex offenders in the psychotherapy with probation group, there was only a requirement for a home visit and these offenders were excused from their monthly reports to their probation officers. Presumably, this was the difference (absence of one visit to the probation office) which convinced the researchers that this group did not warrant a "group psychotherapy and intensive probation supervision" label.
Romero and Williams (1985) failure to elaborate on what characteristics defined this particular brand of intensive supervision, as well as what treatment model guided the group psychotherapy sessions significantly limit the generalizability of their study. Furthermore, it is questionable as to whether the supervision that Romero and Williams (1983) classified as "intensive" would be viewed as such when considering the frequency of contacts demanded by the intensive probation supervision programs of the 1980s (see Petersilia and Turner (1990) for a review).

Despite these problems with the Romero and Williams (1985) study, it is interesting to note that throughout the literature review of group methods for probationers, the conclusions of Romero and Williams (1985) were often misinterpreted and the shortcomings of the research ignored. Several researchers reported that Romero and Williams (1985) had found that group psychotherapy and close supervision were crucial elements of the successful treatment program (Champion, 1988; Becker and Hunter, 1992), when the opposite was true. In fact, Becker and Hunter's (1992) comprehensive review of therapy outcome studies on adult sexual perpetrators of child victims interpret Romero and Williams (1985) study as evidence that "...probation and the supervision that it affords the perpetrator appear to be effective in the majority of cases in assisting them in not acting out on their atypical sexual urges during probation" (p. 82).
There has been a growing emphasis on the use of groupwork with sex offenders by British Probation agencies with relapse prevention methods figuring prominently in this new work. One of the first comprehensive descriptions of the style, nature, and content of these methods was offered by Barker and Morgan (1992). These researchers charted the explosion of sex offender programmes in the Probation Service.  

The researchers found that the majority of probation work with sex offenders is a recent phenomenon in Britain, with all but five of the 63 probation run sex offender treatment programmes identified during the course of the survey having been in existence for five years or less. The majority of the programmes (52 of the 63 identified) are run with the help of external consultants, usually psychologists. Treatment philosophies vary little from one program to another due to the overwhelming influence of one or two training organizations (Barker and Morgan, 1992). The majority of probation programs have adopted the cognitive-behavioral approach in their work, believing it to be the most effective with sex offenders.  

In researching the use of groupwork methods in Britain, the researchers collected data from four sources: telephone interviews with key personnel in Probation, written replies to a survey, survey returns collected by a student at the University of Oxford as part of her dissertation; and the notes made by the Probation Inspectorate during their thematic inspection of probation practice with sex offenders.  

The works of David Finkelhor (1986) and Stephen Wolf (1984) are reported to be the main sources for guidance on
The essence of cognitive behavioral treatment is described by Barker and Morgan (1992):

It aims to confront offenders with their offending behavior, to make them accept that what they have done has profound negative consequences for their victims and to teach them methods of controlling the impulses that lead to their offending. Unlike a more traditional psycho-therapeutic approach, there is little or no discussion of the origin of the offender's deviant sexual behavior. Treatment concentrates instead on altering the offender's perception of his offending, which he normally denies or minimizes, and offers him strategies for avoiding relapse back into sex offending. (p.175)

The cognitive behavioral approach described above, is largely offered by Probation Services through groupwork. Groupwork, according to Barker and Morgan (1992) is viewed as the "...most effective way of working with sex offenders" (p.175). Despite the proliferation of groupwork in Britain, the monitoring and evaluation of these programmes is sketchy and inadequate. Barker and Morgan (1992) inform that because of resource restrictions, the evaluations that have been conducted to date tend to be incomplete and therefore inconclusive. 32 The researchers reported, however, that they have selected a small number of programmes for an indepth evaluations and will be reporting their results in the near future. This research was not available in time for consideration and inclusion in this research project.

32 The researchers offer no citations of published evaluations of groupwork practices with sex offenders on probation in Britain.
Group Work with Sex Offenders: Parole

The Pacific region of the Correctional Service of Canada has provided community-based sex offender treatment programming since 1984. The Vancouver District Sex Offender Program was initiated by Vancouver parole officers seeking to improve the services available to sex offenders and has grown to eight programs throughout British Columbia (Correctional Service of Canada, 1990).

All conditional releases in the Vancouver area who have current or previous convictions for sexual offences or who have demonstrated sexually inappropriate behavior are eligible for screening in the program. The program is not a voluntary one and offenders who are selected are required to participate.

In most cases, the service is a combination of weekly group therapy with individual therapy sessions of at least 30 minutes every six weeks. The weekly group therapy consist of 12 or fewer offenders with a variety of types of sex offenders. Didactic, cognitive and behavioral approaches are used to develop the offender's ability to interrupt, divert and control sexually inappropriate behavior (relapse prevention). Individual therapy sessions address issues inappropriate for group discussion and serve to monitor the individual's stability and progress in the program.

The offender's progress and adherence to the program is strictly monitored by the parole officers. Any deterioration in behavior is recorded and immediately addressed.
Assessment reports are discussed in a joint session with the offender and the parole officer and a final report is prepared shortly before the offender’s warrant expiry date.

Stephenson (1992) conducted a review of the Pacific region’s community based sex offender program which is in operation in four separate districts in British Columbia. The evaluators concluded that most of the expectations of the program had not been met. A few of the more significant criticisms levelled at the program’s operation in three of the four districts included: record keeping practices concerning offender treatment plans often were inadequate, parole officer’s participation in case planning tended to be lax, there was a lack of co-operation and provision of services between contracted psychological services and the parole agency, behavior in the groups was often disruptive, and discussions in group therapy were not offence-oriented. Furthermore, the evaluators found that the parole officers in three out of the four districts operating the program expressed little confidence in their own service and assessments of the treatment approach were generally neutral to negative (p.29).

Despite the negative flavor of much of the evaluation, the evaluators were generally satisfied with the program’s

33 Northern District (serving parolees in the Prince George, B.C. area); Vancouver District; Abbotsford/Chilliwack District; Victoria District.
operation in one of the four districts. As well, an appreciably lower recidivism rate was found in "District 1" which the evaluators attributed to treatment content and delivery within the District (p.29). The recidivism rate in District 1 was 4% (three year follow up period utilized), which was only about a quarter of the rates in each of the other districts (namely, 12%, 10% and 13%).

Driggs and Zoet (1987) report on a program offered to sex offenders on parole in Minnesota. In 1984, Degrees Inc. began a Minnesota Halfway house and group therapy program for sex offenders with no previous treatment (men who had avoided treatment in prison or for whom treatment was not available prior to their release). The most significant aspect of the program is the use of the group model, referred to as the men's sexuality group (MSG). The MSG met weekly for 13 weeks and each meeting lasted 90 minutes. Each group member is expected to complete an autobiography of his sexual offence, sexual abuse cues, control plan, and personal affirmations. The themes of the group meetings included how to be a group member, who sexual offenders are, dynamics of sexual abuse, impact on the victim, personal autobiographies, relapse prevention, control and treatment planning, healthy sexual development and contraception, and personal evaluations. Special problem areas such as chemical abuse, pornography, fantasy

The location of this District was not identified in the evaluation study but was identified as "District 1".
preoccupation, and family stress are also included in group material.

Driggs and Zoet (1987) report encouraging results. After several years of operation, the program's long term impact on its participants was not clear. According to the researchers, short term statistics were encouraging. They report that of the 40 men who had participated in the sexuality group and who were no longer residents of 180 Degrees, almost 75 percent successfully completed their stay at the halfway house, 7 percent absconded from the program, and 18 percent were terminated administratively. In addition to presenting this quantitative data, Driggs, et al., (1987) also report that the rating of the group experience by program graduates has been 85 percent positive. Driggs, et al., (1987) also report that "the fact that in 19 months only two group members have committed further sex offences while in the program is also heartening for community safety" (p.129). No information is presented concerning the specific characteristics of the men who failed to complete the program.

While Driggs and Zoet (1987) clearly present the program in a positive light, they caution that the MSG is clearly not a remedy for the deep-seated problems underlying the sex offender's acting out but rather, is aimed at

35 The authors do not define how program participants rated the program as positive or what instrument was utilized to gather this information.
addressing the critical need for some level of intervention aimed at the sex offender’s crucial point of reentry into society.

In conclusion, the use of group methods in both probation and parole have expanded in recent years to specialized populations of offenders such as impaired drivers, sex offenders and those convicted of auto crimes. Generally speaking, however, the evaluations which have been conducted to date on these methods have often proved methodologically inadequate and descriptions of program operations are lacking in their comprehensiveness. The published literature on the use of group work methods with sex offenders on probation is particularly lacking.

**Intensive Probation Supervision**

A literature review found that there was a complete absence of documentation of intensive probation supervision practices with adult offenders in Canada. In stark contrast to the Canadian situation, the United States has a long history of both innovation and evaluation of various intensive probation and parole practices with both adult and young offenders. While recognizing that the correctional philosophies and practices between Canada and the United States differ on many issues, the influence of American correctional innovations on Canadian correctional policy and practice, both past and present, cannot be ignored.

36 See McCord (1990) for a review of intensive supervision practices with youths.
Historical examples of this American influence are easily found. For example, decisions surrounding what type of prison system would be implemented in Canada were based in large part on examinations of the American Pennsylvania and Auburn systems (Ekstedt and Griffiths, 1984). A more recent and relevant example of the American influence on Canadian correctional practice was found within the recent working document released by the Department of Justice's Sentencing Team in 1991. 37

Within this document, proposals for changes to Criminal Code provisions relating to probation practice and expansion of intermediate sanctions were addressed. The recommendations of the Sentencing Team included an expansion of Canada's current probation service to include a Level I and Level II probation. While the proposed Level I probation would retain the characteristics of the probation practice in operation today, the proposed "Level II probation" would be differentiated in the following ways:

A new sanction of enhanced probation (Level II) would be created and would have three mandatory conditions: a condition to keep the peace and be of good behavior, a condition to report to and be under the supervision of a probation officer, and


38 The "Sentencing Team" document also included a discussion of proposals for changes to Criminal Code provisions relating to Conditional Discharges, Suspended Sentences, and Intermittent Sentences.
a prescribed minimum term... The consequences for breaching an enhanced (or Level II) probation order would be different from those described for breach of Level I probation. Breach of any term of a Level II probation order, whether or not it involved the commission of a new offence, would result in the imposition of a custodial sentence. The length of the sentence would be set out as follows: where the order was made in respect of a summary conviction offence, the court would impose a sentence of imprisonment of up to six months. Where the order was made in respect of an indictable offence, the court would impose a sentence of up to two years. (p.7)

In devising this "Level II" probation, the Sentencing Team appears to have been persuaded by the intensive supervision practices in the United States and the "positive findings" of American researchers Tonry and Will (1988). While these recommendations of the Sentencing Team have not resulted in legislative changes to Canadian law as of 1993, the example is illustrative of the potential influence of American correctional innovations.

In view of the above, the exploration of the American experience with intensive probation supervision with adult offenders represents a purposeful exercise and timely exercise if not only to alert Canada's correctional community to some of the viewed successes, failures and problems with the innovation. Of course, the examination of this correctional phenomenon is also important due to the

---

39 The Sentencing Team reported that Tonry and Will's (1988) evaluation of the Georgia intensive probation supervision program found that the Georgia ISP probationers did not commit much serious crime while on ISP (thus, public safety did not appear to be compromised) and some cost savings were realized.
similarities in practice with the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit.

Clear and Hardyman (1990) articulate that there are two distinguishable intensive supervision movements which have influenced American correctional practices in the last quarter century. The 1920's to the late 1960s, has been characterized as the "search for the magic number" (Carter and Wilkins, 1984) movement of intensive supervision because it was primarily a series of experimental projects designed to determine the optimal number of clients to be supervised in a single caseload (Clear and Hardyman, 1990, p.42). The intensive supervision program was actually an experimental caseload that was compared to a larger caseload to assess whether manipulating caseloads would have effect on correcting aberrant behavior. The typical experiment, according to Vetter and Adams (1971) involved two or more caseloads, one of which was comparatively small (15 to 35 offenders) and the other large (75 to 150 offenders).

Perhaps the earliest of the research on proper case load size comes from Chute (1922) when he notes that no probation officer "ought to carry" more than fifty cases.

Some of these early studies combined small caseloads with a "treatment" effect such as group counselling (Himelson and Margulies, 1966). Other projects combined low case loads with variations in casework approaches. The Saginaw Project, which operated in Saginaw County, Michigan from 1957 to 1960, was an effort to explore what could be
accomplished with caseloads of 50 and increased professional qualifications of staff (Martin, 1960). The results of these early studies on differential caseload programs in probation outcome (recidivism rates) are summarized by Neithercutt and Gottfredson (1975):

...the results thus far indicate that sometimes case load size reduction yields indications of improved performance, sometimes no outcome changes surface and sometimes the smaller case loads do significantly worse than the larger...Perhaps asking a question like "What size case load is optimum?" is committing a reductio ad absurdum. Case load size may be only minimally (and tangentially) related to violation rate. (pp.20-21)

The second movement of interest in intensive supervision, which has been characterized as a significant departure from previous efforts with intensive supervision, was spurred by the State of Georgia's...

40 Preliminary results from the project were reported to be positive, in that the failure rate of probationers was reduced (Martin, 1960).

41 Krajick (1980) reports on what he classifies as the best-known study of probation case loads in the U.S., the "San Francisco Project" which was carried out by the University of California at Berkeley from 1964 to 1968. Federal probation authorities assigned offenders to four case load categories: "intensive", which meant case loads of 20, "ideal", defined as a case load of 40, "normal" with case loads of 70 to 130, "minimum supervision", with case loads of several hundred. The researchers then studied the differences among the groups. The only effect of the smaller case loads was to generate more technical violations. Crime rates were about the same for all categories (p.8).

42 Many researchers refer to the intensive supervision practices of the 1980s to represent a "new generation" of programs (Latessa, 1986, p.71), which have quite different aims and methods from earlier efforts (Burkhart, 1986), and increased emphasis on the surveillance of offenders (Petersilia, 1985).
experience with an intensive probation supervision program in 1982. The major purpose of the Georgian program was to divert nonviolent offenders from expensive prison beds to a strict intensive probation program. Evaluations of the program in 1987 were positive, with the "...most impressive finding being the apparent achievement of effective control of subsequent crime by those supervised under intensive supervision, while simultaneously demonstrating a significant cost savings" (Erwin, 1990, p.63). The results in Georgia generated a great deal of media and professional interest. A Washington Post article called Georgia's intensive supervision program "the future of American corrections" (August 16, 1985). Conrad (1987), commenting on the arrival of intensive supervision programs, stated "...common sense has at last arrived in American penology".

43. The George intensive supervision program for probationers requires offenders to have face-to-face contacts with officers five times a week (reduced to twice a week as they progress through the program), offenders to work 132 hours, and to submit to frequent unscheduled drug and alcohol tests. One probation officer, who specializes in rehabilitative programming and court liaison and one surveillance officer supervise twenty-five offenders. Standard equipment for the officers consists of walkie-talkies to provide back-up capability in field situations; breathalizers; in some cases, portable EMIT urine testing machines; and more recently, Roche urinalysis kits (Erwin, 1990, p.62).

44. The Georgian program evaluation, however, did not assign clients to intensive supervision practices on a random basis. Petersilia (1990) explains that it is impossible to determine whether it was the intensive supervision that actually caused the observed outcomes or was simply associated with them (i.e. judges were able to select good risks).
Clear, Flynn and Shapiro (1987) observed that the chorus of approval for intensive supervision was so strong and seemingly uniform that "...we are tempted to call it the new panacea of corrections" (p.31). By 1987, 40 American states had implemented programs similar to that started in Georgia (Petersilia, 1987). By 1990 reportedly almost every state had instituted or was testing intensive supervision programs in either probation, parole or both (Petersilia and Turner, 1990).

The fact that there has been a proliferation of intensive supervision programs throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s is probably one of the few points of agreement in the literature. There is wide divergence in the literature on several issues surrounding the intensive probation supervision movement. For ease of discussion and review, these issues are separated into the following five areas:

1) Reason(s) for proliferation of intensive supervision.
2) Defining intensive supervision.
3) The goal(s) and objective(s) of intensive probation supervision.
4) Target groups for intensive supervision practices.
5) Effectiveness of intensive supervision.

**Reason for proliferation of intensive supervision.**

There is some controversy in the literature surrounding why the intensive supervision movement spread so quickly in the United States. Most of the early overviews on the development of intensive supervision probation programs accept the proposition that the overwhelming state of institutional crowding created an irresistible demand for
alternatives to incarceration and created a climate of ready acceptance for the intensive supervision programs (Petersilia, 1985; Conrad, 1985; Clear, Flynn and Shapiro, 1987; Latessa and Vito, 1988; Shover, 1988; Clear and Hardyman, 1990). Petersilia advances this view in her examination of intensive probation supervision implementation strategies:

...The entire movement towards (intensive supervision) is economically driven. It is commonly acknowledged that if prison crowding disappeared tomorrow, thereby eliminating the need to create less expensive sanctions, so would the incentive to develop intensive supervision. (1990, p.132)

Some of the more recent overviews of the development of the intensive movement advanced beyond linking the proliferation of programs with economic necessity and prison crowding, analyzing the phenomenon with greater complexity. Benekos (1990) stresses that changes in community corrections cannot be conceptualized only as a response to prison crowding and the state's fiscal need to develop cheaper alternatives to prisons. He suggests that the move to a new generation of "intermediate sanctions" (e.g. intensive probation supervision, house arrest) is also a reflection of the prevailing ideology of "getting tough" with controlling and punishing criminals and the "popular propensity for punishment" within the current society (Benekos, 1990, pp.53-55).

Tonry (1990) contributes yet another multifaceted explanation for the proliferation of intensive probation...
supervision programs in the United States. He suggests that the prevalence and continuing interest in intensive probation supervision have less to do with its stated goals (e.g. reduced recidivism, reduce prison crowding, increase public safety) than with its effectiveness in achieving latent bureaucratic, organizational, political, professional, and psychological goals of probation departments and officers. Tonry (1990) elaborates on what he terms the "latent" functions of intensive supervision:

They serve bureaucratic and organization goals by enabling probation administrators to be "tough on crime" and thereby increase the institutional and political credibility of probation. This brings more staff, more money, and new programs to probation. Bigger budgets and increased responsibilities are the traditional measures of bureaucratic success, and ISP programs are means to those legitimate organization ends.

They serve administrators' normative goals. By being purposely more punitive than traditional probation, ISP programs permit administrators to express a reduced tolerance of crime and disorder that they share with the general public and political leaders.

They serve professional and psychological goals. By attracting new resources and new visibility, ISP programs put probation on the front lines of crime control and thereby enhance the esteem accorded probation and vicariously, the professional and personal self-esteem of probation officers. (p.210)

Defining Intensive Supervision

A review of the literature revealed that there is little agreement over what "intensive" supervision in probation actually implies. Champion (1988) suggests that "intensive" supervision is a relative term which refers to "something more than standard probation, but something less
than incarceration" (p.22). Harland and Rosen (1987) address the problem of defining intensive supervision:

Beyond stating the obvious, that it is a sanctioning option involving a form of probation distinguishable in some way by the "intensity" of its supervision practices, practitioners and commentators have endowed the concept of "intensive supervision" with a bewildering range of defining attributes. (p.33)

Some authors have attempted to resolve the definition problem by emphasizing the shared characteristics of intensive probation programs. Harland and Rosen (1987) typify such an approach in their identification of the two commonly associated factors in intensive supervision:

1) First, is a relatively short-term focus on in-program crime control and compliance with other release conditions.
2) Second, is its primary reliance upon incapacitative and specific deterrent techniques to simulate as closely as possible in the community the more completely controlling effects of a custodial sanction. (p.34)

Most observers of the intensive probation supervision movement, however, have accepted the fact that the differences among programs are too great to assign one definition to the term "intensive probation supervision". Petersilia (1990) concurs with this view stating that "...so many programs call themselves intensive supervision program that the acronym alone reveals little about any program's particular character" (p.3). Clear, Flynn and Shapiro (1987) discussed some of the more significant differences between intensive supervision programs:

The most common programmatic difference is organizational context. Some programs'
governmental location is judicial, others are housed with the county executive, still others are run by the state executive. Some projects are small experiments, others are large, seemingly long-term program initiatives. In practice, the actions of intensive officers vary widely. Some officers are provided a great deal of discretion in planning and conducting supervision, other officers' decisions are tightly controlled by elaborate program requirements. Moreover, the amount of supervision that is called "intensive" varies widely, from twice monthly contact to at least daily contact. (p.42)

Petersilia (1990) added to the list of possible program diversities with her observations of differences in the frequency of unscheduled drug testing, differential enforcement of probation conditions, and various requirements to perform community work service.

The goal(s) and objective(s) of intensive supervision.

While the managers of intensive supervision programs often advance multiple goals for their programs, the goals most often identified include punishment, cost effectiveness, diversion from prison and protection of the public through recidivism reduction. This plethora of goals in and of itself attracts criticism. Byrne (1990), for example, stated "... it is obvious that intensive supervision developers need to clearly articulate the 'primary' purpose of their program (p.14). Clear and Hardyman (1990), in observing the multifaceted goals of intensive supervision programs, states: "if an intensive supervision program can achieve these goals, it must be the wonder child of the criminal justice system" (p.47). They add: "not only is it unrealistic for a single program to
achieve all these aims simultaneously, but in some respects the goals are contradictory. This suggests that the goals are more a matter of public relations than of careful program planning" (Clear and Hardyman, 1990, p.47).

Of equal controversy concerns what "goals" should prevail in intensive supervision practices. This debate inevitably becomes a re-examination of the now decades old controversy of the purpose of probation: "control" or "rehabilitation", or some combination of the two.

A review of the literature found that the surveillance and control components of intensive supervision are recognized as the most prominent program components, with the relegation of rehabilitative services to at best, a secondary role (Petersilia, 1990; Byrne, 1990). Petersilia (1988) in her review of the intensive supervision movement in probation concludes that a new orientation has emerged in Probation:

The goal is not offender rehabilitation, but offender control, with public safety the central concern. (p.167)

Harland and Rosen (1987) elaborate on some of the more common features of the control oriented intensive supervision:

To minimize risk during the supervision period, that probationers will reoffend or breach other conditions of their release, by restricting their opportunity and propensity to do so, via primarily the incapacitative and specific deterrent means of intensive regulation and monitoring of their whereabouts and conduct, and the corresponding increased threat of detection and strict
enforcement of consequences in event of violation. (p.34)

There is a wide divergence in the literature in interpretations over why this "trail em, nail' em and jail' em" (Harris, 1987, p.21) philosophy in intensive probation supervision programs has prevailed and the implications for society and probation. Harland and Rosen (1987) speculate that this ascendancy of restraint-over-rehabilitation, surveillance-over-service in intensive supervision probation might be a result of the lack of public and professional faith in the ability of rehabilitative services to succeed and increasing public support for crime reduction. Some rely on the rhetoric of "social control" discourse, suggesting that probation is being recast under the guise of intensive supervision probation to provide the closest possible approximation of the in-program, risk-control guarantee of more total confinement. In effect, probation is viewed as becoming the "prison-in-the-community" (Harland and Rosen, 1987) and social control is expanded (Benekos, 1990). Other researchers welcome the shift to a control perspective, suggesting that it represents a new "realism" in probation in that we are no longer deceiving ourselves and attempting to deceive the probationers about the therapeutic benefits of the relationship between the officers and the offenders (Conrad, 1987, p.64). Yet other academics advocate a "balanced approach" within intensive supervision practice,
attesting to the benefits of both treatment and control (Romig, 1986; Harris, 1987).

Recent evaluations of intensive programmes have reinforced the argument that an emphasis on control in the absence of attention to offenders' underlying needs and the availability of resources to address these needs will be largely counter-productive (Byrne, 1989; Byrne, 1990). This has been highlighted, in particular in the Georgia intensive probation programme (Erwin, 1990), where, although drug testing was viewed by staff as having slowed down the use of illicit drugs while offenders were in the programme, they tended to resort to further drug use when transferred to less intensive levels of supervision. Erwin (1990) attributed this to the lack of available treatment resources and concluded that "substance abusers provide us with a clear example of the false economy involved in focusing on surveillance and control without giving attention to underlying needs". Petersilia and Turner's (1992) recent negative evaluation of an intensive supervision parole program in Texas, voiced similar concerns: "... if intensive supervision is primarily interested in reducing recidivism and system costs, then ISP programs, as currently structured - with a focus on surveillance as opposed to treatment - will likely fall short" (p.58).

Target group of offenders for intensive supervision.

There is no one adult offender group which has been consistently identified in the literature as more or less
appropriate for intensive probation supervision. In the beginning of the intensive supervision movement (e.g. mid 1980s), program administrators appear to have been what Conrad (1987) termed "commendably cautious" in the formulation of policy for intensive supervision: "no violent offenders, dedicated addicts, no multiple recidivists, no psychotics" (Conrad, 1987, p.64). A review of intensive supervision programs throughout the late 1980s to early 1990s, however, found no consistency in the type of clientele who was either excluded or included in intensive probation programs. In fact, many of the published program evaluations of intensive probation supervision failed to address what type of offence the program participants had been convicted of, commonly describing the offenders as "...typical of the relatively low-risk, nonviolent felons who constitute a significant fraction of the prison population in America" (Pearson and Harper, 1990, p.77).

Nevertheless, it appears that the majority of programs have targeted drug offenders and property offenders (either intentionally or unintentionally). Conrad's (1985) preliminary review of the Georgia intensive probation supervision program found that 51% were property offenders, and 21% were drug offenders. Violent offences, which might presumably include sex offences, represented only 11% of the population reporting to the Georgia program in 1983. Later Program evaluations have found similar results. A 1988 evaluation of the New Jersey Intensive Supervision Program
found that the offences of ISP participants were mainly small-time drug sales (47%) and burglary (24%), with most of the participants having at least one prior felony conviction (Pearson, 1988 cited in Pearson and Harper, 1990). The prevalency of drug offenders in intensive supervision programs was also confirmed in Petersilia and Turner’s (1990) randomized experiment of three intensive supervision programs (probation). The researchers found that over half of the offenders participating in two of the program sites had been convicted of drug sales or drug possession.

There are a few specialized intensive probation programs which target specific offender groups such as alcohol offenders (Anson, 1987; Green and Phillips, 1989\textsuperscript{45}; Golbin, 1983), and those designed for offenders with particular needs such as unemployed or underemployed probationers, or persons with repeated convictions for driving with intoxicated (Petersilia, 1990). As far as the sex offender population is concerned, some intensive probation programs have identified this group as ineligible for participation in their programs, but most of the available evaluations on intensive probation supervision did not address whether sex offenders were eligible for participation. However, since the majority of studies on the recidivism of intensive probation participants did not

\textsuperscript{45}Both of these studies examine the effectiveness of Dougherty County, Georgia’s Criminal Alcoholic Program (CAP). CAP is a five year intensive probation program for alcohol offenders, which includes the ingestion of antabuse.
bother to isolate sex offences as a specific category in presentations of re-offending data (Pearson and Harper, 1990; Petersilia and Turner, 1990), it would seem probable that sex offenders were not included in intensive probation supervision programs. Only one intensive probation supervision programs was found in the literature which targeted sex offenders only (Romero and Williams, 1983).

Conversely, there were several documented intensive parole supervision programs, however, which targeted the sex offender group (Driggs and Zoet, 1987; Pithers and Cumming, 1989).

**Effectiveness of Intensive Probation Supervision**

Intensive probation supervision is viewed as offering a seductive range of benefits to both politicians, professionals and the public: more "control" over high-risk offenders, with safer and more effective supervision; a chance to combine punishment with treatment; and, most of all, reductions in cost, prison overcrowding and reoffending. The most significant question is, whether or not intensive supervision has been able to deliver on these promises. While recognizing that cross cultural comparisons inevitably complicate rather than simply investigations on the effectiveness of probation and the limited

---

46 Comparisons are complicated because of variations in justice system operation and practice, what is defined as crime and differences in probation purpose, philosophy and practice. Champion (1988) argues that the variations between countries are so significant that if implications of probation for recidivism and public risk for U.S. offenders
applicability of this research to the current study\textsuperscript{47}, there are arguably enough significant similarities between the probation systems of Canada and the United States to justify some consideration of this research. Of particular interest to this research project is whether or not "intensive supervision" practices in probation\textsuperscript{48} have been found to reduce recidivism. Furthermore, if positive results have been found, what factors have been related to recidivism in populations of intensive supervision probationers?

Early results from evaluations of intensive probation supervision programs were positive, in that recidivism rates among participants were generally lower than they were for conventional probationers or a matched group of released prisoners (Conrad, 1985; Pearson, 1985; Pearson and Harper, 1987; Anson, 1987; Petersilia, 1987; Pearson, 1988). Later reviewers of these early comparisons between intensive and regular probation supervision programs, dismissed the initial "positive" results of these evaluative efforts as misleading and most likely unreliable because none of these early evaluations were based on random assignment to intensive supervision programs (Petersilia and Turner, 1990; Petersilia and Turner, 1992).

\textsuperscript{47}The research on the recent intensive supervision movement is of limited applicability to the current research effort due to the type of offender usually targeted for these programs (e.g. drug or property offenders).

\textsuperscript{48}For a recent review of an intensive supervision parole Program see Turner and Petersilia (1992).
Generally speaking, because random assignment was not undertaken, it was argued that some or all of the observed decreases in recidivism were due to the selective screening components of the intensive supervision programs, or some other combination of unidentifiable factors, instead of the supervision and counselling components of the intensive programs.

The recent research effort which has dealt the severest blow to the confidence in intensive probation supervision programs was recently released by Petersilia and Turner (1990). In what has been termed the "largest randomized experiment in the field of American corrections", Petersilia and Turner (1990) chose eleven sites to participate in their intensive supervision study, with each site implementing a program modeled on Georgia's respected intensive supervision model. The data collection and analysis was aimed at experimentally testing the effectiveness of intensive supervision practices in decreasing reoffending rates and reducing costs. Three recidivism measures were employed in the study: technical violation, any arrest, any technical violation or arrest. After six months of follow-up, Petersilia and Turner (1990) offered devastating preliminary observations on the effectiveness of intensive supervision:

All that intensive supervision does is monitor offenders' success or failure in meeting the conditions of ISP; it has no apparent effect on recidivism. With minimal reporting, regular probation has no worse recidivism rates than the ISP. Given how much more expensive it is than
probation, why do we need something that does nothing more than take its own pulse?. (p.108)

The overall project result after a one year follow-up period represented more of the same pessimism about the capabilities of intensive supervision to meet its goals of reduced recidivism and costs:

...the evidence suggests that intensive probation supervision, as implemented in these sites, was not associated with a reduction in new arrests...The high violation and incarceration rates drove up program and court costs...Given that these programs are more expensive than routine probation and apparently provide no greater guarantees for public safety, is there any future for them?. (Petersilia and Turner, 1990, pp. 95-98).

The Petersilia and Turner (1990) research also examined the impact of certain background characteristics of intensive probation participants on recidivism. This effort was significant in that the majority of the previous studies on intensive probation supervision had neglected to examine what variables might be related to recidivism. Most of these efforts were preoccupied with questions concerning cost-effectiveness and overall reduction of recidivism rates. Petersilia and Turner (1990) recognized the lack of academic effort on this issue, stating that program developers

49 Turner and Petersilia (1992) recently presented the results of a randomized experiment to assess the effects of an Intensive Supervision Parole program in Texas. The researchers found similar results. The study found that ISP was not associated with fewer arrests, even though ISP offenders received more contacts than offenders on routine parole supervision.

50 See Pearson's (1988) evaluation of the New Jersey intensive supervision program for an example of this approach.
continue to add (or delete) specific features to meet their own needs in isolation from any empirical literature on what components might be most effective. Other researchers have also addressed this issue. Harris (1989), for example, warned that "ISP programs seem to be continually adding new program features, with little concrete evidence that these new elements will increase community protection and/or result in greater offender rehabilitation" (cited in Petersilia and Turner, 1990, p.56).

As a result of the lack of data on specific characteristics linked to recidivism in intensive supervision, Petersilia and Turner (1990) selected several variables (sex, race, age, prior record, living arrangement, drug-treatment needs, and employment) to test the differential effectiveness of intensive probation supervision. The researchers found no statistically significant interaction effects, concluding that intensive probation supervision does not appear differentially effective for offenders with different background characteristics. It should be noted, however, that Petersilia and Turner’s (1990) analysis of variables linked to recidivism was far from comprehensive, nor was it linked with the results of prior research. Furthermore, the researchers did not specifically examine the recidivism rates of sex offenders within these intensive probation supervision programs. Of course, this may have been due in large part to the absence of sex offenders in the programs
evaluated. The researchers did not, however, address whether or not sex offenders were included in the program populations.

It is also important to realize that the Petersilia and Turner (1990) study, like all research, suffers from its own unique methodological problems and thus should not be viewed as definitive evidence of the failure of intensive probation supervision. In fact, despite the negative flavor of the Petersilia and Turner (1990) study in terms of re-offending, there were positive findings. Specifically, they found that in all three of the programs evaluated, offenders who received counseling, were employed, paid restitution and did community service had less recidivism. They further commented that because the level of involvement in program services was low, these activities may have had an even greater positive effect on the overall recidivism rate if a greater proportion of the sample had been involved in rehabilitative activities. Petersilia and Turner (1990) suggested that future research might attempt to confirm this trend. The current project's evaluation of service delivery practices in intensive probation supervision attempted to expand on this request.

To summarize, what appears to have emerged from the research conducted thus far on intensive probation supervision practices is that intensive work which offers help on wider problems than simple offending behavior; which links offenders' lifestyles and community help (especially
for drug and alcohol abuse); and which offers help with employment and/or family problems appears to hold the most promise for intensive probation supervision (Petersilia and Turner, 1990). Intensive supervision of probationers alone, as measured by increased frequency of contacts and surveillance of offenders, has not found positive support in terms of its ability to impact on the re-offending rates of participants. Turner and Petersilia (1992) summarize the results on the effectiveness of both parole and probation intensive supervision programs: "... the cumulative results lend serious doubt to the claim that increased supervision, in and of itself, will reduce recidivism, decrease prison crowding, or save public funds" (p.102). Whitfield (1992), in his examination of research on intensive supervision practices, suggests that in general terms, offence-specific programmes for groups such as sex offenders, drug abuse offenders, or auto-crime offenders, seem to have more credibility, a sharper focus and greater effect (xi).
BACKGROUND ISSUES: SELECTION OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND FORMULATION OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

It was necessary in the initial research project negotiations to carefully consider the views and expectations of project staff towards an evaluative research project. Indeed, the whole prospect of any "evaluative" research exercise, was approached with mixed feelings, particularly as other probation service activities (or other probation offices) were not subjected to the same kind of external scrutiny. The very term evaluation, according to researchers Deutscher & Beattie (1988) implies a "judgmental process", which inevitably concludes with judgements of "success" or "failure" (p.608). Viewing an evaluation in these terms, however, could represent a detriment to the integrity of the research process as the program people may take evasive actions ranging from a mild effort to put their best foot forward to more drastic attempts at deliberate deception (1988, p.607). To avoid these difficulties, Deutscher & Beattie (1988) suggest that researchers intent on evaluation declare an intention to analyze and report "what is happening", rather than the traditional evaluation focus on "what happened" (p.608).

The suggestions of Deutscher & Beattie (1988) were viewed as particularly relevant in light of the dismaying tendency of past evaluative efforts in corrections to be preponderantly negative. Robert Martinson's "What Works: Questions and Answers about Prison Reform" (1974) probably represents the publication which exerted the most profound
impact on not only reinforcing the "nothing works" philosophy in corrections$^{51}$, but reinforcing correctional apprehension towards any evaluative endeavor. As much of recent positive research on the correctional realm is unknown to line level staff$^{52}$, the researcher ensured that the purposes and manner of the evaluation exercise were carefully discussed with the V.S.S.U. staff.

The researcher was careful to explain that no judgements would be made concerning the "success" or "failure" of the program. The purpose of the research project was not to make assumptions concerning what level of public risk (as measured by recidivism) was thought reasonable for a community-based program to be considered successful. Jones (1992) explains that public safety might be considered as a continuous variable, "...with the total absence of crime at one extreme and increased criminal activity at the other" (p.265). While some researchers suggest that the total absence of crime is the appropriate criterion for assessing the "success" of a community-based program (Petersilia, 1990), this issue has not been addressed by B.C. Corrections or the V.S.S.U. program.

---

$^{51}$Martinson (1974) summarized the results of 231 studies on rehabilitation published between 1945 and 1967 and concluded: "With few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism" (p.49).

$^{52}$The work of Gendreau and Ross (1987,1989) and Cullen and Gilbert (1982) have emphasized the positive effects of correctional programs.
Maltz's (1984) comments are particularly significant here: "...one cannot state with any degree of assurance whether a given recidivism rate is high or low; there is no "normal" recidivism rate as there is a normal body temperature" (p.23).

The researcher's primary purpose in conducting evaluative research at V.S.S.U. was to contribute to policy and practice in the probation service, not "make" policy. This approach was necessary to ease the tensions of staff surrounding the evaluative project. The V.S.S.U. office was a unique and to some extent controversial initiative which had unintentionally generated animosity and criticism from other probation offices. Specifically, when V.S.S.U. was introduced into the probation field, some of the more traditional probation thinkers scoffed at the idea of "specialization" and "intensive supervision", fearing that increased education, duties and expectations would be the defining features of future probation supervision practice. Because of the presence of these views, which were evident at the line and management levels of the probation service, V.S.S.U. staff were understandably concerned about the ramifications of a "negative" evaluation. The possibility was explored that the results might be disappointing. It could turn out, for instance, that the research would fail to demonstrate that increasing supervision and services to sex offenders reduces recidivism. These findings could provide grounds for disbanding the intensive supervision
program, although experts in the field of probation evaluation would caution that "judgements about whether or not a program should be continued are, in the final analysis, not solely scientific judgments" (Petersilia, 1991, p.26).

Despite all of the many valid perceived "risks" of evaluation, the V.S.S.U. staff were highly committed in principle to the usefulness of evaluation. Their support was unequivocal, despite recognizing that the project might be scrutinized by the upper management echelons of corrections and unintentionally create obstacles to the achievement of program aims.

Notwithstanding the program's co-operative spirit with respect to this research endeavor, V.S.S.U. staff were not equipped to undertake or collaborate in a full system study. Due to the intensive nature of the work demanded by the project, and the limited amount of time available for duties outside of program management and program objectives, the researcher would have to complete the majority of research tasks independently. Consequently, although V.S.S.U.'s involvement in the research project was invaluable in terms of access to material and occasional availability of probation staff to assist in data gathering and answering questions concerning program practice, the extent to which the specialized office could directly participate in the evaluation was limited. V.S.S.U. staff expressed concern that the project not overload the program with demands which
existed solely to satisfy the requirements of the research endeavor rather than the aims of the program. Thus the methods chosen avoided interference with the practices and day-to-day operations of the specialized unit.

Similarly, while support for this research was received from probation management, it did not seem realistic to proceed with a project that would require substantial input and co-operation from members of the probation service and/or other agencies who were not directly associated with the project, with only one researcher directly responsible for the evaluative effort. This, together with the fact that no financial provision for research evaluation costs were made available to this researcher, meant that the range and sophistication of the measures used would be significantly limited by resource constraints. The following section will outline the evaluative criteria and research questions chosen for this research project as well as the methods employed. Prior to discussing the specific research design employed in this project, some attention will be paid to issues surrounding the measurement of probation effectiveness.

While the development of specialized probation units in British Columbia for sex offenders and other offender groups

---

53 Prior to engaging in this research project, a comprehensive proposal was submitted to Ms. Lynn Stevenson, the Regional Director of Corrections in 1991. A letter of permission was granted to the researcher shortly thereafter.
may be becoming a correctional priority\textsuperscript{54}, there have so far been no systematic efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of these initiatives\textsuperscript{55}. This lack of evaluative research, however, is not confined to units like V.S.S.U. The majority of probation practices in British Columbia have not been subjected to rigorous evaluative research, due in large part to the absence of a corrections department devoted solely to research endeavors\textsuperscript{56}. This state of affairs would surely be surprising to one of the earliest writers on American probation practice, Sheldon Glueck (1933):

\begin{quote}
A research unit in every large probation office is as necessary as an endocrine system in the human body....There are few efficient manufacturing plants that do not give prominent place to the research laboratory. Projects involving human beings ought at least to do as much. (p.18)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{54}Since the implementation of the V.S.S.U. unit, another specialized office for the supervision of sex offenders opened in Coquitlam, B.C. in 1990. This program is modelled on the V.S.S.U. program. The B.C. Corrections Branch has also implemented a specialized Gang Unit to handle offenders who are believed to be affiliated with gang populations. This Gang Probation Unit is located at the Northeast Probation Office in Vancouver.

\textsuperscript{55}While the meaning of "effectiveness" is an issue of ongoing controversy in the literature it is generally defined as the extent to which a strategy or program actually achieves its intended objective (Shover & Einstadter, 1988).

\textsuperscript{56}Jack Aasen's (1985) comprehensive exploration of the enforcement of probation in British Columbia is a notable exception. Aasen's research, however, was conducted for purposes of fulfilling the requirements for a Masters degree in Criminology. Thus, it is unlikely that this research would ever have been conducted if it were not for the personal interest and initiative of this individual.
The shortage of evaluative research on the Canadian Probation Service in general, Canadian intensive supervision practices\textsuperscript{57}, and the effectiveness of relapse prevention in probation, led to the initiation of the research reported here.

The V.S.S.U unit has been involved in at least three research projects during the period of March 1, 1988 to November 1, 1989\textsuperscript{58}. However, no comprehensive research effort of an "evaluative" focus had yet been attempted. As outlined earlier, the Vancouver Specialized Unit was a result of innovation by line level personnel. As there were virtually no data available on this endeavor, there was an obvious need for program evaluation. Thus, evaluative research was viewed as a useful and purposeful endeavor towards "... contributing to subsequent decision-making about the program and to improve future programming" (Weiss, \textsuperscript{57}Canadian inattention to intensive supervision practices in probation may be a reflection of the relatively few intensive supervision programs in operation in the country. This observation, however, is purely a speculative one on the part of the researcher and was not substantiated empirically. In contrast, the United States and Britain have experimented with various intensive supervision programs (parole/probation) since the late 1970s and there is a plethora of literature exploring the various practices and implications of the intensive supervision movement in these countries.

\textsuperscript{58}Steven Hart provided both a descriptive and analytic program evaluation of V.S.S.U. in 1988. Maureen Gabriel, a graduate student in Criminology at S.F.U, examined how adult sexual offenders rationalize, justify and deny their behavior and consequently become sex offenders. In 1990, the Research Centre at Simon Fraser University assisted with a descriptive project of V.S.S.U. offender characteristics.
1972, p.4). Although "evaluation" research has acquired many meanings, it has generally been conceptualized in two ways: (1) the process of collecting and analyzing information on the operational consequences of correctional programs (Cook and Campbell, 1979) or (2) the empirical study of a program's effectiveness at accomplishing certain objectives (Feldman, Caplinger and Wodarski, 1983). Outcomes typically are defined with reference to a set of predetermined goals established for a program (Feldman, Caplinger and Wodarski, 1983).

The Measurement of Probation "Effectiveness"

The pivotal issue in assessment or evaluation of correctional programs is the selection of criteria with which to determine success or failure. Those attempting to evaluate and measure the worth of various strategies in corrections face a most difficult dilemma in defining the meaning of "effectiveness". This particular issue, however, is not unique to the correctional realm. Every social delivery system is battling with similar issues of how to define and measure effectiveness.

According to Anspach (1991), "effectiveness is a socially constructed phenomenon, which is focused on subjective assessments of effectiveness by members of a particular service delivery system" (p..2). Effectiveness is what W. J. Gallie (Bosk, 1979; Lukes, 1977) calls an "essentially contested" concept. Much like the notions of "truth", "beauty" or "justice", there are grounds for
debating the appropriateness of this concept on every occasion of its use (cited in Anspach, 1991, p.2). Thus, instead of developing a more "objective" conception, definition, or criterion for measuring effectiveness, the empirical question becomes: "How do participants in social programs determine that their organizations are effective? What indigenous or folk methods do they use in evaluating social programs?" (Anspach, 1991, p.2).

In deciding on what methods would be utilized in the V.S.S.U evaluation project, the literature on evaluative criteria for criminal justice programs, as well as sex offender treatment programs was thoroughly reviewed. Although V.S.S.U should not be considered a "treatment" program for sex offenders, the evaluative criteria of such programs is of particular interest to this specialized program in view of its specialized offender group, its use of relapse prevention techniques (a common component of sex offender treatment programs) and its coordinated approach to offender management and supervision.

An earlier perusal of the limited Canadian probation literature revealed that two measures are commonly used to determine probation effectiveness: compliance with probation conditions during the probation period and recidivism before or after the probation period (Ontario Probation Officers' Association, 1967; Ouimet Committee, 1969; Cockerill; 1975).

Probation, like other aspects of corrections and the criminal justice system, has long been concerned with
demonstrating that the services delivered were indeed responsible for the desired effect, usually reduced recidivism (Seng, 1983; Palmer, 1992). Maltz (1984) suggests that most criminal justice agencies use "recidivism" and "failure" interchangeably. Ted Palmer (1983) elaborates:

Most programs are judged as successful or unsuccessful because- whatever else they did or did not accomplish with their target group- they either did or did not reduce recidivism. Use of recidivism is consistent with our view that the ultimate goal of rehabilitation is increased public protection. (p.3).

In efforts to evaluate intensive supervision programs in the United States over the past two decades, recidivism and technical violations of probationers are almost always used as prominent measures of program effectiveness (Romero and Williams, 1983; Petersilia, Turner, Kahan and Peterson, 1985; Pearson, 1988; Latessa and Vito, 1988; Pearson and Harper, 1990; Petersilia and Turner, 1990). British probation services have a similar pre-occupation with recidivism rates to assess program effectiveness, a reality which has been criticized by some researchers (Whitehead, 1990).

Although there have been efforts to evaluate the probation service in terms of its effectiveness in assisting clients in problem solving and the delivery of services, the recidivism measure is utilized most frequently. Palmer (1992) suggests that a correctional program evaluation without attention to the reduction of recidivism would not only be incomplete, it would "miss the main point" (p.26).
The emphasis on recidivism measures is no less evident in evaluations of sex offender treatment. While each sex offender treatment program may theorize differently about how sexual deviancy can be repressed, use different techniques, and focuses on different parts of the human anatomy, they all appear to emphasize the ultimate goal of eliminating, or at a minimum reducing the possibility that the offender will reoffend. Michael O'Connell (1990) explains:

There are some general indicators that appropriate treatment is taking place. First of all, the therapist must recognize that cessation of offending is of paramount importance and takes precedence over all other considerations. Although this may seem obvious, it needs to be emphasized because of its implications for therapy and the role treatment plays in protecting community safety...The most important goal of specialized treatment of sex offenders is to prevent reoffence both during and after treatment. (p.101)

Similarly, Prentky and Burgess (1990) underscore the fact that the primary goal of sex offender treatment is actually the reduction of victimization rates. Canadian researchers Borzecki and Wormith (1987) arrived at a similar conclusion in their examination of sex offender treatment programs throughout the United States and Canada. Specifically, after reviewing the evaluation and follow-up component of programmes they concluded: "In considering outcome measures, recidivism was the variable of choice in the U.S. and most Canadian programmes" (p.35). Marshall, Laws and Barbaree (1990) advise that the "bottom line" purpose of treatment for sex offenders is the reduction in
the rate of offending due to the devastating effects of sexual assault on innocent victims (p.6).

Choosing Specific "Evaluative" Criteria for V.S.S.U.

The specific selection of evaluative criteria for the V.S.S.U project proved less complicated than expected due to the fact that V.S.S.U. had succinctly outlined the major goal of its program:

The major goal of V.S.S.U. is to protect society by actively providing opportunities for sexual offenders to establish internal controls with respect to their deviant sexual behavior. External sanctions are provided through supervision and monitoring with a focus towards assisting the offender control his behavior and develop a more socially acceptable lifestyle. (V.S.S.U. Program Manual).

This goal was recently supported by a B.C. Corrections Branch committee charged with examining the delivery of services and management of sex offenders under provincial jurisdiction. The Committee stressed that the role and goal of Branch staff in working with sex offenders included two components:

a. assisting the offender to change his behavior;
b. protecting society while administering the Orders of the Court (Ministry of Attorney General, 1991, p.ii).

Offender Recidivism

In light of the above, "recidivism" was chosen as the primary outcome measure of the V.S.S.U evaluation.

Of course, few are likely to deny the relevance of recidivism rates of sexual offenders in a correctional system where increased public protection against illegal
behavior is one of, if not the primary goal for system interventions (Palmer, 1992). As outlined earlier, "without this index (recidivism), program evaluation would not just be incomplete, it would miss the main point" (Palmer, 1992, p. 26). Nevertheless, for an evaluative effort to focus solely on exploring a seemingly causal question such as: "did the specialized probation service cause reduced recidivism?", has been actively criticized in the discourse on evaluation research in general, and in research on probation evaluation in particular. The prominence of this issue in the literature demands that there be a brief review of the more significant concerns. Within this discussion, a brief note on the use of recidivism measures with sex offenders is also addressed.

Criticism of Recidivism Measure

Probation Research

The over-reliance on the recidivism measure in judging probation's success and failure has found its critics since the early 1930s. Sheldon Glueck (1933) charged that probation's claims for keeping criminality in control were "grossly unwarranted" and might foster resentment and pessimism about the service in the future (pp.9-10). Glueck (1933) criticized probation's adoption of the "reduction of criminality" value as their claim to success, believing that the only sound arguments in favour of probation were economic ones and the fact that it "...substitutes intelligence for humanity for ignorance and brutality in the
treatment of offenders" (pp.9-10). More recent critics of the "reduced re-offending equals success in probation" belief have argued that the service's multifaceted goals, its interaction with other agencies, other positive outcomes, and the many validity concerns of the recidivism measure eradicate the usefulness of the measure in defining effectiveness in the probation service.

In many, if not all, of the critical examinations of probation effectiveness, a central theme has been goal conflict, goal ambiguity, and goal displacement (Cressey, 1960; Hall, et al., 1966). The time-worn controversy over whether probation is punishment, treatment, social control or some combination of the three has never been resolved within the probation service. As such, to rely on one measure of probation effectiveness (such as recidivism) completely ignores the fact that probation has characteristically resisted pursuing any specific activity, such as crime reduction, because of its traditional function of balancing a range of contradictory aspirations59. Harris (1992) outlines these often conflicting objectives of probation as including "...care and control, liberation and constraint, calling offenders to account and demanding Social reform" (p.154). The most recent "Statement of

59 Some researchers suggest that the classification and prioritizing of goals will render probation programs more effective. For example, Conrad (1983) proposes to separate the functions now performed by one probation officer into three separately conducted operations of investigation, service and surveillance.
Mission" of the B.C. Corrections Branch reflects this presence of multifaceted objectives:

* protection of the community;
* assurance that court-imposed penalties are carried out in a manner consistent with their intent;
* provision of avenues for offenders to make restitution and reparation for damages to victims and communities;
* provision of positive and constructive activities for offenders in custody or on probation supervision, and
* assistance to sentenced offenders to re-establish themselves in the community following release from custody (1986, p.3)60.

The probation service’s ongoing interaction with other agencies is a characteristic which has been criticized as diminishing the validity of the recidivism measure in defining probation effectiveness. Glueck (1933) explains:

That probation is in large measure dependent for its success on the cooperation of other social institutions is evident to all but certain myopic probation officers. He adds "...effective probation work is intimately intertwined with, and in large measure dependent upon, an intelligent and cooperative attitude on the part of many of society’s institutions and servants....In the final analysis, rehabilitation of criminals is a community responsibility. (pp.11-12)

Similarly, Smykla (1984) argues that traditional recidivism measures are often quite misleading measures of probation effectiveness as "recidivism represents the end product of an elaborate process that often does not bear a particularly exact relationship to the behavior involved"

60 The B.C. Corrections Branch had been actively involved in developing a new Beliefs, Goals, and Strategies statement throughout 1992/1993. This publication was not available to the researcher in time for inclusion in this study.
(p.306). He explains that there are likely to be considerably more criminal acts committed than there are apprehensions and it is the acts themselves that should interest us, not the varying competence and luck of law enforcement agencies (Smykla, 1984). Smykla outlines his view on what he feels might be a tenuous relationship between supervision and recidivism:

One might find that any combination of visits and reports keeps pressure on probationers to be law abiding and stay in touch with their probation officer. It is difficult to say, however, that supervision really prevents recidivism. A probationer determined to make it does not need surveillance and control; a probationer determined to con a probation officer, evade supervision, or engage in criminal activity can find ways to do so. (p.306)

The typical indicator of probation success has also been criticized for being too narrow to reflect the full quality of program goals. In looking only at recidivism, other valuable performance measures might be overlooked. While the ultimate goal of rehabilitative efforts is the reduction of future law-breaking behavior, sound rehabilitative efforts in the justice system are likely to produce a number of other desired outcomes (e.g. changes in self concept, skill achievement, economic productivity) (Robert and Webb, 1981, p.366). Similarly, other researchers have suggested that attention should be re-directed to whether the probationer received the required services or was assisted in solving personal problems (Seng, 1983; Robert and Powers, 1985). David Stanley points out that if
we always use recidivism as a measure, "an offender can be unemployed, ignorant, promiscuous, and drunk but still a success as far as the criminal justice system is concerned if he commits no crime" (1976, p.173).

Whitehead, in his research on the British Probation Service has suggested that probation service must go beyond their "obsession" with reoffending rates and direct attention to other potentially positive aspects of probation work, such as reducing the personal problems of offenders (Whitehead, 1990; Raynor, 1988). Whitehead advocates the use of an alternative tool to assess probation effectiveness: the "Mooney Checklist" (1990, p.210). This checklist allows clients to identify their own problem areas and thus, allow a more appropriate and focused intervention by probation officers. Whitehead suggests that the checklist should be utilized at both before and after the supervision period to assess the impact of service delivery. If the checklist revealed that the intervention of probation officers was helping to reduce the personal and social problems of clients, this information could be related back to both magistrates and judges in their respective meetings with the local service as "...evidence of constructive work with offenders" (Whitehead, 1990, p.210).

There has also been some recent research suggesting that the goal of reducing reoffending is not one which is supported by line level probation staff. Humphrey and Pease's (1992) elicited perceptions of probation
effectiveness from the viewpoint of British probation officers and found that the majority spoke in what the researchers classified as input terms (e.g., number of reports to the Court, number of offenders entrusted by the courts to Probation), as opposed to output (e.g., reduction of criminality). Their research found that only a small minority of interviewees viewed the slowing down of criminal careers as a legitimate basis for measuring their performance. Humphrey and Pease (1992) quotes one probation officer who views his work in these terms:

One of the bottom lines, and everybody laughs at me but I still say it is a good rule of thumb, is how often do they go back to bloody court. If they are going back 12 times, you have got to be saying "What are you doing with them?". I still think it's basic and I know people don't like putting that one out. They either think you are too big headed or unrealistic...but at my other office I kept a log of my work for a long time and I used to keep people out of Court. (p.40)

Harris (1992) is probably one of the few analysts of the probation practice who would support a probation officer's belief in the possibility of creating change in their client's offending. He explains that probation officers have a price to pay for distancing themselves from the offending "failures" of the clients under their purview:

Almost all supervision officers are concerned that they not be held accountable for their clients' misbehaviors; that it be recognized that

61 Humphrey and Pease conducted detailed, semi-structured interviews with 35 criminal justice personnel, of which 27 were probation officers of all grades. Their interviews were lengthy and designed to elicit perceptions of probation effectiveness.
supervision choices are extremely limited and may well be ineffectual. The result is that officers are frequently unsure of their supervision strategies and vacillate widely in their approaches...The alternative—to believe that each officer is in fact responsible for the failures that occur among clients in his or her caseload—is clearly intolerable...Thus the cynical view that clients determine their own outcomes, largely irrespective of probation, develops as a natural consequence of lack of meaningful feedback.

(p.156)

Harris (1992) explains that it is the distancing of probation officers from "failure" that also distances them from "success" and as a consequence "...it often seems that a debilitating sense of professional impotence and purposelessness is seldom far from the surface" (p.157).

Undoubtedly, the controversy over the applicability of recidivism measures to the probation service is a complex issue which will find no resolution in this thesis. Despite the many valid criticisms of relying on recidivism in measuring probation success or failure, it continues to represent an appropriate measurement of the agency performance due to the fact that the probation service continues to espouse the control and reduction of recidivism as one of its goals. Furthermore, there is value in acknowledging recidivism measures from a public policy perspective. Palmer (1989) explains:

While most programs are not designed to focus on areas other than recidivism.... Nevertheless, if the public and its policymakers are to support a program, especially in financially strapped times, they will doubtlessly prefer to see evidence of that program's impact on illegal behavior, not just on educational adjustment or attitudes. Despite what researchers, academicians, and others may say, recidivism cannot be brushed aside, since
the public and its policymakers want correctional interventions to serve not just offender-centered but socially centered goals. In effect, though recidivism may not be "sufficient" because it does not tell the whole story, it can be meaningful and in a real sense necessary. (Palmer cited in Bartollas, 1985, p.25)

Sex Offender Recidivism

The observations that are now being made about the level of sexual offender recidivism differ drastically from those made by in 1956 by Canada’s Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths (McRuer Report): 62

1. Recidivism is not prevalent among the sexual offenders generally.
2. 86 per cent of those persons who have been convicted on one occasion for more sexual offences were not convicted on a second occasion of a sexual offence. (p.70)

Since 1956, however, most academics have come to accept that there is fundamental problem with the utilization of official data sources for recidivism because recidivism rates based on reconviction are likely to underestimate the true rate of sexual reoffending. Many sexual offences go unreported (Furby, et al., 1989) and undetected crime is quite extensive among sex offenders (Groth, et al., 1982).

Marshall and Barrett (1990), explained that many sex offenders are not prosecuted because the victims are too

62The McRuer Report examined statistical data on sex offender recidivism compiled by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police between the years 1913 and 1955. Of the 3,110 persons convicted of sexual offences who records were available to the Commission, 422 offenders (13.6%) were known to have repeated convictions for sexual offences prior to the date of the study.
young to give acceptable evidence or are considered unsatisfactory witnesses for some reason. Other offenders could escape prosecution for their sex crimes because the offender was judged to be of such good character that charges were deemed unnecessary or, in the case of incest, it was felt that charges would do more damage to the family (Marshall and Barrett, 1990).

Marshall and Barbaree (1988) found that reoffence rates based on unofficial sources were 2.5 times higher than reconviction rates. Sexual offenders in the Groth et al. study (1982) reported committing three to four times as many sexual offences than those for which they have been convicted. Marshall and Barrett (1990) report that the rate of repeat offences for 126 child molesters assessed at the Kingston Sexual Behavior Clinic in 1988 was 2.5 times higher than was publicly acknowledged. The official recidivism for this particular group was seventeen percent; the actual rate, almost forty-three percent (Marshall and Barrett, 1990, p.149). Many pedophiles report hundreds of offences for which they were never charged (Abel, et al., 1987).

Romero and Williams (1983) argued that undetected crime is quite extensive among sex offenders and that official data may reveal only a small percentage of the total sexual offences committed. Because of these problems, many researchers have suggested a need for self-report measures when assessing the true recidivist rates of sex offenders.
(Romero and Williams, 1983). Several treatment evaluation studies have subsequently used offender self-report (Abel, et al., 1986; Maletzky, 1980) measures to count recidivism rates.

However, the best source of accurate information about participation in deviant sexual behaviors may not be the offenders themselves. A major factor inhibiting the collection of accurate information from offenders concerning their deviant sexual behaviors is the fear of negative social and legal repercussions because of the lack of assured confidentiality. The offender might perceive the valid reporting of his deviant behavior as likely to increase the probability of arrest, prolong his incarceration or jeopardize his probation or parole status. Furthermore, Canadian law requires the reporting of some sex crimes to the police (e.g. child molestation), which further discourages offender self-report of sex crimes63.

With respect to the recidivism of sex offenders under probation supervision, most of the studies on Canadian probation effectiveness have not addressed this issue in any depth. Rogers (1981) included sex offences under various

63In addition to these problems there has been some recent research which has shown the potential inaccuracies of self-report measures (Horney and Marshall, 1992). Jan Hindman’s (1988) eight year study of sexual offenders at her Oregon clinic clearly showed that when convicted sexual offenders knew they were going to be subjected to polygraph scrutiny and believed there would be a negative consequence (jail) if they were not truthful, they admitted six times as many victims as they had disclosed in self-report.
offence categories which precluded separation of recidivism data for sex offences. The Ontario Probation Officers Association study (1967) found that all four of the sexual offenders in their study were successful. While these researchers acknowledge that the small number of sex offenders makes any conclusions impossible, they nevertheless infer that the results are indicative of the fact that some sex offenders can be successfully rehabilitated (p.82). It is unsure if the researchers are attributing the success rate to a treatment program outside of probation or to some facet of probation supervision itself. Regardless, the small number of sex offenders in this study precludes any serious examination of this finding. In another study on Canadian probation effectiveness, Cockerill (1975), commented on the success rates of different kinds of offenders, including sex offenders. He found that the individuals who were successful were the ones committing fraud, drug offences, and sexual offences. Cockerill (1975) did not provide information as to how many sex offenders were successful probationers or what particular variables might have been influential in their success or failure.

The lack of Canadian research on the recidivism of sex offenders on probation is surprising in light of the increasing numbers of sex offenders on probation and the damage resulting from their offences. By contrast, there has been some research on the effectiveness of parole with sex
offenders. Broadhurst and Maller's (1992) study of 566 Australian sex offenders released from prison over a twelve year period examined the effect of "post-release supervision" (parole). Large differences between those offenders who were paroled and those released directly to freedom were observed. Specifically, the researchers found that sex offenders released on parole took longer to fail than those released without community supervision, which they expected given the additional surveillance and conditions attached to their release. Broadhurst and Maller (1992) concluded that it appears that such supervision simply delays rather than overcomes the risk of failure (p.69). In a previous work on recidivism findings for all prisoners found in the database (Broadhurst and Maller, 1990), paroled prisoners had lower ultimate probabilities of failing and took longer to fail than prisoners released to freedom. According to the researchers, this effect persisted even after controlling for race, previous terms of imprisonment, length of sentence and age (1992, p.69).

Despite the problems and limitations with traditional recidivism measures with sex offenders, a review of some of the more recent studies on sex offender recidivism found that arrest and reconviction data were still employed as the primary evaluative criteria (see Abel, Mittleman, Becker, 1990).

64 The obvious differences between probation and parole, as well as the many variations between criminal justice systems of the two countries, limits the applicability of this research.
Rathner, and Rouleau, 1988; Barbaree and Marshall, 1988; Maletzky, 1990; Rice, Harris and Quinsey, 1989; Romero and Williams, 1985; Sturgeon and Taylor, 1980).

Research Objective: Recidivism

In spite of all the objections, recidivism was chosen as a primary outcome measure due in large part to the significance assigned the measure by the program itself, the status assigned the measure in the discourse on correctional/sex offender program effectiveness and the relative ease of its quantification. Furthermore, the limited resources available for this research precluded measurement of some of the concepts identified by critics of recidivism measures.

The primary research goal was conceptualized as follows:

To determine and compare the recidivism rates of sex offenders who received the intensive probation supervision and services of V.S.S.U with that of sex offenders who received regular probation supervision only.

Hypothesis: Offenders who completed the V.S.S.U. supervision program have lower re-offending rates than those who have completed supervision at regular probation offices.

The specific details surrounding how "recidivism" was defined, operationalized and collected for the purposes of this project is addressed in the Methodology section below.

Measuring "Service Delivery"

The recidivism issue, while a prominent focus of this project, was not the only issue addressed in this research.
Studies in corrections which look solely at outcome measures such as recidivism to determine success are often depicted as "blind" endeavors known as "back box" studies because they typically reveal little with respect to what goes on during the course of the program itself (Roberts and Powers, 1985, p.100). Feldman, Caplinger & Wodarski (1983) explain that "simply knowing that outcomes are high, low, or different does not tell decision makers very much about what to do. What is missing is information about the actual nature of the program being evaluated" (p.124). Thus, one cannot take programs at face value, and some accounting of what actually went on is clearly necessary (Quay, 1977).

Quay (1977) explains:

If counselling is the treatment, one needs to know if counselling sessions were actually held, how well they were attended, and whether or not what went on in the session constituted counselling as specified by the particular model of counseling utilized. These are critical questions, because without generally affirmative answers, there really is no intervention to evaluate. (p.344)

Many evaluations have failed to explore whether or not a minimal level of treatment has been provided to clientele (Wright and Dixon, 1977). Specifically, evaluations of intensive probation supervision have been criticized for not measuring the type and level of services delivered to offenders subjected to intensive and regular probation programs. As a result of this oversight, it is not known whether supervision practices were significantly different for those offenders (Petersilia and Turner, 1990). Further,
it is necessary to examine variations in services because of research which has shown that the mere establishment of smaller caseloads does not guarantee a more intensive level of supervision (Petersilia and Turner, 1990). Clear and Hardyman (1990) and Petersilia and Turner (1990) suggest that intensive levels of supervision may be difficult to achieve in practice: when caseloads are reduced, staff often spend more time attending meetings and engaging in paperwork or other administrative tasks rather than increasing significantly the amount of face-to-face contact they have with their clients.

The consequence of not looking at service delivery practices is revealed in Rothman's (1980) comprehensive examination of the historical origins, proliferation and practices of probation services in the United States. He found both the supervision of offenders and the provision of services to probationers was minimal and in some cases nonexistent, which led him to the conclusion: "Since no services were being provided to the probationer, it is hard to credit a 'success' rate to anything else except a basic ignorance of the probationer's activities" (Rothman, 1980, p.91).

A similar result was found by Byrne and Kelly (1989) who evaluated a Massachusetts intensive probation supervision program for high-risk offenders. The authors concluded that the program model was not fully implemented as designed and only 27.2 percent of the offenders were
supervised in a manner which reflected a high degree of compliance with the original program model (cited in Petersilia and Turner, 1990, p.21).

Without attention to what happens to the clients during their exposure to the program there is no way of knowing what aspects of a program are functionally related to the observed outcomes (Roberts and Powers, 1985, p.100). Thus, Roberts and Powers (1985) explain that efforts to evaluate program effectiveness must emerge from a dual perspective, with attention paid to issues related to both outcome and process (p.99).

The study of service delivery practices in probation is viewed as a basic and necessary component of probation evaluation (Seng, 1983, p.17) primarily because the majority of probation and parole agencies are based on a "...combined model of service and control" (Abadinsky, 1987, p.372). Abadinsky explains that the control component of probation/parole is measured according to the agency's ability to control recidivism (Abadinsky, 1987, p.371). However, the V.S.S.U unit is also based on a service model. Abadinsky (1987) outlines the characteristics of this model and addresses the issue of measuring success:

For those agencies based on a service model, success is measured by the delivery of, or by referral to, services such as education, training, employment, and specialized counselling, and by client-consumer satisfaction and benefit with the level of service. (p.371)
The need to examine service delivery was viewed as particularly important in light of recent evaluations of intensive supervision practices which have found that intensive programs with better access to treatment and job placement programs have better potential for reducing recidivism. Petersilia and Turner’s (1990) recent experimental evaluation of intensive probation supervision programs in the United States found that in all three of the programs evaluated, offenders who received counseling, were employed, paid restitution and did community service had less recidivism. They further commented that because the level of involvement in program services was low, these activities may have had an even greater positive effect on the overall recidivism rate than if a greater proportion of the sample had been involved in rehabilitative activities.

Thus, it appears that high levels of contact are not, in themselves, sufficient to reduce the seriousness or frequency of probationer offending. Effective supervision also requires that services are provided which can meet probationers’ needs (and especially those that are related directly or indirectly, to their offending behavior). There is increasing research in intensive research which suggests that the provision of services to offenders translates into reduced re-offending (Petersilia and Turner, 1990; Whitfield, 1991), and that increasing supervision in and of itself will not reduce recidivism (Petersilia and Turner, 1992). Similarly, there is also speculation in the research
on intensive supervision that the "human element" in intensive supervision is the key to success and "...there is no substitute for substantive face-to-face contact between officer and participant" (Pearson and Harper, 1990, p.85).

The sex offender population may be a particular offender group in which service delivery practices should be paid special attention. After a comprehensive review of 42 sex offender recidivism studies, Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw's (1989) suggest that the environment and opportunities to which sex offenders return seem likely to play a role in recidivism rates. Specifically, they hypothesize that recidivism is likely to be lower when there exists an extensive social service network that includes postrelease support groups, job placement and chemical dependency services (1989, p.6). The researchers suggest that regardless of the theoretical model underlying sexual aggression, it would be helpful if outcome studies of sex offender recidivism included some description of such services actually utilized by the subjects (Furby, et al., 1989, p.6). Furthermore, recent evaluations of intensive Probation supervision find that offenders who receive more services (employment, substance abuse, counseling) have lower re-offending rates (Byrne and Kelly, 1989; Petersilia and Turner, 1990).

A review of the objectives of the V.S.S.U unit revealed evidence of components of Abadinsky's "service model" (reviewed earlier). To reiterate, in their efforts to
achieve protection of society through monitoring and control of offending behavior, the V.S.S.U unit has implemented an intensive supervision program with the following objectives:

1) Monitoring, supervising and restricting offender activities.
2) Promoting sexually appropriate behaviors and supporting/assisting offender initiatives to change their lifestyle.
3) Maintaining an integrated systems approach to monitoring the offender in the community.
4) Active development of a network of persons and agencies involved in the achievements of our goals and shared pertinent information with said persons and agencies.
5) Developing an awareness of offender traits and crime cycles, with persons (significant others, etc.) and agencies (employment, etc.) involved with the sex offender.

Being that the V.S.S.U unit also espoused objectives which involved the delivery of various services to probation clientele (as well as outside agencies), these issues would also require attention in any evaluative exercise. Thus, it was necessary to examine the extent and integrity of services to determine whether the intensive interventions were implemented and delivered to the clientele. As pointed out by Turner and Petersilia (1992), there is little point in being concerned with impact or outcome of the intensive supervision project unless it did, indeed, take place and did serve the appropriate participants in the way intended (p. 42).

In order to achieve the primary research goal stated earlier, that is, to determine and compare the supervision, monitoring and referral to service practices between the
regular and V.S.S.U. probation office, a specific hypothesis and two research objectives were developed:

**Hypothesis:** Offenders reporting to V.S.S.U. receive greater surveillance and services than the offenders on regular probation.

**Research Objective #1**
*Description of offenders who participated in the V.S.S.U. and regular probation programs.*
Assessments of intensive probation supervision should include detailed descriptions of program participants if possible since the kinds of offenders placed in the programs affects ultimate outcomes (Petersilia and Turner, 1990).

**Research Objective #2**
*Description of the nature and extent of services delivered in the V.S.S.U. and regular probation programs. Specifically, is V.S.S.U. delivering the services outlined in its program manual?*
As outlined earlier, there has been much criticism in the literature that program evaluations do not address whether or not services or delivered (Petersilia and Turner, 1990).

Specific issues surrounding how service delivery practices were measured are addressed below.
METHODOLOGY

Sample Selection

It was not feasible to design this study in accordance with a pure experimental model, since this would have required random allocation of probationers to V.S.S.U. and regular probation offices for supervision. This would have been ethically and professionally unacceptable to practitioners and also very difficult to implement, since it would have involved persuading sentencers simultaneously to use an innovative project and, having identified suitable offenders, not to use it for half of them.

A simple random sample design was utilized for sample selection purposes. As there were multiple steps involved in the selection of study participants, a chronological presentation of events is provided.

First, a complete list of the population of provincial sex offenders (n=1390) "discharged" by B.C. probation offices during the period April 1, 1988 through March 31, 1990, was obtained from the Ministry of Attorney General Support Services Branch in Victoria, B.C..

The time frame for the sample selection was chosen for reasons relating to the opening of the V.S.S.U unit and follow-up period considerations. As the V.S.S.U unit had

65 In the majority of circumstances the reason for discharge was due to the expiry of the court ordered supervisory period. There were a few instances, however, when an offender was classified as discharged from supervision due to re-incarceration, early probation termination, or transfer of supervision to a jurisdiction outside of British Columbia.
opened in March, 1987 and it was felt that at least one completed year of supervision would be the minimal acceptable for inclusion in the sample. It should be noted, however, that the specialized interventions were employed "informally" for a period of time before the formal introduction of the V.S.S.U unit in March of 1987. As such, those offenders whose orders expired in the year of 1988 and were randomly chosen for inclusion in the sample population were probably exposed to the project for a longer term (that is, if the probation order was longer than one year). Further, the logic behind choosing the date of March 31, 1990 as the cut off point for sample inclusion, was to allow for a sufficient follow-up period for the project's recidivism measures.

In addition to providing an identification number for each offender\textsuperscript{66}, the listing obtained from the Attorney General provided additional sources of information which were of use for stratifying the population.

From the total list of sex offenders, the individuals who had been discharged from bail supervision were eliminated because of the study's focus on probation discharges. Further, those probationers who were discharged from probation offices outside of the Metro and Fraser

\textsuperscript{66}This identification number is known in B.C. Corrections as a correctional service (C.S.) number. A C.S. number is an individualized identity number which follows an individual offender as he/she travels through the provincial correctional system.
Region were also excluded. This was necessary as it was felt that there should be some effort to control for the environment in which the offender received supervision. Specifically, the nature of supervision might be vastly different in a rural northern community due to any number of factors such as the minimal number of offenders supervised, lack of resources, and decreased offender anonymity. Furthermore, the selection of offices in the Metro and Fraser regions facilitated easier data collection for the researcher. Financial resources for this study were limited and did not include a travel allowance.

Of the remaining probation cases, fifty cases were randomly selected from those discharged from V.S.S.U. and fifty were randomly selected from those discharged from other Metro and Fraser Region probation offices. While a larger sample would have been preferable, allowing for greater statistical power, this was not possible due to limited resources.

The selected probation files were then accessed by the researcher for coding.

**Measurements: Recidivism and Service Delivery Practices**

**Recidivism: Definition, Operationalization, Measurement**

For purposes of this exercise, recidivism was defined as the conviction of the offender for any Criminal Code...
offence (sex offence or other) which occurred either during the supervisory period and/or during the follow-up period 68

Recidivism data were broken down for each offender by the type of offence for which the individual was convicted. While recidivism was defined as conviction for any offence, the nature of the correctional population in question dictates that a conviction for a sexual offence would be information of greatest interest. Furthermore, the collection of specific recidivism data was undertaken due to research which suggested that research on the success of rehabilitative efforts should be more sensitive to the different levels of seriousness in future law-breaking behavior (Roberg and Webb, 1981; Palmer, 1978). According to Roberg and Webb (1981), "dichotomizing behavior into law breaking or nonlawbreaking is an oversimplistic measure against which to judge the validity of treatment efforts" (p.366).

The following categorical recidivism information was gathered for each offender:

1) Conviction for Sex Offence
2) Conviction for Offence other than Sex Offence

68 The researcher originally intended to define recidivism in terms of both re-arrests as well as convictions due to the Maltz's (1984) arguments on the practicality of defining recidivism in terms of arrest data and the research suggesting that the use of arrest data was crucial with sex offenders (Romero and Williams, 1983). The collection of arrest data was not possible study due to limited resources.
For each of the above areas, the following details were collected:

1) Date of Conviction
2) Description of Offence (Criminal Code Categorization)
3) Disposition of Offence: Days sentenced in jail, fine, community work service, days of probation.

Sources of Information on Recidivism

Definitions of recidivism must also outline the measurement source for recidivism data. Should the researcher utilize official data sources (e.g. arrest records, convictions history, corrections history) or self-report measures, or some combination of the two. There has been considerable controversy surrounding the use of recidivism measures as well as the impact of different ways of operationalizing recidivism on research results.69, 70

The recidivism data for the present study were drawn from official records. Of course, these records are subject to the frequently documented limitations commonly associated with official measures of crime (Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1987; Maltz, 1984).

69Murry and Cox (1979) and Lundman (1986) have discussed the impact of different ways of operationizing recidivism on research results; cessation measures (any offence equals failure) increase the probability of "nothing works" conclusions while suppression measures (less criminality after treatment equals success) tend to generate more optimistic conclusions (in Cohen & Eden, 1991:264).

70See Maltz (1984) for a thorough outline of problems of definition, measurement and analysis of the recidivism measure in the correctional realm.
As official statistics permit some latitude in definition, there were four specific sources reviewed for recidivism data collection. The researcher felt it necessary to use a variety of sources in the collection of recidivism data due to limits in the reliability of each data source. Some of the criticism directed at studies of sex offender recidivism which rely on official records surrounds the fact that the thoroughness of the search of official records leaves much to be desired (Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw, 1989, p.21). As a result, Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw (1989) suggest that recidivism information based on multiple sources is likely to be more valid than that based on only a single source (p.8). Furthermore, McCleery's (1977) observation that the very process of creating and keeping records in the criminal justice context invites distortions, no matter how quantifiable the indicators which are used, was influential in the researcher's decision to employ numerous sources. Therefore, data were obtained from the following sources:

**Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC)**

CPIC data is a central identification/criminal records system which is the responsibility of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Identification Services. Most criminal justice agencies in Canada utilize CPIC data for determining the criminal conviction history of an individual. CPIC data does not document arrest history.
A request for search of the subject's criminal record was made for each selected offender in the study and the completed information was sent to the North East Probation Office for review. As with all official statistics, there can be inaccuracies in CPIC data.

One of the more critical problems with relying on CPIC data for criminal records information is that there is always the possibility that the record requested by the researcher does not pertain to the subject of enquiry. Positive identification of an individual can only be confirmed through submission of fingerprints. To increase the probability that the record returned was indeed the subject of enquiry, all attempts were made to complete the "Request for Search" form completely and accurately. This form requested specific offender information such as full offender name, aliases, birth date, birthplace, driver's licence number and address. The probation file was thoroughly canvassed to search for this information and under most circumstances it was provided.

British Columbia Corrections Case History Print Out.

Provincial correctional personnel in the B.C. system have ready access to this computer generated information on offence issues such as sentencing court and date of disposition, type of disposition (e.g. jail, community work service, probation term) and length of disposition. This print out also provides information concerning offender's specific movements through the system (e.g. release dates
from dispositional sanctions). While this information in no way represents the criminal record of an offender\textsuperscript{71}, it can prove useful in that it may document criminal convictions for which the CPIC data base has no record.

A significant problem was found with the accuracy of CPIC data, which further highlighted the need for the employment of some sort of "cross-checking" measures for criminal convictions information. Out of the 82 probation files which formed the sample for the study, eight of these offenders on probation were deemed by CPIC to have no criminal record. A further four probationers were found to have been convicted of criminal offences which were not recorded on CPIC data. The researcher normally found evidence of the conviction occurring because of the presence of documents in the file which were proof of conviction (e.g. probation order). Of course, fingerprint information was not made available to CPIC by the researcher so this could be part of the problem with data inaccuracies.

Probation File

Many probation files had documentation of both arrests and criminal convictions of the offenders under their supervision. The probation officer normally learned of an offender arrest or conviction due to the self-report of the

\textsuperscript{71}Many inadequacies of this measure prohibit its use as a criminal record history. One of the most significant limitations being the fact that the corrections case history does not document conviction information outside of the province of B.C.
offender or due to the subject's release from jail on bail supervision. On occasion, probation officers would receive information concerning arrests from the police department. This practice, however, was rare. There is no formal duty on the part of the police to inform the supervising probation office of an arrest of an offender under their supervision.

Local Police Record

Most probation files had a copy of a local police record (usually Vancouver Police Department) in the file. When this record was available to the researcher, it was utilized as a fourth source to confirm convictions information. No effort was made to request this information if it was not available in the probation file, however.

Follow-Up Period

In addition to defining recidivism, there must be specification of a follow-up time period during which commission of an act will constitute a relapse or reoffence. Bartollas (1985) elaborates on this point:

Does this time period commence when treatment begins and thus include a treatment period...does it commence only after expiration of parole and/or probation (and thus not include the parole period)...or is the follow-up period relatively short (ie. a few months or years), or is it quite long (ie. several decades) (p.8).

Within what time period should recidivism be counted is an important and increasingly controversial theoretical question when it is the sex offender population which is at
issue. How long will the probation agency retain (statistical) responsibility for the success or failure of a client who has completed a specialized program or treatment, a year, life? For example, suppose a 20 year old probationer (convicted of a sex offence) fulfills his probation term and is freed of all obligations to the Court. Suppose this 20 year old refrains from crime for 30 years. At age 50, the ex sex-offender shoplifts and is apprehended and convicted. Should the now 50 year old shoplifter be classified as recidivist? Is the probation program a "failure" because a new crime was committed 30 years later? As has been found in numerous studies, the longer the follow-up period, the greater the probability of a person being re-arrested and included among the recidivists.

A review of some of the more recent North American studies on sex offender treatment found many studies with no follow-up period, and some with follow-up periods ranging from a few months to 23 years\(^{72}\). There is wide discrepancy in the literature as to what represents an appropriate follow-up period in examinations of sex offender recidivism. Soothill, et al. (1976) in their examination of rapists, concluded that the follow up period should be long enough to allow the individual to return to crime, a minimum of 5 years. In making this recommendation, Soothill speculated

\(^{72}\) See Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw (1989) and McGrath (1991) for a review of the follow-up periods used in sex offender recidivism studies.
that the urge to commit sexual offences probably occurs at longer intervals, than the urge to commit property offences. He suggested "that the unduly aggressive and sexually maladjusted have a long lasting Achilles heel normally held in check by compensatory satisfactions or pressures, but liable to reemerge in times of stress" (p.66). Similarly, Romero and Williams' (1983) evaluation of intensive probation supervision and group psychotherapy on sex offence recidivism rates for sex offenders employed a 10 year follow-up period. The researchers believed that a long-term follow-up is crucial for effective evaluation of programs, for it allows an individual an extended time span to commit and be apprehended for any new offence (p.38). More recent studies on sex offender recidivism have also suggested that a long follow-up period is required. Furby, et al., (1989) observed that many studies on sex offender recidivism lacked a sufficient follow-up period. They recommended that studies have a minimum of ten years of follow up "until we are able to accurately project long term recidivism from short term data" and the "shape of the recidivism function can be scrutinized" (Furby, et al., 1989, p.27). Broadhurst and Maller (1992) followed 566 Australian sex offenders for up to twelve years, stating that short follow-up periods will significantly under-count the recidivism of sex offenders (p.72).

Several studies have addressed the problem of an inadequate follow up period (Soothill and Gibbens, 1978).
Some studies have attempted to utilize failure or survival rate analysis with the belief that its efficient use of data renders fixed follow-up time unnecessary (Broadhurst and Maller, 1992). Broadhurst and Maller attempt the application of failure rate analysis to a large data set, but when the population of sex offenders is broken down by key factors such as age, race and prior record, this imposed limitations on the full exploitation of the method.

While many researchers criticize the length and method of gathering follow-up data on sex offender recidivism, it should be pointed out that many sex offender treatment programs do not have any systematic follow-up data on which to base judgements of effectiveness. Thus, the presence of any follow-up data is most informative. Specifically, J.S. Wormith and R. Karl Hanson (1990) surveyed 22 Canadian sex offender treatment programs as part of a larger exercise aimed at providing direction to federal authorities for the systematic management and treatment of sexual offenders (Canada, 1990). Twenty-six treatment settings across Canada were recruited for inclusion in the review from working group member’s knowledge of existing programs73. The survey found that with few exceptions (Sexual Behavior Clinic in Kingston, Ontario and Regional Psychiatric Centre in

73 The setting of the research, although not randomly selected, represented a wide cross-section of locations including institutions and community clinics, mental health and correctional centres, large professional facilities and small grass roots organizations, as well as both new and well established programs.
Saskatoon) most programs lacked any systematic follow-up data on which to base their judgements concerning effectiveness (p. 30).

Studies of probation effectiveness were also reviewed to review what length of follow-up have been utilized. In reviewing the Canadian studies on probation effectiveness, Cockerill (1975) did not specifically define the follow up period utilized, the Ontario Probation Officers' Association used a follow-up period of three years after probation termination, Rogers (1981) defined their follow-up period as two years after probation termination. These studies did not address issues as to why these specific time periods were chosen in their studies.

For purposes of this research project, the follow up period referred to the time elapsed from the date the offender was first at risk until the last follow-up information was received concerning criminal convictions. Probationers were considered to be at risk when they either began their probation order or when they were released from a correctional institution. In several cases, offenders had

74 Cockerill (1975) computed recidivism rates for probationers whose probation terminated sometime between January 1, 1967 to December 31, 1971. No average follow-up period was defined by the researcher.

75 CPIC data was received between November 1992 to January 1993. The large number of CPIC printouts, in conjunction with the low overall priority of this request for information (for obvious reasons immediate requests for CPIC data by justice agencies for arrest/court purposes were fulfilled first), meant that the entry of data by CPIC personnel was "staggered" over several months.
been released from a correctional facility to parole supervision. In these instances, the follow-up period began after expiration of parole supervision. The average follow-up period for each offender was 40 months for V.S.S.U. probationers and 41 months for regular probation participants. This was not a statistically significant difference.

Technical Violations

Information concerning technical violations of the probation order was also collected for subsequent analysis. This information, however, was not considered as evidence of offender recidivism for purposes of this project. Technical violations of probation (such as failing to maintain regular employment or failing to participate in drug, alcohol, or mental health treatment programs) are too often closely related to the nature of the intervention program (small case loads, specialized case loads, intensive case loads) rather than to the character of the individual participant's behavior (Smykla, 1984, p.306). Similarly, Champion (1988) describes the use of probation revocations as an inadequate measure of recidivism, because these may be based upon rule violations as simple as missing "curfew" by ten minutes or some other minor infraction unrelated to crime (p.99). As well, there has been some recent research which has questioned the emphasis which intensive probation programs have placed on the technical violations of participants. Specifically, Petersilia and Turner's (1990) study of
offenders participating in intensive probation supervision programs found that those offenders who had technical violations were no more likely to have new arrests than those who did not (p.103).

Nevertheless, information concerning probation violations was viewed as being important for ascertaining potential differences between the two probation programs on the following issues:

1) type of technical violations (e.g. periods of non-reporting, not attending court ordered counselling, etc.).
2) probation officer recognition and response to technical violation (e.g. breach filed, discussion with the offender, increased reporting to the office, or disregard of the violation and no action taken).

Evidence of probation violations in this study was defined in two ways:

(1) Written documentation of violations by the probation officer (which may or may not have resulted in the submission of a breach of probation report to crown counsel).

(2) Evidence of probation violations through a comparison of the offender’s probation order with the probation officer’s adherence to the Order. An example of a probation violation would be an Order which required an offender’s participation in counselling but file information documented that the officer either ignored the condition or chose not to refer for counselling.

Procedures

Five data forms were completed for each offender, with each form taking anywhere from half an hour to two hours to complete. The reasons for the varying completion times related to the differences in organization of probation
files, dissemination of information, and the complexity and number of documents. In some cases probation officer records were handwritten and this further increased the time required for transfer of information to the data forms.

The contents of individual offender probation files represented the primary source of information. For recidivism data external sources were utilized (see above). This procedure was consistent with various other evaluations of intensive practices in probation and parole (Petersilia and Turner, 1990; Turner and Petersilia, 1992).

Most probation files contained the following sources of information:

1. Police report(s) to crown counsel
2. Pre-sentence report(s)
3. Corrections case history print out
4. Psychological/psychiatric assessments/reports from Forensic Psychiatric Services or offender's private psychiatrist/psychologist
5. Police interview with offender
6. Police interview with witness(s)
7. Police interview with victim(s)
8. Probation officer file entry information which concerned offender characteristics, management and supervision practices.
9. Sentence management reports/classification reports from custodial facilities
10. Offender's reference letters

V.S.S.U probation files usually contained documents not found in regular probation files (e.g. outline of relapse prevention plan, plan to live by, excerpts from offender diary, persons "checked" bulletins from police agency, etc...).

Throughout the data collection process, the consistency of information (especially within regular probation files)
was found to be a significant problem. Some probation files did not contain the most critical pieces of information such as a police report outlining the circumstances of the offence, or documentation of offender characteristics such as place of employment or residence. Nevertheless, for each individual file, available information sources were thoroughly scrutinized then coded\textsuperscript{76} for subsequent analysis purposes.

Decisions surrounding the nature of the data gathering instruments began with a review of the literature on probation evaluation in general and intensive probation supervision in particular (see Chapter 2). In addition to gathering information on subject's personal and social characteristics and recidivism information, an equal effort was spent collecting information which would shed light on the integrity of service delivery in the two probation practices.

The five data code sheets utilized for this research endeavor as well as the guiding codebook are found in the appendices. Briefly, the five forms covered the following areas:

\textbf{Offender Description}

This form was used to record offender characteristics, including various demographic characteristics such as

\textsuperscript{76} Hagan (1989) defines coding as "the assignment of numerical values to responses or information gathered by a research instrument" (p.263).
education/employment history, social relations history, family history, physical and mental health history, and sexual and substance abuse history. This information was expected to be useful for answering questions concerning the characteristics of offenders placed in the V.S.S.U. program that might have influenced ultimate outcomes. Further, many of these demographic characteristics have been found to be empirically or theoretically linked to recidivism. As well, detailed offender descriptions might also offer some information on what type of offender responded best to either probation regime.

Current Offence Description

This form collected information concerning the legal description and disposition of the offence for which the offender was on probation. Of course, all offenders in this study received a period of probation which varied in length (6 months to the three year maximum term). The probationary term was rendered either solely or in conjunction with other dispositions (e.g. jail/fine/community work service). The length of the Order, as well as the specific conditions attached were documented. Specific characteristics surrounding the offence and the victim(s) were also collected.

Past Offence History

Both prior sexual and non-sexual offence convictions were documented for each offender along with the date of conviction and criminal code categorization.
Probation Supervision Period

Information on supervision, referral and adherence practices on each offender during the offender's period of probationary supervision was collected. The following areas were recorded:

(1) Frequency of Reporting Practices (face-to-face visits, home visitations, phone contacts) and nature of reporting practice (in person attendance, both in person and telephone attendance, sign-in practice) by probation officers throughout the supervisory period.

(2) Type and Frequency of "Monitoring Checks" (including law enforcement checks, alcohol/drug testing checks, employment verification checks, counselling verification checks, contact with spouse/significant other) by probation officers throughout the supervisory period.

(3) Participation in Counselling/Treatment. This section addressed whether the offender was receiving psychological/psychiatric services and if so, what type of service and how frequently. For offenders attending V.S.S.U., information regarding their participation in the group management program was collected.

(4) Offender Participation in Educational/Vocational Training. This section addressed whether the offender had been referred or was attending a program of this nature.

(5) Attendance Record and Reporting Practices. This section gathered information on the offender's attitude towards reporting to the probation office and the reporting requirement to the probation office (e.g. once weekly, twice weekly, etc.). The pattern of the offender's reporting was addressed (e.g. perfect compliance, irregular reporter, etc.), as well as whether the reporting was interrupted and why. For example, was an offender transferred to another office during the supervisory period, returned to custody, or interrupted by work obligations.

(6) Recidivism and Technical Violations during the supervisory period.

(7) File Contents Information. Did the probation file contain a police report, victim statement, psychiatric assessment, pre-sentence report, letters of reference, etc...
Recidivism

Information on new arrests/convictions during the follow-up period of probation supervision was collected with this instrument. Legal categorizations for each new offence/arrest were documented, as well, the source of the recidivism information (e.g. CPIC data, probation file record, probation computer system, local police record) was documented.
RESULTS

This chapter is devoted to the presentation of the study's numerous findings. Following a detailed description of the probation participants in both the V.S.S.U. and regular probation groups, an examination of various service delivery practices will be undertaken. Specific attention will be paid to whether or not the two probation practices differed in the type and level of services provided to the probationers. As well, this section will examine whether or not the V.S.S.U. program is providing the level and type of service expected by program management.

The second part of the results section will be devoted to discussion of the evaluation results relating to the primary outcome variable of this evaluation: re-offending. Specifically, the recidivism of the probationers, both within the supervision period and during the follow-up period will be compared and examined.

Description of the Study Participants

As outlined earlier, assessments of a program's effectiveness must include detailed descriptions of the participants, since the kinds of offenders placed in programs impact on the outcome. This type of exploration is particularly crucial in this case where random assignment to the different probation practices was not possible. Specifically, this is important because the observed differences in the primary outcome measure (officially measured recidivism) might be due to the fact that the two
groups were not equivalent in the first place. This was a particularly strong possibility in that the V.S.S.U. unit actively encouraged the referral of what might represent more "serious" offenders (e.g. those with mental health needs, sex offences characterized by violence, etc.)\textsuperscript{77}.

While the data instrument utilized allowed for collection of numerous offender characteristics for subsequent comparison, the possibility must be acknowledged that the two offender groups differed on other significant characteristics which were either not addressed or overlooked by the researcher.

Prior to discussing specific characteristics of the subjects, however, it should be acknowledged that eighteen (18) of the randomly selected cases were subsequently eliminated from inclusion in the final sample for data analysis. The final sample size for analysis was 43 V.S.S.U. cases and 39 regular cases. The reasons for case exclusions are outlined below:

1. **Lost files:** Three probation files could not be located for coding purposes.

2. **Offender deaths:** Two probationers were excluded because they died early in their supervision period.

3. **Immediate transfers:** Four probationers transferred out of the province shortly after the beginning of their probation orders. In all cases the offender had been

\textsuperscript{77}See V.S.S.U. referral form in the Appendix of this report for further details surrounding appropriate referral characteristics.
supervised for less than five months at either the regular or V.S.S.U office.

4) Too many transfers between offices: Four files were excluded from the sample because of numerous transfers between offices. In two cases there were transfers back and forth between a regular probation office and the V.S.S.U office. This state of affairs was particularly inappropriate due to the possibility of contamination of the "treatment" effect. It should be noted, however, that there were cases which were transferred from a regular probation office to the V.S.S.U office were included in the final sample. In these cases, however, the probationer was either immediately referred to the V.S.S.U office after reporting initially to the regular probation office, or was transferred within a short period of time. The data collected on each probation case documented whether or not there were transfers between offices, and if so, how long an individual was supervised at one office.

5) Transfer from an out-of-province probation office: Two probationers were "courtesy supervision" cases from other provinces. While this in and of itself was not problematic, the fact that these cases transferred to the probation office after completing a substantive period of supervision at their home office was the issue of concern.

6) Not a sexual assault: One of the probation files selected was not a sexual offence, but an assault of a
police constable. This finding was evidence of the presence of inaccuracies in the original offender list.

(8) **No information in probation file:** One probation file was excluded because of the absence of information in the probation file. The file included a probation order only. No written records or other information could be located on this individual.

(8) **No supervision required by the probation order.** One probation file was excluded because there was no condition for the offender to report to probation services.

The amount of information that could potentially be recorded on the five forms and subsequently used to describe the client population of the regular and V.S.S.U. program was extensive. Accordingly some selectivity in reporting is necessary. Table 3 contains frequency distributions on the following variables: total sample, sex, age, birthplace, racial origin, parenting history, siblings, Ministry of Social Services familial involvement, parental physical abuse and abuse of alcohol and/or drugs, school grade completed, post secondary education, relationship history, number of dependant children and history of mental illness or alcohol/drug abuse.

**Demographic Characteristics**

With regard to demographic characteristics outlined in Table 3, the two samples were not different in terms of central tendency on several characteristics: sex (all male), mean age (52), last known school grade completed (Grade 10),
majority were born in British Columbia (51% of V.S.S.U. and 53.8% of regular), and the level of Social Services involvement through the offender's childhood (16.5% of V.S.S.U. and 15.4% of regular). Further, the majority of offenders were Caucasian (76.7% at V.S.S.U. and 87.2% of regular), most grew up in a home characterized by the presence of both a mother and father (60.5% of V.S.S.U. and 56.4% of regular), with an average of four siblings, and roughly one third of V.S.S.U. and regular probationers experienced some post secondary education (e.g. college/ university/vocational training).

Although there were greater differences on the number of dependent children, relationship history, prior physical and sexual abuse, alcohol abuse history, and adult/youth mental health history, these were not statistically significant.

Overall, only three differences surfaced. Specifically, a significant difference was observed in the father's abuse of alcohol/drugs, with the V.S.S.U. offenders experiencing a greater incidence of father abuse of alcohol/drugs (Chi~²=7.21, p<.007). Further, V.S.S.U. offenders appear to have suffered a higher incidence of physical abuse by their father (Chi~²=3.10, p<.08). Thirdly, more V.S.S.U. offenders were found to have a prior history of drug abuse (Chi~²=3.95, p<.05).
Selected Characteristics during Supervision Period

Referring to Table 4, it is evident that there were no observed significant differences at the .05 level of probability between the V.S.S.U. and regular probationers on the following characteristics: source of income, frequency of employment, marital status, spouse/significant other involvement in supervision, contact with family members, and alcohol/drug problems through supervision. Generally speaking, the majority of offenders in both probation practices were employed during the supervisory period, were single, and more offenders in both groups were documented as experiencing an alcohol problem as opposed to a drug problem throughout the supervisory period.
Table 3

Description of the Probationers
Selected Characteristics of Participating Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>43 cases</td>
<td>39 cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of Offender</strong></td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birthplace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(British Columbia)</td>
<td>51.0 (22/41)</td>
<td>53.8 (21/38)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>76.7 (33)</td>
<td>87.2 (34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Indian</td>
<td>9.0 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>7.7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Number of cases in parentheses.
### Table 3 (con't)

Description of the Probationers
Selected Characteristics of Participating Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenting History</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43 (26)</td>
<td>39 (22)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and Father</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother only</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father only</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and companion</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father and companion</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family member</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Home</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Home</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Reform School /Maples)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2Number of cases in parentheses.
### Table 3 (con’t)

**Description of the Probationers**

**Selected Characteristics of Participating Offenders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Siblings in Offender’s Family</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>27.9 (12)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>16.3 (7)</td>
<td>20.5 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>17.9 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>12.8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>23.1 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3Number of cases in parentheses.
### Table 3 (con't)

**Description of the Probationers**  
**Selected Characteristics of Participating Offenders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Services Involvement in Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father abuses Alcohol/Drugs</td>
<td>46.4 (13/28)</td>
<td>10.0 (2/20)</td>
<td>ChiSq=7.21, p&lt;.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother abuses Alcohol/Drugs</td>
<td>25.0 (7/28)</td>
<td>9.5 (2/21)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Physically Abusive</td>
<td>37.0 (10/27)</td>
<td>14.0 (3/21)</td>
<td>ChiSq=3.10, p&lt;.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Physically Abusive</td>
<td>7.0 (2/28)</td>
<td>4.8 (1/21)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Sexually Abused</td>
<td>58.6 (14/29)</td>
<td>34.8 (2/23)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4Number of cases in parentheses.
Table 3 (con't)

Description of the Probationers
Selected Characteristics of Participating Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Last School Grade Completed</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some Post Secondary Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.6 (14/43)</td>
<td>28.0 (11/33)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship History</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more marriages/common law</td>
<td>58.1 (25)</td>
<td>30.8 (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable marriage</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td>17.9 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but no marriage (heterosexual)</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term relationships (homosexual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual relationships (heterosexual)</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>7.1 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual relationships (both sexes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal sexual or social interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in either sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in relationship but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too shy to establish</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>25.6 (11)</td>
<td>n/a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5Number of cases in parentheses.
Table 3 (con't)

Description of the Probationers
Selected Characteristics of Participating Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependant Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21/43</td>
<td>19/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22/43</td>
<td>16/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Alcohol Abuse Problem</td>
<td>47.6 (20/42)</td>
<td>45.2 (14/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Drug Abuse Problem</td>
<td>19.1 (8/42)</td>
<td>3.3 (1/30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined History of Drug/Alcohol</td>
<td>19.5 (8/40)</td>
<td>10.3 (3/29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Professionally Diagnosed Mental Illness (Youth)</td>
<td>7.0 (3/39)</td>
<td>10.3 (4/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Professionally Diagnosed Mental Illness (Adult)</td>
<td>9.4 (4/39)</td>
<td>23.1 (9/21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6Number of cases in parentheses.
Table 4

Description of Offender Through Supervision Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>79.1 (34)</td>
<td>72.0 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.I.</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time stable</td>
<td>32.6 (13)</td>
<td>46.2 (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time stable</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporadic &quot;on-call&quot;</td>
<td>18.6 (8)</td>
<td>12.8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous positions</td>
<td>25.6 (11)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>18.0 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common-law</td>
<td>14.0 (6)</td>
<td>7.7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>14.0 (6)</td>
<td>12.8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>46.5 (20)</td>
<td>48.7 (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>15.4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of Offender Through Supervision Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact with Family Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ per months</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-monthly contact</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td>7.7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times yearly</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular contact</td>
<td>14.0 (6)</td>
<td>25.6 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives w/family</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>12.8 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>32.6 (14)</td>
<td>35.9 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documented Alcohol Problem through Supervision</strong></td>
<td>11.6 (5/41)</td>
<td>17.9 (7/29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documented Drug Problem through Supervision</strong></td>
<td>2.3 (1/41)</td>
<td>2.6 (1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documented Combined Drug/Alcohol Problem</strong></td>
<td>2.3 (1/41)</td>
<td>2.6 (1/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referral to Alcohol/Drug Counselling</strong></td>
<td>9.3 (4/43)</td>
<td>5.1 (2/35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Past Offence History

With respect to previous sex offence convictions, Table 5 documents that there were no significant differences observed between the V.S.S.U. and regular probationers. Specifically, 15.4% or 6 clients reporting to regular probation offices had prior convictions for sex offences, with five of these probationers showing convictions for exhibitionism. Only one offender of this group had a previous sexual assault conviction.

Of those reporting to the V.S.S.U. unit, only three or 7% had prior convictions for sex offences. Of these cases, two were convictions for sexual assault and one for exhibitionism.

There were no dramatic differences viewed between the two probation groups as far as non-sex offence convictions were concerned. Out of the 43 V.S.S.U. cases, 15 probationers or 34.9% of the sample had prior non-sex offence convictions. Out of the 39 regular probationers sampled, 13 or 33.3% of the probationers had prior non-sex offence convictions. For a breakdown of the nature of non-sex offence convictions the reader is referred to Table 5.

---

78 All information concerning prior convictions relied on official sources; C.P.I.C., probation computer and probation file documentation.
Table 5

Past Offence History of Probationers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Stat. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Sex Offence Convictions</td>
<td>7.0 (3/43)</td>
<td>15.4 (6/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Previous Sex Offence Convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>2 cases</td>
<td>1 case</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing (Exhibitionism)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Non-Sex Offence Convictions</td>
<td>34.9 (15/43)</td>
<td>33.3 (13/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Non-Sex Offence Convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of narcotic</td>
<td>4 cases</td>
<td>1 case</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault (common)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischief</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilful damage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft under $50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive while licence suspended</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft under $200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain lodging by fraud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False pretences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to appear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft under $1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape lawful custody</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft auto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss. stolen property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud under $2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss. stolen credit card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud under 1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (con't)

Past Offence History of Probationers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Stat. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault causing bodily harm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterfeit money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault police constable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession house breaking tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Offence Characteristics

As can be seen in Table 6, the majority of offenders reporting to either V.S.S.U. or regular probation offices had been convicted of Level I sexual assaults, which represents the least serious of the sexual assault categories. Specifically, 76.7% (33) offenders at the V.S.S.U. unit and 64.1% (25) offenders at regular probation offices were convicted of these assaults. This result was not surprising being that the vast majority of reports to police are classified as Level I (the "least serious" category) (Department of Justice, 1991).

The next most frequent sexual offence conviction found within the two probation groups was that of exhibitionism, with 16.3% (7) of the V.S.S.U. offenders and 23.1% (9) offenders of regular probationers falling into this category.

The offenders reporting to either probation practice were also similar on other offence characteristics. Namely, the average age of offenders at the time of commission of the offence was equivalent between groups (32). Further, the majority of V.S.S.U. and regular probation clients were convicted of an offence with one named female victim. Only a

79. The Criminal Code of Canada includes a trilogy of sexual assault offences: sexual assault (s.271, Level I); sexual assault with a weapon, threats to a third party or bodily harm (s.272, Level II), and aggravated sexual assault (s.272, Level III). The maximum penalties are, respectively: 10 years, 14 years and life imprisonment.

80. Section 173 (1) (2) of the Criminal Code relate to the offence of exposure.
minority of cases in both groups were convicted of offences which involved a male victim (3 of 43 cases at V.S.S.U. and 5 of 31 cases at regular).

The offenders reporting at the V.S.S.U unit, however, appear to have been convicted of sexual assaults of a more serious nature. As seen in Table 6, of the 43 offenders sampled at V.S.S.U., 30 of these offenders had received a combined disposition of incarceration and probation. By contrast, only 18 of the 39 offenders reporting to regular probation offices had received a period of incarceration in addition to probation (ChiSq=4.70,p<.04). Further, of the 30 V.S.S.U. offenders receiving a custodial term, 12 of these served their sentence at Stave Lake Correctional Centre. Only one regular case was documented as serving a custodial sentence at Stave Lake. The greater frequency of ex-Stave Lake inmates reporting to V.S.S.U. was expected in light of V.S.S.U's liaison role with that institution.

There was also a statistical difference in the average length of custodial terms received by offenders reporting to either practice. Specifically, V.S.S.U. offenders received a custodial sentence which averaged 425 days, while those reporting to regular offices averaged a custodial sentence of only 163 days (t=2.16,p<.04).

---

81 Stave Lake Correctional Centre is a provincial custodial facility for offenders serving sentences of two years less a day. Stave Lake has developed into a "specialized" custodial facility for sex offenders where treatment is offered in-house.
A statistical difference (ChiSq=4.24, p<.04) was seen when comparing the two groups on the variable of vaginal penetration. The data indicated that 16 of the 43 cases at V.S.S.U. had been convicted of an offence which involved various forms of vaginal penetration. By contrast, only 5 of the 39 cases at regular probation were found to possess this offence characteristic.

Furthermore, the difference between the ages of the victims was significant, indicating that more V.S.S.U. offenders had sexually assaulted children. Offenders at the V.S.S.U. unit were convicted of offences involving a mean victim age of 12.82, while those reporting to regular offices were characterized by a mean victim age of 19.88 (t=-2.25, p<.03).

82"Forms" of vaginal penetration included penetration with penis, digitally, or with a foreign object.
### Table 6
Current Offence Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Current Offence</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>76.7 (33)</td>
<td>64.1 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>16.3 (7)</td>
<td>23.1 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Touching</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Indecency</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>1.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition of Current Offence (Probation plus)</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Discharge</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Sentence</td>
<td>20.9 (9)</td>
<td>28.2 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>12.8 (5)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community work service</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>69.8 (30)</td>
<td>46.2 (18)</td>
<td>ChiSq=4.70, p&lt;.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Length of Prison Term&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>425 days</th>
<th>163 days</th>
<th>t=2.16, p&lt;.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stave Lake Incarceration</td>
<td>29.3 (12/41)</td>
<td>2.6 (1/38)</td>
<td>ChiSq=10.18, p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Age of Offender at Time of Offence       | 32        | 32       | n.s.                     |

<sup>1</sup>Length of custody for probation plus custody cases.
### Current Offence Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Victims in Current Offence</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>97.7 (42)</td>
<td>79.5 (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average victim number</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Age of Victim**  
12.82 (40/43)  19.88 (26/39)  \( t = -2.25, p < .03 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Victim</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>16.1 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93.0 (40)</td>
<td>83.9 (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Offence</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender's residence</td>
<td>25.6 (11)</td>
<td>12.8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim's residence</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>20.5 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender's/victim's</td>
<td>32.6 (14)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>12.8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders' vehicle</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Room</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage/Gas Station</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent (Camping)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim's place of work</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (con't)

Current Offence Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Offence</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offender's place of work</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooded/bush area</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>23.1 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victim a member of offender's household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.S.S.U. (15/42)</th>
<th>Regular (7/27)</th>
<th>n.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Duration of Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>16.3 (7)</td>
<td>7.7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months</td>
<td>14.0 (6)</td>
<td>12.8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td>7.0 (3)</td>
<td>15.4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>55.8 (24)</td>
<td>38.5 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>25.6 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Violence in Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.S.S.U. (28/42)</th>
<th>Regular (23/31)</th>
<th>n.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fondling Behavior in Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.S.S.U. (34/42)</th>
<th>Regular (20/32)</th>
<th>n.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2Fondling behavior in offence included victim fondling offender’s genitals, fondling of breasts, fondling of buttocks, and assaultive fondling.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Offence Characteristics</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Sex</strong></td>
<td>18.6 (8)</td>
<td>15.4 (6)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vaginal Penetration</strong></td>
<td>37.2 (16/43)</td>
<td>15.4 (5/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=4.24, p&lt;.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anal Penetration</strong></td>
<td>9.3 (4/43)</td>
<td>5.1 (2/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Income at Time of Offence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>58.1 (25)</td>
<td>46.2 (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>23.3 (10)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.I.</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>7.7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by Parents</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status Time of Offence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law</td>
<td>18.6 (8)</td>
<td>7.7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>23.3 (10)</td>
<td>8.2 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>34.9 (15)</td>
<td>41.0 (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>7.7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probation Conditions

There were eight probation conditions which were common to the probation orders found in both groups. These conditions are outlined in Table 7 in addition to the frequencies in which they occurred in the two probation practices.
Table 7

Probation Conditions of the Probationers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Stat. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend for psychological counselling</td>
<td>33 (76.7%)</td>
<td>34 (87.3%)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured reporting</td>
<td>9 (20.9%)</td>
<td>7 (17.9%)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report change of address</td>
<td>17 (39.6%)</td>
<td>6 (15.4%)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend alcohol/drug counselling</td>
<td>7 (16.3%)</td>
<td>6 (15.4%)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with victim</td>
<td>18 (41.9%)</td>
<td>6 (12.2%)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain in B.C.</td>
<td>6 (14.0%)</td>
<td>2 (5.2%)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain from alcohol</td>
<td>2 (4.6%)</td>
<td>4 (10.3%)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report all breaches to Court</td>
<td>2 (4.6%)</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the probation conditions outlined in Table 7, there were nine other V.S.S.U. offenders who possessed probation conditions which were not found on probation orders of the regular probationer group. By contrast there were only three offenders reporting to regular probation offices who possessed probation conditions which were not common to V.S.S.U. probationers. Overall, the offenders reporting to the V.S.S.U. unit could be viewed as representing a more demanding clientele in that probation officers were responsible for monitoring probationer's adherence to a greater number of probation conditions.

**Summary**

Generally speaking, no significant statistical differences were viewed between the samples on the vast majority of demographic characteristics explored in this project. The few statistical differences which did emerge, however, suggested that the V.S.S.U. offenders were from more abusive familial environments and were characterized by a higher incidence of prior drug abuse.

The two sample groups were not equivalent with respect to offence characteristics. Specifically, the offenders reporting to the V.S.S.U. unit during the time period of this study were convicted of sexual assaults of a more serious nature. Significantly more offenders reporting to the V.S.S.U. unit received a period of incarceration in addition to probation, with a longer average custodial term than for regular offenders who received a custodial
sentence. The higher incidence of custodial sentences and
greater sentence length amongst the V.S.S.U. probationers is
not unexpected in light of the fact that the offences of
V.S.S.U. probationers involved significantly younger victims
and were characterized by a greater incidence of vaginal
penetration.

The two groups were not significantly different with
respect to conviction history for sexual or non-sexual
offences.

Of course, there is the possibility that greater
differences or similarities on the characteristics
considered might have been observed had there been more
information available to the researcher. While both groups
of probation files had deficiencies with respect to the
presence of information, regular probation files were
particularly at fault in this respect.

Probation File Contents

Referring to Table 8, it is apparent that the probation
files of V.S.S.U. were consistently complete in both the
presence of documents and the completeness of information on
offenders. As outlined in Table 8, V.S.S.U. files were much
more likely to possess a police report (41 cases compared to
27 cases), victim statement (41 cases compared to 25 cases),
psychological assessment (36 cases compared to 15), as well
as provide written documentation of each probationer contact
(41 cases compared to 19). All of these differences were
statistically significant. V.S.S.U. and regular probation
files were not different with respect to the presence of a pre-sentence report or letters of reference in support of the probationer on supervision.

Obviously, the increased availability of specific documents in V.S.S.U. files facilitated more comprehensive data gathering on these probation clients. In addition, V.S.S.U. probation officers consistently entered detailed descriptions of various probationer characteristics (e.g. employment, residence, life stressors, etc.) throughout the period of supervision which was also beneficial to information gathering.

In contrast, no consistency was viewed in regular probation files with respect to this issue. Some regular probation files were overwhelmingly detailed, while others contained virtually no information on the probationer on supervision. This was surprising in that Corrections Branch service delivery standards dictate that the supervision plan of a probationer should comment on the frequency of contacts with the probationer, employer(s), family, friends, present educational institution(s), doctor and/or therapist, the offender's goals and attitude toward supervision and the rationale for the level of intensity of supervision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation File Contents</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Report</td>
<td>95.4 (41/43)</td>
<td>69.2 (27/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=9.85, p&lt;.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Statement</td>
<td>95.4 (41/43)</td>
<td>64.1 (25/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=12.71, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Assessment</td>
<td>83.7 (36/43)</td>
<td>38.5 (15/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=17.82, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Sentence Report</td>
<td>67.4 (29/43)</td>
<td>61.5 (24/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Reference</td>
<td>11.6 (5/43)</td>
<td>12.8 (5/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written doc. contact</td>
<td>100.0 (43/43)</td>
<td>48.7 (19/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=29.16, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Delivery Practices: Examination of the Differences

One of the primary purposes of the in-program analysis was to measure the extent of service delivery at the V.S.S.U. unit and to determine if intensive supervision led to increased contact and the provision of more services for the probationers. In examining service delivery practices, two specific questions were addressed:

(1) To what extent did the V.S.S.U. services and contacts differ from those provided to the comparison group of regular probationers?

(2) More specifically, did the V.S.S.U. offenders receive greater surveillance and services than the offenders on regular probation?

Frequency of Offender Face-to-Face Supervision

Table 9 documents monthly face-to-face contacts for both V.S.S.U. and regular probationers for the three possible years of supervision. Even a cursory examination of the Table reveals that the V.S.S.U. program was more "intensive" than that of regular probation in terms of documented face-to-face contacts with probationers.

In examining the first year of supervision, it is clearly evident that the V.S.S.U. program probation officers experienced greater numbers of face-to-face contacts with the offenders than probation officers at regular offices. Specifically, 32 to 46% of V.S.S.U. offenders were documented as being seen in person by their probation officers on two occasions per month, and 27 to 37% of offenders were documented as seen in person on four occasions per month during the first year of supervision. By
contrast, the majority of offenders at regular probation offices (55 to 72%) were seen in person once per month for the first year of their probation order.

A further difference between the offices was found in the probation officer's documentation of contacts with their clients. It appeared that the V.S.S.U. program consistently documented every face-to-face contact with program participants throughout offender supervision periods. File summaries were thorough in terms of the date and type of offender contact (e.g. in-office, home visit, telephone), as well as documenting the date of missed appointments.

Regular probation officers, however, were not as diligent with respect to documenting offender contact, with between 12 and 17% of files not documenting the frequency of contacts with their clientele. There were many instances found within regular probation files where probation officers failed to document when and how offenders had reported to the probation office.

In these files, file summaries normally implied that the offender had reported as directed but there were no specific file entries or documentation which provided detailed information concerning the frequency of reporting (e.g. weekly, biweekly, monthly), how he reported (in-person, telephone), or details on missed appointments. For some regular probation cases, the probation officer had also failed to document a supervision plan in the file, which at minimum would outline a rationale and expectation concerning
the required frequency of offender reporting (e.g. weekly, biweekly, monthly).

It should be noted at this point that the data instrument was also designed to collect information on probation officer's telephone contacts with probationers as well as face-to-face contacts. It became clear in the early stages of data collection that information concerning telephone contact with probationers was not available with any consistency in the majority of regular probation files. V.S.S.U. probation officers, however, regularly documented telephone contacts with their probationers and often kept telephone messages from offenders within the files as formal documentation of this contact.
## Table 9
Frequency of Face-to-Face Contact with Probationers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year I Month</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N/d*</th>
<th>I/c**</th>
<th>S/E***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>14.6(6)</td>
<td>44.2(16)</td>
<td>41.9(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>66.7(26)</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td>44.2(19)</td>
<td>37.2(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>64.1(25)</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>18.6(3)</td>
<td>46.5(20)</td>
<td>34.9(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>69.2(27)</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>20.9(9)</td>
<td>46.5(20)</td>
<td>32.6(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>71.8(28)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td>44.2(19)</td>
<td>32.6(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>71.8(28)</td>
<td>7.7(3)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td>44.2(19)</td>
<td>32.6(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>71.8(28)</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>39.5(17)</td>
<td>27.9(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>64.1(25)</td>
<td>7.7(3)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>25.6(11)</td>
<td>39.5(17)</td>
<td>27.9(12)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>71.8(28)</td>
<td>7.7(3)</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>25.6(11)</td>
<td>32.6(14)</td>
<td>30.2(13)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>61.5(24)</td>
<td>7.7(3)</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Face-to-face contact(s) with offender not documented.

**In custody during this month of supervision.

***Supervision period expired.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N/d</th>
<th>I/c</th>
<th>S/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>27.9(12)</td>
<td>32.6(14)</td>
<td>30.2(13)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>59.0(23)</td>
<td>7.7(3)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>25.6(11)</td>
<td>32.4(14)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>27.9(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>55.4(22)</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>17.9(7)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>27.9(12)</td>
<td>30.2(13)</td>
<td>30.2(13)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>56.4(22)</td>
<td>7.7(3)</td>
<td>17.9(7)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9 (con't)

**Frequency of Face-to-Face Contact with Probationers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N/d</th>
<th>I/c</th>
<th>S/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>20.9(9)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td>25.6(11)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>51.3(20)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>25.7(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>20.9(9)</td>
<td>20.9(9)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>51.3(20)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>28.3(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>25.6(11)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>43.6(17)</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>28.3(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>25.6(11)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>51.3(20)</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>28.3(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>27.9(12)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>20.9(9)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>46.2(18)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>28.3(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>25.6(11)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>51.3(20)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>28.3(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>27.9(12)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>35.9(14)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>30.8(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>30.2(13)</td>
<td>14.0(6)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>35.9(14)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>33.4(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>30.2(13)</td>
<td>16.3(7)</td>
<td>23.3(10)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>18.6(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>35.9(14)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>33.4(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9 (con't)

**Frequency of Face-to-Face Contact with Probationers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>15.4(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (con’t)

Frequency of Face-to-Face Contact with Probationers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N/d</th>
<th>I/c</th>
<th>S/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.1(32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.1(32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>7.7(3)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.1(32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>11.6(5)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.1(32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.1(32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.1(32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.6(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.6(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>10.3(4)</td>
<td>5.1(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.6(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/d</td>
<td>I/c</td>
<td>S/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>VSSU</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>7.0(3)</td>
<td>9.3(4)</td>
<td>2.3(1)</td>
<td>4.7(2)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>12.8(5)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>76.7(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mental Health Services

Table 10 provides an overview of the probation officer’s referral practices to various mental health services during the probationer’s supervision period, as well as the offender’s attendance at specialized sex offender counselling/treatment. The vast majority of probation orders in the two samples possessed a probation condition that the offender attend for psychological counselling (83.7% of V.S.S.U. sample and 81.1% of regular sample). While some of the probation orders within the two samples specifically directed that the offender attend sex offender counselling, the majority of probation orders were not specific on the type of counselling which the offender was required to attend.\textsuperscript{83}

General Mental Health Services provided

Overall, 27 V.S.S.U. offenders or 62.8% of the sample were receiving a mental health service for various purposes during their respective supervisory periods (e.g. sex offender treatment, depression, marriage counselling, assessment only). In the regular sample, 24 offenders or 61.5% of the sample received mental health services. Where the significant differences become evident, however, is in

\textsuperscript{83}Presumably, the intent of the Judge imposing this condition at sentencing was to ensure that the offender participated in specialized sex offender counselling. This information, however, was not available to the researcher within the probation files and would have required perusal of individual court transcripts. For obvious reasons, the intensive nature of this task and resource constraints precluded this research endeavor.
the purpose of mental health treatment provided and the agency providing service. Of the 27 offenders at V.S.S.U., 10 offenders received the service for psychological assessment purposes only, with no further mental health service provided. This assessment was completed by either a correctional contract psychologist or Forensic Psychiatric Services personnel. By contrast, of the 24 offenders receiving mental health services at regular offices, only one offender received a mental health intervention for the purposes of a psychological assessment. Furthermore, more of the regular offenders were receiving a mental health intervention for the purposes of sex offender treatment. Specifically, 20 of the 24 regular offenders in comparison to 14 of the 27 V.S.S.U. offenders (ChiSq=3.94, p<.05).

With respect to the agency providing mental health service, V.S.S.U utilized the correctional psychologist more frequently than did regular probation offices (ChiSq=11.82, 84 The psychological assessment generally offers a comprehensive description of the form, duration, intensity and frequency of problematic sexual behaviors. It also identifies the presence of other (nonsexual) psychological problems, whether or not these are believed to be associated with the offenders problematic sexual behaviors. It also identifies the broader personal and social context within which problem behaviors (sexual and nonsexual) manifest themselves. The assessment serves the needs of the Branch, Court and the offender in identifying appropriate resources.

85 The data instrument also measured a more general use of psychological consultation which is discussed in a later section of the project. The variable "referral for psychological consultation/assessment" measured cases where comprehensive assessments may not have been completed, but a brief encounter/consultation with the offender was undertaken for case management purposes.
Probation Officer referral to Sex Offender Treatment

Probation officers in regular offices were also found to refer offenders to various forms of specialized sex offender treatment on a more frequent basis than their counterparts at V.S.S.U. (see Table 10). Out of the 39 cases sampled from regular offices, 19 cases or 48.7% of the offenders were referred to sex offender treatment by their probation officers. At the V.S.S.U. unit, there were 12 cases referred for this purpose, or 27.9% of the population. This difference was significant (ChiSq=3.77, p<.06).

Sex Offender Treatment

A referral to sex offender treatment by the probation officer, however, does not necessarily imply that there was attendance by the offender. Attendance at sex offender treatment was measured separately and also included those offenders who had been attending treatment on their own accord (e.g. without a referral from a probation officer).

With respect to attendance at sex offender treatment, 20 offenders reporting to regular offices or 51.3% of the sample, were attending. Of the V.S.S.U. offenders, 15 offenders, or 34.9% of the sample were attending. This difference was significant (ChiSq=3.54, p<.06).

Despite the significant difference, the low percentages of offenders attending for treatment observed in both groups was surprising in that they were well below that which was
dictated by probation order conditions\textsuperscript{86}. Of course, there is no way of ascertaining whether or not the Court intended for the offender to participate in sex offender treatment as most of the probation orders did not specify the specific type of counselling desired. There were various reasons why an offender was not attending sex offender counselling which will be addressed below.

For both groups of offenders attending some type of sex offender treatment, the type of agency providing the service was documented. Regular probation officers were found to have utilized the Forensic Psychiatric Services sex offender program to a greater degree than V.S.S.U. officers. Specifically, of the 20 regular offenders who attended for treatment, 12 offenders (60\%) were receiving this service at Forensic Psychiatric Services. By contrast, only 5 of the 15 offenders (33\%) receiving treatment at V.S.S.U. were receiving these services at Forensic Psychiatric Services.

The above results appear to suggest that regular probation officers are more likely to refer their probationers to specialized sex offender treatment and utilize Forensic Psychiatric services to a greater extent to accomplish this task. Further, the results suggest that offenders supervised by regular probation are more likely to attend for sex offender treatment.

\textsuperscript{86}Recall that 83.7\% of the V.S.S.U. sample and 76.9\% of the regular sample contained probation conditions for offender attendance at psychological/psychiatric treatment.
A closer look at these results reveals that the V.S.S.U. unit appears to have implemented a more thorough "screening" process than that of the regular probation offices and may be referring those offenders to Forensic who are more problematic in terms of their state of mental health. Recall that out of the 27 offenders receiving mental health services at V.S.S.U., 10 offenders had received a psychological assessment only, with no other mental health service provided. By contrast, only one offender from regular probation practices had been referred for assessment purposes only with no subsequent treatment provided. Descriptive notes taken by the researcher revealed that of the ten offenders referred for assessment purposes from V.S.S.U., seven of these individuals were assessed as not requiring ongoing sex offender treatment by either the correctional psychologist or Forensic Psychiatric Services. There were various reasons documented as to why treatment was not needed, with two of the more common explanations being that the offender did not represent an appropriate candidate for treatment due to denial or some other personality characteristic (e.g. low intelligence), or intensive treatment was not a necessity due to the recency of prior mental health interventions. Furthermore, in some cases the mental health professional (Correctional psychologist or Forensic Psychiatric Services personnel) believed that V.S.S.U.’s combination of intensive supervision, relapse prevention and group management
represented an appropriate "treatment" intervention as opposed to more traditional therapy.

In these cases, it is not surprising that V.S.S.U. staff did not refer to sex offender treatment as it had been deemed unnecessary by a mental health professional. Furthermore, several of the V.S.S.U. sample had presumably already received some level of sex offender treatment from Forensic Psychiatric Services while incarcerated at Stave Lake Correctional Centre. As outlined earlier, close to twice as many offenders reporting to V.S.S.U. had also received a custodial term in addition to a period of probation. Of the 30 offenders receiving a custodial term, 12 of these served their jail time at Stave Lake Correctional Centre. Generally speaking, the majority of offenders at Stave Lake Correctional Centre are expected to participate in some type of sex offender treatment (usually group therapy) if their sentences are of sufficient duration to permit such an intervention. Recall that the average length of custodial sentence for V.S.S.U. offenders was close to 15 months, which represents a more than sufficient duration for treatment to occur. While the data instrument was designed to collect information concerning whether the offender had received treatment while incarceration, the majority of probation files did not include this information.
Other Referral Services

Probation officers of both the V.S.S.U. unit and regular offices infrequently referred offenders under their supervision to alcohol/drug counselling (see Table 11). The V.S.S.U. unit referred 4 of the 43 cases (9.3%) under their supervision to substance abuse counselling. Within the regular probation sample, 2 offenders of the 39 cases (5.1%) were referred to substance abuse counselling. These low referral rates were surprising in light of the fact that alcohol/drug abuse had been documented as a factor in offending behavior in a much higher percentage of the files (30.2% of V.S.S.U. files and 25.5% of regular probation files)\(^87\).

There was no significant difference in the extent to which V.S.S.U. officers referred clients to educational/vocational training. V.S.S.U. staff referred 8 offenders or 18.6% of the sample population to such programming. By contrast, regular probation staff referred 4 offenders or 10.3% of the sample to such programs.

---

\(^87\)There were 12 probation files in which either a police report was absent or no comment was made concerning the presence or impact of alcohol/drugs in offending behavior. Evidence of alcohol/drug abuse as a factor in offending behavior was assumed if the probation officer documented it as such, there was probationer self-report, or if the police report indicated that the offender was intoxicated at the time of the offence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Service</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition for Psych. Counselling</td>
<td>83.7 (36/43)</td>
<td>81.1 (30/37)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving General Mental Health Service</td>
<td>62.8 (27/43)</td>
<td>61.5 (24/37)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Purpose of Mental Health Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender Treatment</td>
<td>55.6 (14/27)</td>
<td>83.3 (20/24)</td>
<td>ChiSq=3.94, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Only</td>
<td>37.0 (10/27)</td>
<td>4.2 (1/24)</td>
<td>ChiSq=6.58, p&lt;.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Agency Providing Mental Health Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic</td>
<td>25.9 (7/27)</td>
<td>56.5 (13/24)</td>
<td>ChiSq=4.84, p&lt;.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Psychologist</td>
<td>45.4 (12/27)</td>
<td>4.3 (1/24)</td>
<td>ChiSq=11.82, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: In some cases there is more than one primary agency providing service.
Table 10 (con't)

Mental Health Services (General and Sex Offender Treatment) Received through Supervision Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Service</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>7.7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-weekly</td>
<td>11.6 (5)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>4.7 (2)</td>
<td>17.9 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 5 times yearly</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>2.6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended initially (1-6 mos) then quit</td>
<td>9.3 (4)</td>
<td>10.3 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended (7-12 mos) then quit</td>
<td>2.3 (1)</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency not documented</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. referral to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Sex Offending</td>
<td>27.9 (12/43)</td>
<td>48.7 (19/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=3.77, p&lt;.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Sex Offending</td>
<td>32.5 (14/43)</td>
<td>51.3 (20/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=3.54, p&lt;.06.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\)In some cases the offender was attending for counselling on his own accord and was not referred to a specific agency by probation.
Table 10 (con’t)

Mental Health Services (General and Sex Offender Treatment) Received through Supervision Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Service</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Agency providing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offending Counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic</td>
<td>33.3 (5)</td>
<td>60.0 (12)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Psychiatrist</td>
<td>46.7 (7)</td>
<td>25.0 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Psych.</td>
<td>13.3 (2)</td>
<td>5.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Team</td>
<td>10.0 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>6.7 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.O. refer for Psych. Assessment/Consultation during supervision</strong></td>
<td>48.8 (21/43)</td>
<td>30.8 (12/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=2.78, p&lt;.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psych. Assessment prior to Sentencing for current offence</strong></td>
<td>62.8 (27)</td>
<td>30.8 (12)</td>
<td>ChiSq=8.41, p&lt;.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring/Referral Checks performed

Significant differences were identified between V.S.S.U. and regular probation with respect to monitoring checks performed on the probationers (see Table 11). Specifically, V.S.S.U. staff performed law enforcement checks in 48.8% of their probation cases. In dramatic contrast, only 2.6% of regular probation files documented a law enforcement check of this nature. Similarly significant differences were viewed with respect to employment checks (e.g. to confirm an offender’s place of employment, hours of work, etc.). For V.S.S.U. probationers, such checks were performed in 41.9% of all cases. For regular probationers, these checks were only employed in 2.6% of documented cases.

The most infrequent monitoring check related to alcohol/drug use. In only two of the V.S.S.U. cases were such checks performed (accomplished by sending offender for urinalysis testing), with no checks of this nature documented in regular probation files. Further, no home visits were conducted by regular probation officer staff, while in 14% of the V.S.S.U. cases home visits were conducted.

Law enforcement checks were accomplished by checking "Persons Checked" bulletins from police agencies. These bulletins provide the probation agency with detailed descriptions (name, height, weight, etc.) of individuals who were checked by police and the reason for the check. This type of information is of assistance to the probation officer in monitoring an offender’s adherence to specific probation conditions (e.g. no contact with victim, area restriction, abstain from alcohol/drugs).
The only monitoring check which was equivalent between the two probation practices was with counselling agencies, where roughly half of the probation officers in each group experienced contact with different mental health agencies to confirm offender attendance, participation and progress in counselling.

**Contact with Offender’s Spouse/Significant Other**

V.S.S.U. probation officers were more likely to involve the offender’s spouse/significant other throughout the probation supervision period, which was consistent with their program model of creating a large network of collateral contacts. Of the 43 V.S.S.U. cases, 12 of these offender’s had either a wife/common-law spouse or family member involved in supervision (see Table 11). Of the 38 regular cases for which information was available, only 4 of these cases documented the involvement of social supports of the nature outlined earlier throughout the supervisory period. This difference between the groups was marginally significant \(t=1.98, p<.051\).
### Table 11

**Monitoring/Referral Checks Performed by Probation Officer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Checks</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>48.8 (21/43)</td>
<td>2.6 (1/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=22.31, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug</td>
<td>4.7 (2/43)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>41.9 (18/43)</td>
<td>2.6 (1/39)</td>
<td>ChiSq=17.71, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Spouse or Significant Other</td>
<td>27.9 (12/43)</td>
<td>10.5 (4/38)</td>
<td>ChiSq=3.84, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>41.9 (18/43)</td>
<td>46.2 (18/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visit</td>
<td>14.0 (6)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>ChiSq=5.87, p&lt;.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Referral Practices by P.O.**

| To Educational Vocational Training         | 18.6 (8/43) | 10.3 (4/39) | n.s.                     |
| For Psychiatric Assessment                 | 48.8 (21/43) | 30.8 (12/39) | n.s.                     |
| To Alcohol/Drug Counselling                | 9.3 (4/43)   | 5.1 (2/39)  | n.s.                     |
Summary

To what extent did the V.S.S.U. services and contacts differ from those provided to the comparison group of regular probationers? Specifically, did the V.S.S.U. offenders receive greater surveillance and services than the offenders on regular probation?

Overall, the V.S.S.U offenders differed from regular offenders in that they received a greater intensity of supervision as well as different types of monitoring services. This result was to be expected in light of V.S.S.U. program expectations and lower caseloads. Specifically, V.S.S.U. probationers received more intensive supervision (as measured by face-to-face contacts with offenders), significantly more monitoring checks with respect to police, the offender’s place of employment and contact with the offender’s spouse or family member. Furthermore, the V.S.S.U. unit conducted home visits, while regular probation officers were not documented as doing so.

With respect to mental health service delivery practices, the results are less clear. While more offenders reporting to regular probation offices were documented as receiving treatment for sex offending, V.S.S.U.'s greater incorporation of psychological assessment suggested that the unit was more actively involved in "screening" probationers for treatment. Furthermore, more of the V.S.S.U. probationers had presumably participated in sex offender
treatment while incarcerated, thus lessening the need for intensive treatment after release from jail.

Generally speaking, the results are reflective of V.S.S.U.'s attempts to establish a collaborative relationship with individuals and agencies involved in the offender's life. V.S.S.U.'s program model of relapse prevention dictates that an informal network of collateral contacts be actively encouraged and facilitated by the probation officer to assist in monitoring offender behavior in the community. This type of "safety-network" approach to supervision is deemed to be the preferable method of management as sex offenders are viewed as possessing notoriously poor luck, exercising terrible judgement, demonstrating destructive impulsivity and are deceitful about their deviant behavior (Emory, Cole and Meyer, 1992, p.136).

How well did V.S.S.U. deliver the services intended?

To what degree were the planned V.S.S.U. program activities delivered to probation clientele?

There are several specific segments of the V.S.S.U. program which allowed for quantitative examination in this research project, specifically, the intensive supervision practices, home visitation, group management program and use of psychological assessment in the management of sex offenders. Many of objectives of V.S.S.U. could not be addressed by this research effort, a problem which is reviewed further in the Discussion.
Intensive Supervision

As outlined in Table 9 and discussed earlier, the documented face-to-face contact rates in the V.S.S.U. program were significantly higher than in the comparison regular probation group. However, the V.S.S.U. program expectation was for weekly face-to-face contact with the offender for the first month of supervision and subsequent contact with the offender on a frequency of not less than twice per month.

With respect to the requirement of weekly contact in the first month, results indicated that only 41.9% of the offenders actually received four face-to-face contacts with their probation officers in the first month of supervision. The majority of offenders received two face-to-face contacts during the first month (44.2% of the sample). Only 6 offenders or 14% of the sample received one face-to-face contact in the first month. These results suggest that V.S.S.U. did not meet the program requirement of weekly contact in the first month.

After the first month of supervision, the V.S.S.U. program expected to maintain contact with offenders on a frequency of generally not less than two times per month. The results indicated that the program generally exceeded these expectations. Referring to the first year of an offender's supervisory period at V.S.S.U. (Table 9), it was found that between 30% to 46% of offenders saw their probation officers on a frequency of twice per month
throughout the first year of supervision. More importantly, however, was the fact that between 28% to 37% of the remaining sample of offenders saw their probation officers on a frequency of four times per month during the first year. This level of contact exceeded program expectations. Generally speaking, less than 10% of the sample received monthly face-to-face contact on only one occasion or in rare circumstances, no contact, during the first year of a probationer’s supervision at V.S.S.U.

The frequency of face-to-face contacts was also documented for the second and third years\(^{89}\) of an offender’s supervisory period (when applicable) at V.S.S.U. Generally speaking, a pattern emerged whereby offenders with longer supervisory periods were gradually required to report less frequently to the V.S.S.U. probation office, usually either twice per month (22 to 26% of sample) or once per month (25 to 31% of sample). However, approximately 22% to 31% of offenders continued to report on a frequency of four times per month throughout the second and third years of supervision. All of these frequency levels were far greater than that found at regular probation offices. In the vast majority of cases, offenders reporting to regular probation practices were only seen by their probation officers on a frequency of once per month.

\(^{89}\) The maximum probationary period is three years.
While the data collection instrument did not allow for the specific measurement of the "quality" of probationer-offender contacts between the two probation practices, some observations could be made with respect to this issue. A simple estimate of the length and nature of the officer-probationer contact could be made through examination of the officer notes/documentation. V.S.S.U. interviews appeared to have been more lengthy, personal and comprehensive than those held by regular officers. While the V.S.S.U. notes were almost consistently detailed, the information documented by regular officers often presented as superficial, mechanical and "policy-directed." 90

The two probation practices also appeared to differ in the nature of interviewing and questioning conducted with the probationers. V.S.S.U. officers were found to regularly discuss and document issues surrounding the probationer's sexual offending (e.g. intimate details of the offence, level of denial, offence cycle, deviant fantasies, current sexual behaviors, etc.). This form of offence-specific interviewing was rarely documented as occurring with the regular probation group. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine that this could occur when many of the regular probation files lacked a police report outlining the circumstances of

90 British Columbia corrections branch service delivery standards requires that probation officers at minimum inquire about changes in an offender's address, employment or education situation, contact with police or outstanding charges and review of compliance with conditions of probation.
the offence. While the reality of excessive caseloads and inadequate agency resources in regular probation offices undoubtedly impairs more preferable standards of officer-probationer contacts, one could also speculate that the officers purposefully avoided discussion of the offence because of their own feelings of embarrassment. Indeed, the topic of sexuality is probably not the most comfortable subject on which to confer with a client unless one either chooses to work in this area or is specifically trained to work in this field. However, there are other possible reasons for this type of "superficial" supervision which have been addressed in research on the supervision practices of parole/probation officers. These might include officer laziness and involvement in personal pursuits (McLearly, 1978), and the lack of a fully developed probation agency which can provide practical assistance to clientele (Studt, 1973).

Home Visits

One of the more important components of the V.S.S.U. program is home visitation. As contained in the program description, the planned level of home visitation for each offender included one home visit within three months of the offender beginning supervision and at least on one occasion for every six month period of supervision. According to what was documented in the V.S.S.U. files, home visits were only conducted in 6 out of the 43 cases reviewed (refer to Table 12). If this information is an accurate depiction of this
component of service delivery, then it is obvious that this particular program component is not being delivered as planned. Of course, there is the possibility that home visits were conducted but not documented in the file due to probation officer oversight. A more likely possibility, however, is that the frequency of home visits could not be conducted due to the simple reality that staff are overworked and lack adequate resources to meet this time consuming program objective. Indeed, V.S.S.U. staff are not only providing an intensive level of supervision and monitoring of offenders but are also conducting group management supervision programs after normal office hours.

**Group Management**

Another defining feature of V.S.S.U.'s brand of supervision and management of sex offenders is their use of the groups. Of the 43 probationers sampled, 12 offenders or 27.9% of the program participants were involved in their group program (see Table 12). The average length of participation in group was ten months. As participation in the group program is voluntary, there is no expected level of participation with which to compare. As well, this project made no attempt to examine the "quality" of the group program or measure specific components of the group program's operation such as nature/type of group discussions, etc.
Psychological Assessment for Case Management Purposes

Although there is no specific expectation for each and every V.S.S.U. probationer to undergo psychological assessment, the unit does purport to utilize mental health resources to a greater extent for case management purposes. While a previous discussion on mental health services revealed that regular probation officers appeared to be referring offenders to sex offender counselling and utilizing Forensic Psychiatric Services to a greater extent than V.S.S.U., this variation could be explained when considering the offender's prior experience with treatment while in custody, or assessment "screening" by either the in-house psychologist or Forensic Psychiatric Services.

The V.S.S.U. probation officers were more likely to refer offenders for psychological assessment/consultation throughout the supervisory period. Specifically, of the 43 V.S.S.U. cases, 21 cases were referred for psychological assessment/consultation at some point throughout a probationer's supervisory period. In contrast, of the 39 regular probation cases, 12 cases documented a probationer referral for psychological assessment/consultation throughout the supervisory period. Descriptive notes taken by the researcher revealed that V.S.S.U. probation officers were more likely to refer offenders for psychological assessment/consultation for purposes of seeking specific information on how to effectively supervise the offender in question. For example, V.S.S.U. staff were occasionally
interested in whether or not a particular offender was suitable for the group management program and/or what level of supervision might be most appropriate. In addition to questioning mental health professionals on specific issues related to probation supervision of the sex offender, the V.S.S.U. unit was also more likely to refer probationers for updated psychological assessments through the supervisory period. There were six documented cases where V.S.S.U. probationers were required to attend for updated psychological assessments. File records documented various reasons for this "update", including viewed changes in an offender’s behavior/lifestyle which were of concern to the probation officer (e.g. involved in new relationship/alcohol use/criminal conviction), or if a probationer was subject to a long probation order. Regular probation cases were far less likely to request this type of ongoing direction from mental health professionals. In fact, only one regular case documented referring a probationer for an "updated" assessment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.S.S.U. Service Delivery Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offender Participation in Group Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Length of Participation in Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Visit</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were many significant aspects of the program which did not lend themselves easily to quantitative evaluation and were not specifically addressed in this research effort. For example, an important component of the V.S.S.U. model is their use of the relapse prevention model in the supervision and management of offenders. This research did not allow for specific components of the V.S.S.U. program to be separated for individual analysis to determine which were most "effective". This shortcoming is addressed in the Discussion.

Through the V.S.S.U program probationers received significantly more contacts and services, thus supporting the contention that intensive supervision can provide a higher level of service to clients. The question remains whether or not the program has had any impact upon recidivism rates.

**Controlling Criminal Behavior**

A positive impact on re-offending was expected not only because this was a program goal espoused by the V.S.S.U. unit but due to the findings in the literature of the benefits of the relapse prevention model and the fact that increased level of services to correctional clientele can impact positively on re-offending. In this project, recidivism information was separated according to two phases:

1) Sex offence and non-sex offence convictions during the supervision period; and
2) Sex offence and non-sex offence convictions during the follow-up period.

Information concerning technical violations in the probation files was also collected.

Recidivism: Supervision Period

Table 13 documents convictions for both sex and non-sex offences during the supervisory period. There was no statistically significant difference between groups. Somewhat more V.S.S.U. offenders were convicted of new sex offences during their probation supervision period than regular probationers. Specifically, out of 43 V.S.S.U. cases, 5 offenders were convicted of new sex offences. Out of 39 regular cases, 1 offender was convicted of a new sex offence.

The two groups were roughly equal with respect to new non-sex offence convictions. Of the 43 V.S.S.U. cases, five offenders were convicted of new non-sex offence convictions during their probation supervision periods, compared to 6 of the 39 regular probation cases. No significant differences were viewed with respect to the type of non-sex offence convictions between the two groups.
Table 13

Recidivism during Supervision Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Period</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conviction for Sex Offence</td>
<td>11.6 (5/43)</td>
<td>2.6 (1/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Sex Offence Conviction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Touching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction for Non-Sexual Offence</td>
<td>11.6 (5/43)</td>
<td>15.8 (6/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Non-Sexual Offence Convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch dwelling house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft under $1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach Probation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Stolen Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischief</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Violations of the Probationers

The two probation groups were roughly equal in terms of evidence of technical violations of probation orders. Types of technical violations which occurred most frequently among the two probation practices included the following:\footnote{\textsuperscript{91}}:

- periods of non-reporting to the probation office,
- not attending court ordered counselling as directed by the Court or probation,
- refusal to attend alcohol and drug counselling as directed by Court or probation,
- and conviction for a new offence.

The frequency with which these various types of technical violations occurred in the two probation practices was roughly equal between groups. Although each probation practice documented one or more incidents of the types of technical violations referred to earlier, the most common violations included periods where the offender failed to report to the probation office as directed or failed to attend counselling as directed by probation or the Court.

Overall, of the 43 V.S.S.U. cases, 27 cases or 62.8\% of the sample documented various types of technical violations.

With respect to the regular probation group, of the 36 files for which information was available, 66.7\% documented various types of technical violations.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{91}There were also other kinds of technical violations occurring which were less frequently documented. For example, incidents whereby an offender contacted the victim of an offence when prohibited to do so, violation of an area restriction, failure to attend residential drug/alcohol treatment, or failure to abide by structured reporting requirements as directed by the Court.}
Despite the high level of technical violations, the incidence with which probation officers in either probation practice filed breach of probation charges with the Crown counsel office was minimal. This observation was unexpected in light of the serious nature of the offender group under supervision, but this is not an unrecognized phenomenon in probation. In what represented the first comprehensive study of probation enforcement in British Columbia, Aasen (1985) found that there are a significant number of persons who are not officially reported by probation as being in violation of their probation orders. In explaining this phenomenon, Aasen (1985) speculated that probation officers might not forward proposed breach charges to Crown counsel because of the difficulty in proving the charge. More generally, probation officers may not perceive all violations as justifying the harsh sanction of a breach charge, particularly when other sanctions short of revocation are available (e.g. verbal or written warning or increasing the reporting requirement). Officers who emphasize the goal of treatment over surveillance may feel a need to overlook certain types of their clients' misbehaviors during the course of a rehabilitation process. The willingness of an officer to let a minor problem "slide" can help to establish

92 Breach of probation has been defined by Aasen (1985) as "...a willful failure or refusal to comply with conditions set out in a probation order or a conviction for an offence subsequent to the making of a probation order and while the offender is bound by the probation order" (p.10).
the basis for a more trusting supervision relationship. There has been some research describing the responses of a community supervision agent to violations by clients, but these studies have produced only a vague portrait of officer reaction to clients' indiscretions (Harris, Clear and Baird, 1989)

Regular probation officers were more likely to file a breach allegation with the Court. Of the 39 regular probation files, there were 7 cases whereby a breach report was either found in the file or documented as being completed and sent to Crown counsel for breach charge approval. By contrast, at V.S.S.U. there were 3 cases which either included a breach report or documented breach form completion to the Court.

Of the three V.S.S.U. breach reports sent to Crown counsel, two of these cases proceeded to Court and convictions for breach of probation were registered. By contrast, of the 7 breach reports filed by regular probation officers with the Court, none of these resulted in a charge and subsequent breach of probation conviction. This lack of probation enforcement, especially within the regular probation group, was again not entirely surprising. Aasen's (1985) research on probation enforcement found that in relation to the total number of persons subjected to probation orders at any one time, the absolute number charged with breach is low.
The researcher can only speculate on the reasons for this difference as breach enforcement did not represent a primary variable of interest in this project. It may be that the breach reports filed by V.S.S.U. officers were taken more seriously by the Crown Counsel's office and proceeded with in Court because of the credibility which has been established by the specialized program. While future research would have to confirm this trend, this high rate of conviction of V.S.S.U. submitted breach allegations suggests that the V.S.S.U. unit might afford the public a more heightened level of protection and offender accountability.

Recidivism: Follow-up Period

Referring to Table 14, it is evident that the average length of the follow-up period was roughly equal between groups. V.S.S.U. participants were followed for a mean of 40 months following the expiration of probation supervision, compared to a mean of 41 months in the regular probation group.

Overall, very few of the discharged probationers re-offended during the follow-up period. Specifically, of the 42 V.S.S.U. offenders who were eligible for the recidivism analysis, six offenders re-offended during the follow-up period. All of the 39 regular cases were eligible for the analysis due to incarceration during the whole follow-up period.
recidivism analysis. Of these cases, one offender had recidivated during the follow-up period.

Although the hypothesis was that V.S.S.U. probationers would reoffend at a lower rate, analysis of reoffending data indicated that there were no significant differences between groups with respect to the rate of offending.

There were slight differences viewed with respect to the type of sex offence convictions for those offenders who re-offended. With respect to the V.S.S.U. offenders, four of the six convictions were for sexual assault. Each of these four offenders received a provincial custodial sentence (two years less one day), in addition to a period of probation. The mean number of days in custody was 579.66, with the mean number of days of probation being 494.16. The remaining two convictions among the V.S.S.U. sample were for exhibitionism. Each of these offenders did not receive a custodial disposition as a sentence, but a two year term of probation.

The one conviction registered within the regular probation caseload was for exhibitionism. This offender did not receive a custodial sentence but a two year probation order.

The two probation practices were also compared with respect to non-sex offence convictions during the follow-up period. No statistical differences were found between the two probation practices. There were six V.S.S.U. offenders who were convicted of non-sex offences during the follow-up
period. By comparison, nine regular offender cases were convicted of non-sex offences. There were no dramatic differences viewed between the populations with respect to the type of non-sex offence conviction. Table 14 provides a breakdown of the type of offence convictions found in each probation practice.
Table 14
Recidivism during Follow-Up Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Length of Follow-up</strong> (months)(^1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conviction for Sex Offence</strong></td>
<td>14.3 (6/42)</td>
<td>2.6 (1/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type Conviction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing (Exhibitionism)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total convictions:</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conviction for Non-Sexual Offence</strong></td>
<td>18.6 (6/43)</td>
<td>23.1 (9/39)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type Conviction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft under $1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach Probation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Pretences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to Provide Breath Sample</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft under $200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruct Police Constable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Stolen Property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total new offence convictions:</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10(^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)One offender of V.S.S.U. group incarcerated during follow-up period.
\(^2\)One regular offender had two non-sex offence convictions during the follow-up period.
DISCUSSION

Prior to summarizing the findings, a number of methodological issues which might potentially have impacted the results need to be addressed.

While the methodological problems of evaluation research in general have been repeated countless times in other works (Campbell and Stanley, 1966; Hagan, 1989), there should be some attention to some of the more critical problems potentially impacting on the validity of the conclusions found in this particular project. The need for this type of "research candor" is understandably significant. Weiss (1972) elaborates:

If there are gaps, rival interpretation, or room for doubt, the evaluator who acknowledges limitations can help decision-makers arrive at responsible choices. (p.20)

Similarly, Roesch and Corrado (1979, p.536) stress that researchers must not only be aware of the limitations of their studies, but must acknowledge them. Thus, key methodological concerns in the current evaluation related to an inadequate experimental design, the method of data gathering, evaluator bias, sampling error, choice of indicator, treatment overlap, and measurement of the intensive probation supervision "package" and failure to measure staff "quality". Other significant methodological concerns surrounded the use of recidivism measures in probation/sex offender populations were reviewed in earlier sections of the project and will not be repeated here with any comprehensiveness.
Research Design

There are significant limitations that come with the use of a quasi-experimental research technique as employed in this study. This study simply looked retrospectively at a program’s operation with no attempt to actively manipulate the assignment of participants (e.g. random assignment) to different probation practices. The choice of such a technique makes it difficult to attribute any changes observed to program participation, since the group of individuals who participated in the two correctional programs might have differed initially in a number of important ways.

As a result of the research design employed in this study, one could not be confident about inferring that differences in both in-program and post-program re-offending behavior were due to the program, as opposed to pre-existing differences among participants. In fact, evidence of the non-equivalency of groups was clearly found in this study. A significant difference was observed between the two samples in terms of offence characteristics. V.S.S.U. probationers were convicted of what might be categorized as more "serious" sexual offences in that they involved younger victims and resulted in custodial terms of greater duration. This may have occurred as a result of the selective screening component\(^{94}\) of the V.S.S.U. program.

\(^{94}\) V.S.S.U. encourages referral of more "serious" offenders. Refer to V.S.S.U. referral sheet in the Appendix of this report.
This type of problem is not unfamiliar in the field of corrections, although it often operates in a direction which reflects positively on new correctional innovations. For example, early data from the Georgia intensive supervision program showed that persons on intensive probation supervision had lower recidivism rates than persons on routine or regular supervision. The findings received considerable publicity and were used to expand the program, both within the state and across North America. However, closer examination of the two study groups showed that those placed on intensive supervision had less serious prior criminal records than did offenders in the comparison groups (Erwin and Bennett, 1987). Since criminal record is known to be strongly associated with recidivism, the intake process had "stacked the deck", thereby making intensive supervision probation look effective (for a review see Petersilia and Turner, 1990).

The non-equivalency between probation groups in this study, however, represents but one potential methodological problem of this research which future research efforts might attempt to avoid through matching techniques or random assignment.

A related research design issue surrounds the choice of study groups selected for this endeavour. The addition of other comparison groups, (e.g. For example, a group of sex offenders on bail supervision (who generally receive no services during supervision) or a group of probationers
convicted of offences other than sex offences), might provide useful information concerning the rate of reoffending of sex offenders compared to other offender groups as well as the impact of service delivery on offending.

Documents as Data Sources: Advantages and Disadvantages

Probation files represented the primary source of information utilized in this research endeavor. Other than the obvious cost savings benefits which come with this method, the chief advantage of this unobtrusive method of data gathering is the avoidance of reactivity problems. If the subjects are unaware that they are being studied, then it might be assumed that the program practices being observed are more "natural", unhampered by reactive effects to testing or artificial experimental arrangements. Despite this significant advantage, there are many potential errors or biases in using documents as data sources.

The possibility must be considered that any differences observed in the groups may be due to differences in data sources rather than the presence of any real differences between the two samples. Granted, this may be a concern with any approach, but the current research effort found notable differences in record keeping practices between regular and V.S.S.U. offices. While some of these differences were anticipated and expected due to the specialized nature of the V.S.S.U. program, what was surprising was the lack of information in many of the regular probation files on
crucial variables (e.g. absence of police report, no information on family background, employment status through supervision, etc.). This absence of information undoubtedly compounded the researcher’s ability to adequately compare the two groups on variables of significance in the project for purposes of determining the level of equivalency between the two probation practices.

In addition to concerns surrounding the comprehensiveness of the data base, there are numerous other well known reliability and validity issues related to archival information bases. Fitzgerald & Cox (1991) provide a brief review:

First, the person who originally reported the information is likely to have been selective in both recording events and filing documents. The researcher’s reliance on available documents means his data sources are biased by the original recorder’s selectivity. Second, there may be clerical or typographical errors or omissions in the documents or archives themselves. Although infrequent unsystematic mistakes such as clerical errors may have a small effect on research findings, systematically incorrect or incomplete information can create a bias in research results. Third, much of the information contained in documents consists of the original record’s reconstructions or interpretation of what the client, suspect, witnesses, or participants said or did. There is always the possibility that the original recorder misinterpreted what he heard, saw or read. And, of course, the document researcher may compound the difficulty by misinterpreting the contents of the documents. (p.109)

Future examinations of program service delivery practices might consider employing observational measures of staff practices in addition to archival measures for
purposes of measuring the extent to which program staff actually employed the program model under examination. A checklist outlining the critical components of the program model could easily be developed for this purpose. It would be interesting to establish whether or not the program model is adhered to consistently between different probation staff. The probation files might not represent the most accurate indicator of what is actually taking place between probation officer and client.

The Role of the Researcher

The impact of the evaluator on the quality of research completed is also a significant issue which deserves discussion. Specifically, the fact that the researcher responsible for the evaluative effort was also employed as a probation officer was an issue of particular concern in light of literature suggesting that the evaluation of probation programs should be conducted by agencies outside of the probation service. Understandably, the use of probation staff in the evaluation of the services that they themselves deliver raises the question of bias. Generally, it is believed that the more removed the evaluator from the process, the greater the chance of controlling bias, the more objective the observer and this is often cited as sufficient reason for the use of outside evaluators (Szabo and Rizkalla, 1978). Objectivity is maintained because the evaluator is not identified with the program and therefore
receives less pressure from colleagues and interest groups (Riecken, 1972, p.99). In addition, independence may allow the researcher to include evaluative criteria that may question some of the organizational premises (Szabo and Rizkalla, 1978).

Not all of the discourse on the evaluation of criminal justice programs suggests that the evaluation should be conducted by an impartial third party. Byrne (1990) calls the assumption that external evaluators of intensive probation supervision projects are completely objective "naive" (p.10). In his pessimistic presentation of the interaction between researchers and practitioners, he suggests that external evaluators are affected by factors such as (1) the need for current funding and the priorities of the funding agency, (2) the potential for future funding and, (3) the pressure to publish positive findings (p.10). Byrne (1990) also addresses how an external evaluator's eagerness to evaluate the latest "panacea" of correctional programs might also encourage the adoption of conditions that encourage a methodologically inadequately study. Byrne (1990) details how this approach to evaluation makes subsequent "damage control" efforts relatively simple:

If the evaluation is negative, the decision maker can easily dismiss the results by blaming evaluators who are "out of touch with the real world" and/or pointing out how "probation has changed" since the evaluation was completed. (p.11)
Seng (1983) labels the entrenched belief that evaluation of probation programs should be performed by objective, outside experts and not regular probation staff as a "myth" (p.18). Seng (1983) points to the substantial cost savings to the probation service if regular probation staff is used in the evaluation exercise. Additionally, he advises that "dumping" an evaluation job on outside evaluators is not wise professionally as a "...task performed by experts with no real time and effort investment by department staff can lead to a finished produced which is of no real benefit to the department" (p.18). Smith and Bassin (1984), in their discussion of the conducting research in a United States probation department, comment on the issue of researcher qualifications:

...expertise in grantsmanship, research methodology, and data analysis is not sufficient to qualify anyone to undertake meaningful research in probation or parole unless they have reasonably wide experience in those fields, or can enlist the assistance of individuals with whom they can work closely who have that experience. Currently, scattered through the ranks of probation and parole officers...are a fair number who have earned their doctorates...and an even larger number who are continuing their doctoral studies in the newer programs of criminal justice and criminology. The talents and insights of these practitioner-experts should be used in future research, training or demonstration projects. (p.28)

The exploration of the various dimensions of evaluator bias was advantageous in heightening the researcher's awareness of the bias potential, but it did not sway the
researcher's decision to conduct the project. The alternative was to ignore the need for evaluation and simply assume that the good intentions of the program and its devoted staff would translate to positive practice and results.

The project's use of a probation officer in the collection of information, however, might have represented a strength of the study in that the probability may have been increased that the available information was coded with greater accuracy. Specifically, this officer was intimately familiar with the contents of probation files by virtue of line level experience in the probation field. An external researcher with no such work experience might overlook relevant information or misinterpret certain documents in the file because of their unfamiliarity with the probation practice. Furthermore, this researcher was well aware of the potential inaccuracies and idiosyncrasies of probation files at the outset of the study because of personal experience with these issues. As a result, all steps were taken to substantiate information found in the files. For example, if the topic of interest was an offender's familial history and there were three potential document sources available on the subject (e.g. psychiatric assessment, two pre-sentence reports), each of these documents were reviewed and compared.

95 Refer to Fitzgerald and Cox (1991) for a thorough discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the different relationships between researchers and who/what is being researched.
before finalizing the coding of information. In addition, the data instrument was designed to increase reliability by making the recording task as clear as possible. All of the categories used to cluster and summarize information were clearly operationally defined to maximize reliability. While these cautionary steps were taken to ensure coding accuracy, there is always the possibility that errors in coding occurred and the consistency with which information was gathered suffered. The limited resources available for this project precluded the employment of inter-rater reliability measures\textsuperscript{96}.

**Sampling Error**

The samples of V.S.S.U and comparison probationers were chosen from a population list of provincial sex offenders who terminated supervision during the study period. This list, as noted earlier, included some inaccuracies, and as a result, sampling error may have increased. The extent to which this was a problem could not be determined by the researcher. As such, the generalizability of the results to the population of sex offenders on probation may be limited.

**Reliance on Recidivism**

A major problem in the evaluation of correctional programs has been the selection of appropriate criteria of success. In this study, recidivism represented the primary outcome measure of the program evaluation. As reviewed \textsuperscript{96}See Conrad and Maul (1981) for a thorough review of methods for ensuring greater reliability in data gathering.
earlier, there are numerous problems with the definition and measurement of recidivism. Although reducing the rate of re-offending is a necessary goal of correctional interventions with sex offenders, any real-world measure which relies on this as its only (or primary) outcome measure faces an incredible number of potentially contaminating factors.

The methodological problems of measuring criminal behavior as indicated by official police arrests have been presented in the criminal justice literature. It is well known, for example, that official crime statistics underestimate the frequency of actual criminal behavior. While it is generally true that most criminals get away with more crimes than they are convicted of, the research indicates that this is especially true of offenders who commit sexual assaults (Groth, Longo and McFadin, 1982). As there is substantial evidence that undetected crime is quite extensive among sex offenders, it may well be that the regular probationers had rates of recidivism which were dramatically different, but the inadequacies of official data collection detected different numbers of subsequent crimes for both groups. As a result of this problem, special care should probably be taken in interpreting the officially reported criminal history of sex offenders reported in this project.

This research effort refrained from attempting to generate estimates of the "actual" level of criminal behavior among the probationers. Rather, it sought to
demonstrate the impact of the V.S.S.U. on probationer recidivism, as indicated by official involvement in the criminal justice system. Future efforts might attempt to uncover undetected crime through the addition of self-report measures, although some researchers continue to argue that official criminal data may be more valid than the self-report of sexual offenders because of the legal and judicial settings in which such self-report data are often gathered (Hall and Proctor, 1987). Nevertheless, combined measures of recidivism would add a level of reliability to correctional program evaluations. A future research effort might consider exploring the ethical and legal implications of asking probationers to voluntarily sign a permission form during their probation supervision periods which would permit the researcher to re-establish contact with the probationer following the expiration of their Court Order. The purpose of these subsequent probationer follow-ups would be to gather data regarding offending behavior.

A related issue surrounds the follow-up period utilized in this research which averaged slightly over three years for both groups. Soothill and Gibbens (1978) study clearly demonstrated that a sizeable proportion of offenders were reconvicted a long time after the usual follow-up period of three to five years. Furthermore, the reconvictions which occurred after this considerable lapse of time were often serious sexual and/or violence offences (Soothill and
Gibbens, 1978, p.274). A longer follow-up period, while desirable, was not possible due to resource restraints.

As this study focused on recidivism, there is no way of knowing whether the level and type of supervision provided at the V.S.S.U. unit impacted positively on the probationers in other ways. For example, did the level of supervision benefit offenders in terms of assisting in their search for employment, stabilizing familial relationships, encouraging heightened levels of self-esteem and self-satisfaction, etc? Future efforts might attempt to address these possible positive impacts on offender behavior which went unnoticed by this research effort.

A particularly important issue for future research might be whether or not the V.S.S.U. program facilitated greater self-understanding and control of offending behavior through the knowledge of relapse prevention principles. A crude estimate of an offender's adoption of relapse prevention might involve interviewing clients shortly after admission to probation supervision and again after several months of program participation. During these interviews, clients could be presented with scenarios which would likely lead to a relapse to sex offending. The client would be asked to identify the problem in the situation, how the actor is likely to respond, what the consequences of those actions would be, what the alternative actions could be taken, and what the consequences of the alternative actions will be. Of course, the lessons learned from this endeavor
could only be an assessment of the level of relapse prevention skills acquired by the offender, rather than a determination of whether or not a particular offender might utilize the newly acquired skills in real-life situations.

**Treatment Overlap**

It is important if differences in impact are to be detected that the V.S.S.U. group and comparison group be qualitatively different in practice. The literature provides several examples in which the experimental program "infected" and changed the comparison group. In that this study was conducted retrospectively, it was not possible to control for these effects.

Boruch (1976) has noted that in an organizational setting, innovative approaches may "spread like a disease" to control groups. If these observations are correct, then an intensive supervision program like that in operation at V.S.S.U could influence the operation of regular probationary practices within the probation service so that the experimental and comparison groups receive the same treatment. Treatment overlap, according to Petersilia (1989) may be a problem unique to criminal justice experiments. In Petersilia's evaluation of the effectiveness of eleven U.S. intensive supervision projects in 1989, the problem of treatment overlap was so strong that "...at certain points in the ISP program and in regular probation, offenders received identical treatments" (p.453). Romero and Williams (1983) study of sex offenders who were randomly assigned to
either group therapy and probation or probation only cautioned that even though the probation-only group did not participate in group psychotherapy (defined as their experimental group), this did not mean that they were excluded from potential "treatment" by contact with their probation officers who were experienced in assisting the probationers in numerous ways that were not documented. In the event that these problems occurred in this study, the experimental design would be undermined and the results would not provide a valid basis for estimating program effects (Cook and Campbell, 1979).

The possibility did exist that the comparison group might have received an enhanced form of probation supervision because of the presence of the V.S.S.U. program. The V.S.S.U personnel were vocal supporters of their program from its inception and regularly submitted materials for the purview of all probation officers regarding their program practices and philosophy. Additionally, V.S.S.U. staff were committed to "getting the word out" about the program and often attended the monthly meetings of regular probation offices to discuss the program and potential referrals. Furthermore, many of the probation offices have a liaison probation officer identified who was placed at regular probation offices for the purposes of assessing appropriate referrals to the V.S.S.U program. While the extent to which the V.S.S.U. program influenced actual regular probation practices is unknown, it is conceivable that the V.S.S.U.
style of probation supervision might change a whole agency's orientation so that probation officers begin to shift toward an intensive supervision approach. If this happened, the integrity of treatment in the intensive supervision and comparison group would not be maintained.

To minimize the possibility of this type of treatment overlap effect, Petersilia (1989) encourages researchers in analyzing outcomes to "...differentiate between subjects not only in terms of which program they were initially assigned to, but in terms of the kinds and levels of treatment they actually received" (p.453). In this research effort, service delivery practices were addressed in this evaluative endeavor. The data collection instruments were designed to measure type/frequency of services clients actually provided by probation officers and other agencies and received by probation clientele.

By collecting this type of specific data, there were some measurable indicators of sample differences in levels/forms of service delivery. The collection of information surrounding these practices represented a strength of this study in that it provided at least a crude measurement of the extent of treatment overlap. Of course, the researcher can not be confident that treatment overlap problems were not an issue in this project since the effort was multiyear. As most programs are not static but in a continuous state of evolution, the potential for not only treatment overlap but changes in the context in which the
programs and their clients operate (e.g. staff turnover, changes in legislation, etc) was high and undoubtedly influences the validity of the evaluation.

Ignoring Specific Program Components and Evaluating the "Package"

A significant weakness of this evaluation was the inability to isolate the possible effects of particular programme factors. In this study, the impact of the entire multifaceted "package" of the V.S.S.U. and regular probation programs were addressed. No effort was made to study particular program components (e.g. intensive supervision, relapse prevention\(^97\), group work practices, two-on-one interviews, etc.) to ascertain their significance to program success and/or failure. Several researchers have criticized evaluations which do not address what components of a particular program are effective or if certain types of offenders benefit differentially from one approach or the other (Romero and Williams, 1983; Thorvaldson and Matheson, 1973). Petersilia and Turner (1992) suggest that more complicated experimental designs in correctional

\(^{97}\)There are fundamental problems facing researchers who attempt to assess the effectiveness of relapse prevention. Specifically, various components of the relapse prevention model are often employed in conjunction with various "treatment" methods for sex offenders. As a result, it will prove difficult for researchers to attribute a positive treatment effect to the relapse prevention techniques or some component of the "treatment" program employed. A further viewed difficulty is the fact that the "relapse prevention" model is not a precise treatment model which is presented in the same manner or to the same population of offenders. Indeed, "relapse prevention" is a model which can mean varying things to varying programs.
evaluations, in which separate factors are independently manipulated, may help future studies sort out the impact of key program components (p.55). Indeed, future research needs to be done to find out what parts of a specialized program impact positively on selected outcome variables. For example, how important is it to have frequent face-to-face contacts with probationers? How important is relapse prevention with sex offenders in probation? How important is group management of sex offenders? What combination of program components work best with different sex offender types? Is it the V.S.S.U.'s particular emphasis of psychological assessment, team supervision, surveillance checks, group management, and so on? Or some combination these components? More generally, future research is needed to ascertain what components and levels of intensive supervision work best with what kinds of offenders. The limited resources available for this project, however, precluded the adoption of what would require a more sophisticated experimental research design to examine these important issues.

**Measuring Staff "Quality"**

In collecting information on offender characteristics and service delivery practices, no effort was made to measure the "quality" of services and supervision provided to each offender. Part of the reason for the researcher's inattention to the issue had to do with complexities
inherent in measuring a concept such as "quality". Humphrey & Pease (1992) discuss this issue:

...all work can be classified in terms of inputs and outputs. The measurement of output is more complex and ethereal in service organizations than in manufacturing organizations. It is easier to identify and assess the quality of the output of a motor manufacturing process than it is to assess the quality of care in the community, a crime prevention project, or a period of supervision of an offender on probation. (p.32)

Supervision in this study was measured in terms of "frequency", not "quality" of contacts. Thus, this study does not rule out the very likely possibility that the quality of contacts might have varied between wide limits for both groups. For example, were the V.S.S.U. probationers subjected to longer and more beneficial visits with their probation officers than the probationers at regular offices? This was a particularly strong possibility in that V.S.S.U. staff aimed for a more personalized, in-depth, detailed and "treatment-oriented" (e.g. relapse prevention philosophy) approach towards supervisory practices.

Some researchers have suggested that more than any specific systemic approach to treating offenders, it seems rather the quality and credibility of relationships offenders have with treatment staff and significant others may well have the greater correctional influence (Braswell, 1989). This approach suggests that the qualities of the relationship process itself are at the center of positive or destructive decision-making; that the inner work of an offender or counselors' relationship needs to take priority
in order that external expressions in the context of family and work can be positive and sustaining. Even Martinson (1974) who was so critical of the results of the general correctional rehabilitative effort wrote "...the only such benefit may flow not from intensive supervision itself but from contact with one of the "good people" who are frequently in such short supply" (p.31).

A related issue surrounds the impact of the "quality" of staff on program effectiveness. This research did not set out to measure and assess staff "quality", which probably represents a significant limitation of the study in light of the plethora of literature which has linked various dimensions of staff quality to program effectiveness.98 99

Maltz (1984) summarizes these efforts in his

98 Research by Humphrey and Pease (1992) on line level probation staff's perception of effectiveness found that the quality of optimism was viewed as an important determinant of their effectiveness.

99 Feldman, Caplinger & Wodarski (1983), in their large scale evaluation of the Group Integration Project (known nationally as The St. Louis Experiment) which represented a multifaceted intervention program for youths which relied heavily on the use of group methods. Among the more significant conclusions of the researchers addressed the effect of program staff on program effectiveness: "...the most rapid and potent therapeutic changes among groupmates took place in integrated groups that were treated by experienced group leaders. Such changes, in turn, brought about the greatest and most meaningful modifications in the behavior of individual youths"(p.278).

100 Quay (1977) reports that questions related to personnel may well be the most important in evaluating program integrity. Specifically, he identifies three subareas related to personnel: (1) degree of expertise of personnel, (2) amount of training provided, (3) degree of supervision (p.345).
observation that the success of a correctional program may be due more to the particular personalities of the staff running the program than to the nature of the program: "...given that same staff any program would show signs of success" (p.21).

While the effects of probation and parole personnel on program operation and success have been research questions for decades (McCleary, 1978), the evaluators of intensive supervision programs have addressed these issues with a renewed and heightened interest. Whitehead and Lindquist (1987) suggest that any complete examination of an intensive supervision program must include data on the officers who implement the program, since it is these street level bureaucrats who ultimately determine the fate of innovation (p.68). Whitehead (1989) elaborates on this issue in a later work on the impact of line personnel on intensive supervision program:

...it is the line workers who, for better or worse, implement policy. Any mission reform in probation, parole or prisons is ultimately implemented and shaped by the probation, parole, or correctional officer who actually interacts with the inmates. Both academic and executive suggestions are only as good as the officer who follows them....Without the worker, corrections is a set of ideals and promises; with the worker, corrections becomes reality. (p.138)

101 Petersilia & Turner (1990) report that a serious deficiency of their evaluative study of intensive probation supervision programs was the inability to distinguish quality from quantity of supervision.
Similarly, John Conrad (1987) makes the following observation surrounding the staff of intensive supervision programs:

No matter how we organize a program like this, it will always be vulnerable to the personal inadequacies of people carrying it out. There are enough numskulls, time-servers, and psychological cripples circulating around our penal and probation establishments so that managers will have to keep a wary eye on appointments if intensive supervision is not to go the way of many other hopeful innovations....If the best and the brightest can be brought into the program—if they think about what they are doing—and their superiors as well—the potential for the intensive revolution may be enough to level some old prison and depopulate some of the new joints. (1987, p.64).

The examination of the characteristics of staff might be especially critical in light of the viewed difficulties that can arise because of the specialized nature of the population. Lena Dominelli (1991), in her study of probation practices with the sex offender population in Northern England and Western Canada during 1989 and 1990 describes the difficulties of working with this specialized offender group:

Isolation, emotional exhaustion, intellectual fatigue and the difficulties of achieving a detachment from the issues entailed in working with sex offenders makes the practice with them psychologically and physically draining. (p.87)

Similarly, sex offender treatment specialists, Emory, Cole and Meyer (1992) depict working with sex offenders as a sensitive area which tends to foster different reactions from colleagues, family and other therapists. They describe how interactions with colleagues can become strained because
many openly believe that crucifixion is the treatment of choice; how a defensive and isolative posture can develop with family and friends who recoil when informed about the nature of the work, and how other therapists openly wonder what one could possibly obtain from this work (pp.136-137). Despite the difficulty of the work, Dominelli's research found that there was a notable lack of "...formal recognition of the personal costs probation officers bear...", which she refers to as "major occupational hazards" for probation officers (p.98). To assist in the resolution of this issue, Dominelli suggests that formally established support networks be developed (p.87).

Undoubtedly how far "success" might be attributable to the effectiveness of the particular staff involved is clearly relevant to the question of replicability: How far does one effective intensive supervision program support the general case for the introduction of such projects elsewhere? While no attempt was made to assess staff quality, the intense level of commitment of V.S.S.U. probation officers to their program model and their creativity and dedication in individualizing their responses to their client's problems were characteristics which were clearly observable to the researcher. It would not be surprising to find that some probation officers are more effective than others with offenders. Future projects would be wise to explore what qualities of staff might impact on efficient and effective service delivery of correctional
programs. For example, Dominelli (1991) feels that the sexual abuse experiences of probation officers should be explored because of the relevancy of such abuse for their ability to work effectively with the sex offender population. She questions, "Will it make them collusive workers or more able to challenge offenders on their own ground?" (p.93).

While a project's success depends partly on having good staff, this does not mean that other projects with similar aims cannot be set up elsewhere, it simply means that good staff should be picked to run them (Raynor, 1988, p.163). There have been some efforts to operationalize "quality" of services in probation practice. Petersilia (1990) suggests that "evidence" of quality might represent the length of interview times, the subject matter discussed, and the usefulness of the contacts from the offender's perspective.

As well, there should be some attention to maintenance of staff health and the prevention of burnout among the personnel of the new intensive supervision program as the intense level of dedication with which these programs require can only be maintained so long. As Conrad (1987) has noted, Any program that is based on constructive personal relations must be carried out by normal people - not be saintly deviates who neither have nor want private lives of their own" (p.63).

Summary and Conclusions

The multifaceted nature of the V.S.S.U. program, in conjunction with the limitations of the research design employed in this study, precluded analysis of every objective of the V.S.S.U. unit. The specific parts of the
program which were examined in this study, namely intensive supervision (measured by face-to-face contacts), surveillance checks, psychological assessment and group management, suggested that V.S.S.U. is achieving a good level of program success in terms of meeting stated objectives. Home visitation was the only program component which was significantly below program standards. Overall, it appears that the operation of the V.S.S.U. program has closely matched original intentions.

While the V.S.S.U. program appears to have provided a program which met many of their expectations in terms of contacts and service provision, this research effort did not find significantly lower recidivism rates for V.S.S.U. participants. Analysis of reoffending data indicated that there were no significant differences in recidivism between the groups.

Although this research effort did not find significantly lower recidivism rates for V.S.S.U. participants, it is possible that some component of the Vancouver Specialized Unit positively impacted on recidivism. A significantly higher rate of recidivism among V.S.S.U. participants might reasonably have been expected in light of the more serious offenders reporting to the unit. Thus, it is possible that the specialized unit is assisting to control re-offending over the long term. It would be difficult to imagine how heightened surveillance, increased face-to-face contact with offenders, more personalized and
in-depth interviewing with offenders, heightened inter-agency co-operation, the application of relapse prevention principles and a deep sense of commitment among V.S.S.U. staff could possibly contribute to sexual re-offending in any substantial way. Future studies, which are not plagued by the methodological problems compounding this study, might offer a clearer view of the impact of these program components (either individually or in combination) on offender behavior.

Overall, the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit differed from regular probation in the level and nature of services provided to the probationers. Specifically, the V.S.S.U. offenders received a greater intensity of face-to-face supervision, as well as different types of monitoring services (e.g. police and employment checks, contact with family). These results can be interpreted as reflective of V.S.S.U.'s attempts to establish a collaborative relationship with individuals and agencies involved in the offender's life. This type of "safety-network" approach, which is consistent with the external supervisory dimension of relapse prevention, has attracted attention from researchers in recent years.

Byrne (1990), a critic of "surveillance-oriented" intensive supervision practices, suggests that the probation officer who facilitates interactions with family, job, friends and the community is more likely to create more preferable informal social controls and reduce the formal
control emphasis of intensive supervision programs. If, however, officers are more chameleon-like, taking on the protective coloration ostensibly provided through the emphasis on formal control, their orientation will be more punitive and very likely less supportive of positive uses of those mechanisms of informal social control. As such positive uses decrease, the likelihood of intensive supervision helping to make an enduring change in offender behavior may similarly decrease (Lipsky, 1980; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1992).

Several of the more recent evaluations of the new intensive supervision programs have speculated that control of offenders alone is not enough and that some form of assistance is necessary even in these new programs which were founded on the surveillance premise (Petersilia and Turner, 1990; Byrne, Lurigio and Baird, 1989). While it obviously serves the community's interest to monitor convicted offenders in a manner that could help prevent crime and that detects and intervenes when violations occur, it is questionable as to whether this type of punishment-surveillance orientation to supervision has any potential for influencing behavior after the surveillance is discontinued.
Nasibitt (1980) made the point that when the use of "high tech" increase, corresponding increases must be made in the use of "high touch". He explains that probation and parole officers must be constantly aware of the forces in modern living that tend to depersonalize the individual, and they must ensure that caseload supervision includes adequate concern for the enhancement of the offender's self-image along with responsible behaviors. Control capabilities may make easier the part of the job that records the offenders' whereabouts, but at the same time they may make more difficult the part of the job that involves the motivation of the offenders and gaining their commitment to a responsible lifestyle which does not include deviant sexual behavior. The Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit, in its incorporation of a relapse prevention model of offender supervision and management, may be providing a form of "assistance" which in some way impacts on offending behavior in the longer term. Future research should explore this possibility.
In conclusion, it can be argued that specialized work with serious and potentially dangerous sex offenders is essential. While innovations in corrections and efforts at offender rehabilitation necessitate significant monetary investment, when viewed in light of the human cost to society, the choice is obvious. Society must seek new methods to manage and treat sex offenders in light of the financial and potentially damaging impact of incarceration, lost productivity on the part of the offender and victim, strained criminal justice resources, as well as the social loss of family disintegration and sense of personal safety. Due to the significance of these costs, a concerted effort at finding better ways to manage and assist offenders to avoid crime is needed. The Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit represents but one correctional innovation which is attempting to meet this difficult challenge. Future research efforts might explore the many potentially positive impacts of the program which could not be examined because of the methodological limitations of the study.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

History of Probation

The development of the "modern" system of probation in Canada, which offers organized supervision of offenders, with imposed restrictions and the possibility of criminal conviction for breach of conditions of a probation order, has been described as having emerged from a general current of social and political reform whose original focus was a critique of the philosophy and practices of the existing juvenile court system. Several academics have published detailed examinations of probation in relation to these events and it is not the purpose of this discussion to reiterate those (Hagan and Leon, 1980; Meeker, 1967; Rothman, 1980; and Glueck, 1974).

Implicit in these analyses is the belief that correctional practices evolve to a higher level when the inadequacies of criminal justice practices are recognized (Hylton, 1982). Thus, correctional reform is seen as being motivated by benevolence, altruism and humanitarianism, and the eventual record of successive reforms should be read as an incremental story of progress (Cohen, 1985).

What has been labelled as the "conventional view" (Hylton, 1982; Cohen, 1985) or the "liberal-pluralist" (Ekstedt and Griffiths, 1984, p.58) interpretation of the movement towards community based alternatives, however, is not without its challengers. Generally speaking, the most significant
detractors from the conventional view of correctional change relate to the same theme: "the dispersal of discipline thesis" (Vass and Weston, 1990, p.189). This theme suggests that community correctional "alternatives" are not really alternatives to incarceration, and that they do more harm than good: they tend to widen the state's net of surveillance and control (Scull, 1977; Cohen, 1979; Cohen, 1985; Hylton, 1982; Vass and Menzies, 1989; Vass and Weston, 1990). This "dispersal of discipline" discourse represents but one of many examples of how the development and purpose of correctional innovations can be written and rewritten. Indeed, the controversy over what probation truly represents, whether a humane alternative disposition to incarceration, a form of punishment, a rehabilitative tool, a less visible social control mechanism or a useless endeavor sustained for professional interests - is yet to be resolved as probation practice approaches the twenty-first century.

The first legislation formally authorizing the practice of probation in Canada was passed in 1889. Specifically, the Act to Permit the Conditional Release of First Offenders in Certain Cases permitted judges to suspend the imposition of a sentence in the criminal court and instead place the offender on "probation of good conduct" (Ekstedt and Griffiths, 1984, P.54). Sheridan and Conrad (1976) elaborate:

In Canada adult probation apparently began with the judge directing the release of certain offenders on a recognizance rather than imposing sentence. This procedure, though not legal, was generally accepted and in 1889 the Act to Permit the Conditional
Release of First Offenders in Certain Cases was passed. (p.253)

In 1921, one of the many amendments made to this legislation, which had been included in the Criminal Code in 1892, required the offender to report to an officer of the court, thus, in the words of Sheridan and Konrad (1976) "...legally recognizing that there was a value in supervising those released on suspended sentence" (p.254). Ekstedt and Griffiths (1984) explain that despite this legislation, the development of probation services in the various provinces has taken place over a fifty-year period of time. This observation is particularly reflective of the development of the probation service in British Columbia.

In April of 1946 British Columbia witnessed the passing of its first Probation Act. Under this legislation, the role of the probation officer included investigation and reporting with respect to information required by the court on the offender (e.g. family history, previous convictions, employment, etc.) and supervision of persons placed on probation" (Doherty and Ekstedt, 1992, p.66). Since the introduction of this legislation, the probation service has expanded considerably in British Columbia, encompassing changes in the probation officer role, the philosophy and mandate of the service, as well as management and supervision practices. Ekstedt and Doherty (1992) offer a comprehensive descriptive chronology of the significant changes which have occurred within the Corrections Branch in British Columbia.
Generally speaking, the overall purpose of probation has remained consistent in that it represents a relief from the constraints of imprisonment justified on the basis of the offender's age or character or because of the minor nature of the offence (Department of Justice, 1991). The rehabilitative functions and potential of probation have also assumed a pre-eminent role in Canadian probation practice.

Present Forms of Probation

Definitions of probation are many and varied. In 1969, the Quimet Report (1969) offered a definition of probation which is applicable to the Canadian probation practice today:

As a disposition of the Court whereby an offender is released to the community on a tentative basis, subject to specified conditions, under the supervision of a probation officer (or someone serving as a probation officer) and liable to recall by the Court for alternative disposition if he does not abide by the conditions of his order. (p.293)

Essentially, probation is a contract between the Court and the offender, whereby the offender agrees to abide by all imposed conditions. Failure to abide by one or more of these conditions may result in probation revocation and subsequent incarceration.

1While the nature and number of conditions attached to a probation order can vary, each and every order includes two statutory conditions which direct that the individual on probation keep the peace and be of good behavior, and secondly, report to the Court when required to do so. Other conditions of probation vary from individual to individual. The supervision practices to which each offender is subjected are defined in large part by the probation conditions outlined in the judicial order.
Probation is a complicated dispositional option available to the Canadian judiciary in that there are a variety of means by which an offender can be placed on a probation order. For example, probation can be applied to persons who, while having been found guilty, differ in whether or not they have been technically convicted and/or sentenced. Others may have received a sentence of probation combined with a fine or imprisonment. Finally, some persons may have been given an intermittent sentence (less than 90 days) during which period (when in the community) they are subject to the conditions found in a probation order. The varying ways that an offender can be placed on a probation order are outlined in detail in the Criminal Code of Canada. Briefly, the Court can impose a Period of probation in the five ways outlined below, with the common restriction that whatever option the Court chooses for an individual offender, the maximum period of probation allowed under the Criminal Code is 3 years.

Probation associated with conditional discharge

A plea or finding of guilt (without a conviction) may lead to a conditional discharge. In all cases, the accused is placed on probation under the terms of a probation order. The Criminal Code outlines what specific offences are eligible for this sentencing option. Generally speaking, there must be no minimum penalty by law and the maximum penalty must be less than 14 years before a conditional discharge can be granted.
Probation associated with a suspended sentence

When a person is found or has pleaded guilty and a conviction is registered, the passing of sentence may be suspended. This requires a period of probation under conditions set out in a probation order. The Criminal Code is specific in outlining what offences might be eligible for this sentencing option. Generally speaking, there must be no minimum penalty prescribed by law.

Fine plus probation

When a conviction is registered, the accused may be sentenced to a fine accompanied by a period of probation. Payment of fine is not a condition of probation. Fine amounts differ depending on whether there has been a conviction for an indictable offence (no fine limit) or summary offence (limit of $2,000).

Imprisonment followed by probation

Imprisonment for a term not greater than two years may be followed by a period of probation. In this case, the actual probation begins after the term in jail has expired. This period of probation will also include conditions set out in a probation order. An offender may be fined, imprisoned and placed on probation.

Intermittent Sentence

These sentences of 90 days or less are always accompanied by a probation order. This probation order might outline specific conditions that the offender must abide by while in
the community. The probation order terminates when the offender serves the last day of the custodial sentence.

**Canadian Research on Probation Effectiveness**

Probation services are complex and imperfectly understood organizations which have not greatly benefited from the ongoing scrutiny of researchers. Probation practice has been recognized as a characteristically low-visibility enterprise which has not been the subject of much research, compared to such sibling occupations as policing, public welfare, prison guards, or to such distant wealthy relatives as doctors or lawyers (Thomson, 1987, p.100 cited in Harding, 1987). One of the few probation researchers, Krajick (1990), describes the field of probation as "...the least visible, least studied, most diffuse and most underfunded part of the criminal processing apparatus" (p.7).

Krajick's observations concerning researcher's lack of interest in probation is certainly reflective of the Canadian situation. While there have been a few noteworthy Canadian research efforts on the historical and philosophical origins of the service (Hagan and Leon, 1980), legal issues surrounding the probation order (Dombek, 1975; Boyd, 1977), there has been limited attention to the effectiveness of probation. This inattention to probation practice is surprising in light of statistical evidence documenting the increasing popularity of probation as a sentencing option in Canada. The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics reported a
10% national increase in periods of probation initiated in 1991-1992 over the previous year. The 1990-1991 year found a 12% increase in probationary terms over the previous year. In addition to the increasing numbers of individuals sentenced to probation, Statistics Canada reported that the median term of probation has increased in recent years from 11 to 12 months (1993, p.10). In the province of British Columbia, probation has represented a more common judicial response than incarceration since 1990 (Statistics Canada, 1993).

Despite what appears to be the increasing popularity of probation as a sentencing option in the 1990s, Canadian research on probation effectiveness suffers from methodological problems (Parizeau and Saxbo, 1977; Boyd, 1978), is rare (Cockerill, 1975), and usually old (The Ontario Probation Officers Association; Cockerill, 1975). Notwithstanding these problems, available published studies of Canadian probation effectiveness are reviewed below.

Canadian research has generally defined effectiveness in terms of: (1) the offender’s compliance with conditions of probation during the supervision period and (2) the offender’s ability to refrain from criminal activity either during the supervision period or for a period of time after supervision has expired. Most studies have combined the two measures of effectiveness.

One of the first studies which focused solely on probation effectiveness was published by the Ontario Probation Officers Association in 1967. The criteria for success during
a three year follow-up period were non-conviction for an indictable offence or non-violation of the probation order's terms. The study claimed a success rate of 68.3% for 466 probationers involved in this survey. The researchers did not examine factors related to successful or unsuccessful completion of probation.

The next known published examination of the effectiveness of probation was cited in the Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections (1969):

During 1966, Alberta reported that 89 per cent of adult probationers completed successfully, while Manitoba reported a success rate of 85 per cent, Ontario 85 per cent and Saskatchewan 84 per cent. This consistent high rate of success is most encouraging. (p.297)

The definition of "success" used by the Committee being "...the completion of the probation period by the probationer without a breach of conditions sufficiently serious to induce the court to terminate probation and impose a sentence" (p.297). The Committee justifies their use of this definition of success in the following excerpt:

This is an important measure of success since it means that permitting the offender to spend the probation period in the community did not endanger the public while his successful efforts to abide by the probation conditions indicated progress on his part. Cost to the taxpayer is also reduced. (p.297)

In their reporting of this very encouraging evidence of the success of probation, however, the Committee leaves many significant questions unanswered concerning the details of the research results they report (e.g. who conducted the research,
what research design was utilized, etc.). Further, what factors might have been influential in either the successful probation cases or in the failures is not addressed.

The early 1970s saw the release of another study on the effectiveness of probation. The Alberta Attorney General (1973) study used recidivism rates to gauge probation effectiveness, which were determined for a province-wide sample of all people convicted of criminal offences in Alberta between January 1, 1967 and December 31, 1971 whose disposition included probation. Recidivism was defined in the study as further criminal convictions following the conviction for which the offender was placed on probation. These further convictions were counted not only for the time period on probation but also for the time after the probation was completed until the end of 1972. Of the total 2726 probationers, 1664 successfully completed their term of probation, with no appearance in court while the order was in force, and with no reconviction during the follow-up period. A total of 1062 were unsuccessful, either by reoffending while on probation or during the follow-up period. This yields an overall success rate of 61.0%.

In 1975 the Cockerill study was released. The primary purpose of the study was to provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of probation, with recidivism rates utilized as a gauge of probation effectiveness. The study used data from 2,726 probationers files in the Edmonton, Alberta adult probation service from June 1967 to December 1972. Cockerill
used a somewhat more stringent standard of success than the earlier Ontario Probation Officers' Association study in holding any court appearance following termination of probation as an indication of probation failure. The overall reported success rate was 61%. The success and failure rates during and after probation were higher than the over-all rate. Specifically, a total of 2,061 probationers successfully completed their term of probation, yielding a success rate during probation of 75.6 per cent. A total of 2,049 probationers were reconvicted from the time their probation ended\(^2\), yielding a success rate after completion of probation of 75.2 per cent.

The Cockerill study took the former Canadian studies on probation effectiveness one step further in that the relationship of numerous background and treatment variables on over-all success and failure rates was considered. During probation, Cockerill found that employment status (being occupied, either as a student or employee, increased the chances of succeeding), the time of the most recent previous conviction in relation to the probation conviction (if previous convictions were less than a year from the offence the individuals were given probation for, the individuals could be expected to have lower success rates than if prior convictions were more than two years earlier), occupation

\(^2\)The follow-up period was not defined in the study but presumably was for some length of time between the start of the study (January 1967) and the end of the study (December 1971).
(unskilled probationer more likely to re-offend) and marital status (being married increased the chances of success) were the variables that best differentiated between successes and failures. After probation, the only variable that accounted for any important degree of association was racial origin. Specifically, native Canadians were found to have higher levels of recidivism (1975, p.290).

In 1981, Rogers published a study on the factors related to recidivism among a sample of 1,104 probationers in Ontario. This represented a follow-up investigation of a descriptive profile of Ontario probationers which had been conducted in 1977 by Renner and Associates. Three measures of recidivism were examined by Rogers (1981): (1) reconvictions during the probation period, (2) reconvictions between the date the probation order was issued and 24 months following termination; and, (3) sentence(s) of incarceration between the date the probation order was issued and 24 months following termination. The overall recidivism rate for probationers on probation was one in every five convicted of further offences. Two years following termination, this proportion increased to one in three probationers. The variables found to be indicative of high recidivism included: criminal history, low socio-economic status, lack of family cohesiveness, problems at school (e.g. suspended or expelled, drop outs), unproductive use of leisure time, criminal associations, poor employment history, offences against public order, and problems related to inter-personal skills.
With respect to the recidivism of sex offenders under probation supervision, most of the studies on Canadian probation effectiveness have not addressed this issue in any depth. Rogers (1981) included sex offences under various offence categories which precluded separation of recidivism data for sex offences. The Ontario Probation Officers Association study (1967) found that all four of the sexual offenders in their study were successful. While these researchers acknowledge that the small number of sex offenders makes any conclusions impossible, they nevertheless infer that the results are indicative of the fact that some sex offenders can be successfully rehabilitated (p.82). It is unsure if the researchers are attributing the success rate to a treatment program outside of probation or to some facet of probation supervision itself. Regardless, the small number of sex offenders in this study precludes any serious examination of this finding. The final study on Canadian probation effectiveness, Cockerill (1975), commented on the success rates of different kinds of offenders, including sex offenders. He found that the individuals who were successful were the ones committing fraud, drug offences, and sexual offences. Cockerill (1975) did not provide information as to how many sex offenders were successful probationers or what particular variables might have been influential in their success or failure.
Summary

Generally speaking, the majority of the Canadian studies on probation effectiveness of the 1970s may be of limited applicability to the probation practice of the 1990s because of their methodological inadequacies (Boyd, 1978), as well as significant changes which occurred in the federal laws dictating probation practice. Aasen (1985) argues that the Cockerill (1975) and Ontario Probation Officers Association (1967) studies cannot be generalized to the present effectiveness of probation because of significant Criminal Code amendments in 1968-1969 (p.36).

Furthermore, as the Unit under study in the present thesis, the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit, departs from regular probation practices (e.g. their use of group methods, specialized population of sex offenders, relapse prevention model, and intensive supervision), the generalizability of these early probation studies is also limited. Nevertheless, this review of the early studies of probation effectiveness has been a necessary exercise if only for setting the context for this study, and in justifying the need for the current exploration of probation practice.

---

3 Boyd (1978) outlines the methodological problems of the Canadian probation studies: "offenders are not randomly assigned to probation or jail as a consequence of court appearance; no cause-effect relationship can be drawn from any data on recidivism rates" (p.371). Boyd (1978) argues that a moderately low recidivism rate for probationers tells one little about the efficacy of the probation system because the probationer is placed on probation in the first place because it is unlikely that he will be a recidivist.
Appendix E

Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit

Program Operation

Staffing

At present there are three probation officers (two Probation Officers, one Local Director) and one support staff, assigned to the Unit by the Corrections Branch. Two probation officers from selected Vancouver area offices are involved in co-facilitating case management groups. Typically, probation officers from other catchment area offices will volunteer for this assignment to V.S.S.U. out of personal interest. Probation officer interest and personal suitability are the primary determinants of which particular probation officer will be accepted for this "extra-curricular" assignment. To date, six probation officers from other offices have completed training sessions in group co-facilitation at V.S.S.U..

In addition to the above Attorney General staff members, V.S.S.U. has contracted out to a psychologist who provides two sessions per week at the unit; approximately seven hours of psychological services. Furthermore, an employment counsellor from the Job Placement Program has office hours in the V.S.S.U. probation office one day per week.

V.S.S.U. is also utilized as a practicum placement for students from Simon Fraser University's School of Criminology, and as a re-entry program placement for the Ministry of Advanced Education and Technology.
Staff Training

It is generally recognized that working with sex offenders demands special skills, above those acquired by probation officers through basic training or through their work with other offenders. To acquire these skills Probation Officers normally attend the Justice Institute of British Columbia, located in Vancouver, B.C., for training. Probation Officers at the V.S.S.U. unit have completed the available specialized courses in the management and supervision of sex offenders at the Justice Institute. One staff member has obtained a Masters Degree in Counselling Psychology from the University of British Columbia.

In addition to receiving specialized training in courses offered through the Justice Institute, most staff members engage in ongoing "self-training" by keeping abreast of the latest developments in sex offender management and treatment issues. While much of this "self-training" is undertaken at the personal expense and initiative of the individual V.S.S.U. officers, the unit is permitted a small budget for the purchase of relevant materials (as are all probation offices). The office has managed to develop a small library which is at the disposal of its specialized unit as well as regular Probation offices.

The Corrections Branch has recognized the level of experience and knowledge obtained at the V.S.S.U. unit by encouraging the staff to disseminate this knowledge to Probation staff at other offices throughout the Province. This
is accomplished through appearances as guest speakers at Justice Institute training seminars, as well as through occasional appearances at individual probation office monthly meetings.

Referral Process to V.S.S.U.

V.S.S.U. is a service delivery unit for the city of Vancouver (which currently has three adult probation offices) and the Municipality of Richmond (one adult Probation Office). Each office has identified a liaison probation officer to streamline the referral process. The liaison probation officers meet at the beginning of each month to discuss appropriate V.S.S.U. intakes for the following month. A referral criteria checklist (Appendix C) prioritizes the suitable candidates for the V.S.S.U. program. It should be noted the referral criteria has not been scientifically validated and consequently should not be considered for determining risk. It is meant to be used as an internal case management tool to streamline the referral process. V.S.S.U. attempts to adhere to the referral guidelines, but the referral process is also flexible to accommodate anomalies.

Staff at V.S.S.U. candidly acknowledged that there has been a level of opposition to the concept of a specialized program such as V.S.S.U. and the associated referral process for sex offenders since its introduction. While no formal survey has been undertaken to date to assess the level of dissatisfaction or satisfaction with the V.S.S.U. program, it was evident that there were probation officers who were not
fully committed to the idea of a specialized intensive supervision program for sex offenders. This lack of commitment was exhibited in that many probation officers chose not to refer appropriate candidates to the specialized program and continued supervising them in their own offices. Indeed, the referral process is a voluntary one - probation officers are not bound to refer sex offenders to the program unless it is a specific condition of probation that they participate in intensive supervision or attend V.S.S.U.

In discussions with numerous probation staff, several reasons why probation officers might not respond positively to a specialized program for sex offenders were outlined. Some of the seasoned probation officers believed that they possessed the required skills to supervise sex offenders and thus, saw no urgency or need to refer their clientele to another program. Furthermore, some officers believed that some of the sex offenders on their caseloads were not "serious" offenders in their eyes and thus not deserving of a referral. Other probation officers chose to ignore the V.S.S.U. referral option for their sex offenders because of a desire to maintain a multifaceted caseload and avoid being forced into their own "specialized caseloads" by eliminating sex offenders through referral to V.S.S.U.

**Program Principles, Goals and Philosophy**

The fundamental principles and goals of V.S.S.U. have remained consistent since the program’s inception in March of 1987, due in large part to the continuing presence and
commitment of its founding member, Neil McKenzie. The V.S.S.U. Program Manual outlines the principles and goals of the program:

Protection of society, reintegration of offenders, positive programming and referral to other agencies, provision of intensive and appropriate levels of supervision, and increased assurance that court-imposed sentences are carried out consistent with the intent of sentence (1990, p.4).

The primary goal of V.S.S.U. is to protect society by actively providing opportunities for sexual offenders to establish internal controls with respect to their deviant sexual behavior. Ultimately, these internal controls are reinforced for the purpose of reducing the possibility of offending behavior and protecting the public. A focus on the principles of relapse prevention and the group process of case management being ways of encouraging internal controls. Additionally, external sanctions are provided through supervision and monitoring with a focus towards assisting the offender to control his behavior and develop a more socially acceptable lifestyle (e.g. free from criminal activity). To achieve these goals, V.S.S.U. has designed an intensified supervision program integrating the following components:

1) Monitoring, supervising and restricting offender activities.
2) Promoting sexually appropriate behaviors and supporting/assisting offender initiatives to change their lifestyle.
3) Maintaining an integrated systems approach to monitoring the offender in the community.
4) Active development of a network of persons and agencies involved in the achievement of our goals and sharing pertinent information with said persons and agencies.
5) Developing an awareness of offender traits and crime cycles, with persons and agencies involved with the sex offender
VSSU Program Manual, p.4).

V.S.S.U. is committed to a coordinated approach to protect the community from sexual victimization. While recognizing that coordination presents professional dilemmas given the different treatment mandates of persons and agencies involved in the treatment plan, the V.S.S.U. unit hopes to facilitate this process through the development of a program philosophy. The identification and documentation of a program philosophy also assists unit staff to work towards common goals.

In developing its program philosophy, V.S.S.U. has integrated many program initiatives from academic writings and other sex offender treatment programs. The following multifaceted philosophy has been adopted by the V.S.S.U. unit:

1) Sexual Assault is either the result of:
   a) a deviant arousal pattern and/or
   b) the inappropriate conversion of nonsexual problems into sexual behavior.

2) A primary goal is for offenders to learn to control their deviant arousal patterns.

3) Offenders must take responsibility for child sexual abuse without minimizing, externalizing, or projecting blame onto others. Manipulation and denial are major behavioral overlays of the offence and the response to discovery.

4) Each parent must take responsibility for his or her own behavior and not the other’s. Spouses are responsible for abuse only if they are involved in sexual abuse. They are responsible for denying and minimizing if they do so.

5) Child sexual abuse is a treatable problem. Treatable is defined as helping the offender learn ways of minimizing the risk of reoffence. It does not imply cure.
6) Any dysfunctional family patterns resulting from or providing the opportunity for sexual abuse need to be addressed and changed. These may include but are not restricted to isolation, poor communication, lack of boundaries, and patriarchal entitlement.

7) Victims are not responsible for child sexual abuse under any circumstances.

8) Child sexual abuse is harmful to children.

9) An important goal of any sexual abuse program is to provide support to other professionals and to network effectively (V.S.S.U Program Manual, 1990, p.4).

The Program Model: Relapse Prevention

In order to describe the work being done at V.S.S.U. it is important to understand the program model. V.S.S.U. has adopted the "Relapse Prevention" treatment and supervision model of managing sexual offenders in the community.

The staff at V.S.S.U. actively work with offenders to develop and strengthen the internal self-management dimension of relapse prevention. The internal self-management dimension of relapse prevention, according to Pithers (1990) assists sex offenders in the following tasks:

* identify high risk situations leading to abuse;
* analyze seemingly unimportant decisions that allow them to be put into high-risk situations;
* develop strategies to avoid, or cope more effectively with, these situations (p.20).

V.S.S.U. staff employ the internal self-management dimension of relapse prevention through their frequent one-on-one contacts with the offender as well as through the group
management process. Both of these practices are discussed in a later section on Intensive Supervision Practices.

When employing the relapse prevention model, V.S.S.U. staff do no view themselves as "therapists" or engaging the probationers in a "therapeutic relationship". Rather, V.S.S.U. staff employ the relapse model to encourage the maintenance of positive changes which may have been accomplished through institutional or within their ongoing participation in outpatient treatment programs. Many of the sex offenders reporting to V.S.S.U. have participated in sex offender treatment while incarcerated or have attended for sex offender treatment at Forensic Psychiatric Services. For those probationers who have not received either treatment intervention, their introduction to relapse prevention at V.S.S.U., albeit through probation officers and not therapists, is nevertheless viewed as a beneficial intervention.4

The internal self-management dimension of relapse prevention has sometimes "proved inadequate" (Pithers, 1990, p.357). Pithers (1990) explains that sexual offenders may neglect to employ their acquired skills at critical moments or deny lapses to the professionals involved in their treatment and supervision. Because sex offenders were sometimes unreliable informants regarding their own lapses and relapses, un

4 While some therapy programs for sex offenders are subsumed by relapse prevention techniques, it is commonly recognized that sex offenders cannot be treated adequately by those procedures alone (Pithers, Martin, and Cumming, 1989).
creating other methods of gaining access to information about their functioning was considered essential to enhance community safety (Pithers, 1990, p.357). This second dimension of relapse prevention was developed for use by parole and probation agencies in 1987 (Pithers, Kashima, Cumming, Beal and Buell) and is known as the external supervisory dimension of relapse prevention. This dimension of the relapse prevention model is also integrated into V.S.S.U.'s program model.

**External, Supervisory Dimension of Relapse Prevention**

According to Pithers (1991), the external supervisory dimension of relapse prevention facilitates supervision of sex offenders by community agents such as probation or parole officers. V.S.S.U. employs Pithers (1990) external supervisory dimension of relapse prevention to enhance supervision of the offender. There are three functions of this dimension of relapse prevention which are employed at V.S.S.U.. These include: (1) monitoring specific offence precursors, (2) development of an informal network of collateral contacts, and (3) creation of collaborative relationships with other agencies.

**Monitoring Specific Offence Precursors**

V.S.S.U. staff assist each individual offender to recognize the factors that led to their offences and might put them at risk in the future. In addition, help is given on how to avoid these risks or to deal with them when they are unavoidable. According to relapse prevention theory, if sex
offenders are going to be able to successfully avoid relapse in the future, they must be able to identify the salient elements of high-risk situations that increase the likelihood for their reoffending. Pithers (1990) elaborates on the usefulness of this type of focused supervision:

Since officers monitor specific risk factors related to the offender's sex offences (rather than attempting to monitor all the offender's behaviors, many of which are irrelevant), the efficiency of supervision is increased. (p.23)

There are various idiographic assessment purposes which are applied for this purpose, including the preparation of an offender autobiography, use of structured interviews and self monitoring techniques (e.g. diary).

Informal Network of Collateral Contacts

V.S.S.U. staff actively work to increase the efficiency of supervision by creating an informal network of collateral contacts who could assist the probation officer in monitoring the offenders behavior by reporting factors related to relapse. Collateral contacts who might offer assistance in this capacity vary depending on an offender's individual's social circumstances but might include the offender's spouse/significant other and other family members, mental health agencies, police agencies, and the offender's employer.

Creation of Collaborative Relationships

V.S.S.U. has created a collaborative working relationship with mental health and other agency professionals who are involved in an offender's life. Traditionally, the mandates of the Probation Service, Corrections (institutional side),
Police and Mental Health agencies appear divergent and consequently common goals and objectives are not easily defined. While all probation offices encourage co-operation between the agencies in managing and supervising offenders in the community, V.S.S.U. has generated a far more active role in this arena. The structure of relapse prevention with sex offenders encourages a multi-disciplinary approach in managing sexual victimization (Pithers, 1990). Relapse prevention is focused on a common goal that can be philosophically interpreted and practically applied by all the agencies involved in the treatment of sex offenders. V.S.S.U. encourages the use of a waiver of non-confidentiality enabling the networking systems to communicate and to prevent wedging one system against another. The program's intensive liaising with agencies both within the Attorney General's Ministry and in the professional community, is a defining feature of its Program and is a departure from standard practice at regular probation offices. While the V.S.S.U. office has access to the same agencies/services as regular probation offices, there are two agencies with which the V.S.S.U. agency has developed a Particularly intense liaison relationship with, namely the Stave Lake Correctional Centre and Forensic Psychiatric Services.

Liaison with Stave Lake Correctional Centre

As part of the V.S.S.U.'s integrated approach to case management, the program has recognized a need for case management planning between the institution and the community.
V.S.S.U. has incorporated a liaison role with the provincial custodial institution which deals exclusively with sex offenders: Stave Lake Correctional Centre. Stave Lake houses approximately 59 to 63 sex offenders at any given time. The institution offers a multi-disciplinary, multi-agency approach to the management of sex offenders through a team effort of therapists, program counsellors and correctional officers. It is intended that all sex offenders at Stave Lake participate in group therapy, however, due to limited resources there may be one or a two month delay in group access.

In addition to being represented on the Stave Lake Advisory Committee, a member of V.S.S.U. attends the correctional facility on a regular basis. V.S.S.U. staff work with Stave Lake's case management coordinator to develop appropriate release plans for inmates intending to return to V.S.S.U.'s catchment area (Vancouver City/Richmond Municipality). Further, staff of the specialized unit are available to respond to inmate queries about the program, assist in establishing community treatment plans, and advise on the suitability of release plans. All temporary absence and parole community investigations regarding Stave Lake inmates returning to Vancouver/Richmond are processed through V.S.S.U.

**Adult Forensic Psychiatric Services**

The Forensic Psychiatric Services Commission (adult and Youth programs) are divisions of the Ministry of Health which offer mental health services to the Ministry of Attorney
General. Among the mandates of the Adult Forensic Services Commission is the provision of mental health services to sex offenders in three general circumstances:

1) Sex offenders are referred by the courts to the Sex Offender Treatment Program for assessment prior to sentencing.

2) Sex offenders living in the community are referred to the Programme as a condition of probation or BC Parole.

3) Sex offenders who are incarcerated in the Provincial Correction System can agree to participate in the sex offender assessment/treatment programmes held at Kamloops Correctional Centre and at Stave Lake Correctional Centre.

Both regular probation offices as well V.S.S.U. have access to the sex offender treatment services offered by Adult Forensic Psychiatric Services out-patient clinic. The V.S.S.U. unit, however, has worked arduously to develop a close relationship to Forensic personnel which encourages the sharing of relevant offender information. The fact that a significant number of the sex offenders reporting to the V.S.S.U. program are referred to forensic services also assists in fostering a cooperative partnership in the management of sex offenders. V.S.S.U. probation officers ensure that they participate in the program and remain accountable.

From a two group Vancouver based program in 1982, Forensic’s treatment services for sex offenders in 1991 has expanded to 25 groups spanning the province of British Columbia (services offered in Vancouver, Victoria, Surrey, Campbell River, Prince George and Kamloops area). Of these 25
groups, eight groups serve Correctional Centres and 17 groups operate in the community.

In 1991, there were approximately 170 offenders treated in the program per year. The typical length of participation in treatment is 18 months. Offenders typically receive three hours of direct program activities (ie. therapy groups, individual counselling) per week. Of the offenders accepted into the program, the majority utilize the program on an outpatient basis (76% of offenders), while approximately 24% are custody (LaTorre, 1991).

Treatment Goal(s) of Forensic Services Commission

The overall purpose of Forensic’s sex offender program is to reduce the likelihood, prevalence and incident of reoffending and thereby prevent and reduce further victimization (LaTorre, 1991). The following comprises the minimal desirable goals of a this comprehensive sex offender treatment program:

*enhance victim awareness (e.g. empathy with the victim)
*enhance emotional awareness and expression.
*enhance awareness of the offender's own victimization.
*enhance appropriate sexual arousal.
   inhibit inappropriate sexual arousal.
*enhance interpersonal functioning.
*enhance self-assertive behavior.
*enhance knowledge of human sexuality.
*enhance stress management techniques.
*enhance mastery over disinhibitors.

Forensic Treatment Strategies

While specific treatment techniques will largely be determined by the training and experience of the therapist and the needs of the particular client, the following are
considered essential treatment strategies to be undertaken at some point during the treatment process in all offender groups:

1) Sex education in order to provide knowledge of human sexuality and sexual dysfunctions.
2) Supportive confrontation to encourage complete disclosure and acceptance of total responsibility for offensive behavior.
3) Cognitive restructuring to address faulty attitudes or beliefs that support, maintain or rationalize the offending behavior.
4) Social Skills Training to enhance the client’s abilities to verbally and otherwise socially interact appropriately with other adults and to establish and maintain appropriate adult relationships.
5) Assertiveness Training to enhance self-assertive behavior while reducing passive and aggressive behavior.
6) Planning to prevent reoffence by thorough understanding of the offence cycle and the role of behavioral antecedents and by a well thought out relapse prevention plan.

For clients with inappropriate sexual arousal patterns, treatment would additionally include behavioral or cognitive behavioral techniques to reduce inappropriate fantasies and arousal and to enhance appropriate fantasies and arousal. Such techniques may include but need not be limited to:

*Covert sensitization to disrupt deviant fantasies by pairing them with aversive images.
*Masturbatory Satiation to reduce deviant arousal by pairing it with an aversive or boring task.
*Orgasmic reconditioning to reduce arousal to deviant stimuli while enhancing arousal to non-deviant stimuli by having non-deviant fantasies increasingly replace deviant fantasies.

Forensic services offers little in the way of follow-up or booster sessions to sex offenders following their completion of treatment. Offenders who have been through the program are occasionally seen on a one-on-one basis as needed, particularly at crisis points. However, very few few offenders
who have left the program receive follow-up treatment services from Forensic as the service has no mandate to provide services to this group of offenders.

**Intensive Supervision Practices at V.S.S.U.: Through Intake to Supervision**

**Intake**

The V.S.S.U. program operates from a team perspective and individual probation officers at the unit do not carry specific individual caseloads. However, each sex offender reporting to V.S.S.U. is assigned a primary probation worker. The primary workers responsibilities include, arranging intake appointments, scheduling case management meetings, file management, ensuring all conditions of probation orders are being met, completing referrals to appropriate agencies and being identified as the contact probation officer to outside agencies.

All clients reporting to V.S.S.U. are subject to an intensive initial interview process. All attempts are made to ensure that two probation officers conduct the initial interview with the offender. The duration of the first interview is between 1 hour to 1.5 hours. Generally speaking, V.S.S.U. probation officers address the following issues with each individual offender:

*Description of the V.S.S.U. program and the Relapse Prevention Model.*
*Inform the offender of the manner in which probable situations will be handled.*
*Review the letter of expectation and ensure offender comprehension (Appendix C).*
*Review police reports/pre-sentence reports to confirm information.
*Provide offender opportunity to make inquiries regarding offender expectations and responsibilities.
*Ensure all relevant documents (Probation Order, consent forms, etc.) are reviewed, signed and witnessed.
*Review pardons and complaints procedures.

The initial interview is viewed as a critical step in the supervision process as it establishes a foundation upon which to build a relationship and introduce relapse prevention practices. The initial interview at V.S.S.U. has the following objectives, as outlined in their Program Manual:

*Attempt Yes response atmosphere.
*Demythologize the stereotype of the sex offender.
*Mix confrontation with supportive comments.
*Emphasize relief of acknowledging his secrets.
*Discuss the strength demonstrated by disclosure.
*Stress importance of not making another mistake (deviant sex act).
*Make use of strong religious beliefs if available.
*Repeat questions periodically.
*Confront contradictions.

**Case Management Plan**

The primary worker is responsible for ensuring a case management plan is developed and documented within one month of the offender’s initial interview. After the initial interview the primary worker arranges for a psychological assessment with the contract psychologist. In most cases new intakes are assessed by the contract psychologist for case management purposes. The psychologist prepares a written report prior to the case management meeting which includes the result of the psychodiagnostic evaluation. Included in the report will be a recommended case management strategy including suggested referrals to appropriate resources in the community.
Within the first month of supervision at V.S.S.U. the offender completes a Plan to Live By. This plan is a case management tool based on relapse prevention theory which requires that the offender identify his offending cycle and pattern of deviant behavior. The Plan to Live By outlines high risk situations and identifies intervention techniques to avoid re-offending. It is beneficial to both the offender and the probation officer. The Plan is normally updated by the offender every six months and reviewed accordingly.

The psychological report, Plan to Live By, as well as other relevant information, are presented at a case management planning meeting. Case management planning meetings are normally scheduled at the V.S.S.U. office for Wednesday mornings. At these meetings, available probation officers are involved in discussing and developing a supervision plan for offenders at the unit. This plan is recorded on the offender case file within one month of the initial interview.

Case management is viewed as a dynamic process at V.S.S.U. and strategies developed for the supervision of an offender are not considered static. Staff recognize that circumstances in an offender's life (e.g. employment, residence, relationship, court involvement, substance use) are constantly changing. Accordingly, effective case management demands that any supervision plan be reviewed and adapted to meet the level and type of changes in an offender's life. At V.S.S.U. the supervision plan of an offender is reviewed every six months and documented in the probation file. This
supervision plan addresses such issues as reporting frequency, autobiographies, diaries, referrals to appropriate agencies, methods of monitoring specific conditions, intervention techniques, collateral contacts, etc.

**Intensive Reporting Schedule: In Office and Home Visitation**

To facilitate a more intensified supervision of offenders, the total caseload of V.S.S.U. is capped at 90 offenders. A maximum of 35 offenders per individual probation officer and 20 offenders per Local Director. V.S.S.U. completes all Pre-Sentence Reports\(^5\) for the Court for offenders on their caseload and all Temporary Absence/Parole Assessments\(^6\) originating from Stave Lake Correctional Centre.

As a result of the increased risk of public safety which sexual offenders represent, sex offenders receive an intensified form of supervision, either medium or maximum supervision depending upon the circumstances. Specifically,

---

\(^5\)The primary purpose of a pre-sentence report is to provide the sentencing judge with information about the offender, the victim and the sentencing options, it is also used in case management both in institutions and in the community by the National Parole Board. In the preparation of a pre-sentence report, a probation officer is required by policy directives to address the following areas of investigation: social and criminal history, alcohol and drug use, medical and psychiatric history, offender's attitude to the offence, previous response to Corrections programs and comments of the victim.

\(^6\)The purpose of a Temporary Absence/Parole Assessment is to assess the inmate's plan for his/her return to the community. Areas of investigation include proposed employment and residential plans and response to previous community supervision practices. These reports are one of the many documents reviewed by the releasing authorities and form only a part of the decision-making process.
all offenders are required to report in person to the V.S.S.U. office on a weekly basis for the first month. At the case management conference a supervision plan outlines an individual offender's reporting frequency. Only in unusual circumstances will offenders report in person on a frequency of less than twice per month. The primary worker documents rationale in the probation file for changing reporting schedules.

The primary worker also arranges an out of office appointment at the offender's employment or at the offender's residence7 within the first three months of intake date and at least every six months thereafter. The primary worker also makes the necessary arrangements to ensure that two probation officers attend offender's residence/employment when personal safety is an issue.

The purpose of an out of office interview is to confirm residential location, living arrangements (e.g. Is the offender living in the company of children when a Probation Order prohibits such contact), employment and identify high risk situations (e.g. Is there alcohol in the home when a Probation order prohibits use). The employment of other confirmation methods such as pay receipts, telephone bills,

7For a historical overview of the use of home visitation in the beginning years of probation as well as a comprehensive review of the practices and issues surrounding home visitation in the 1990s refer to Lindner (1992). Although this work reviews the practice of home visitation in the United States, much of the article is relevant to Canadian probation practices.
drivers licence, etc. are also considered important ongoing documentation in the supervision plan.

Group Work at V.S.S.U.

Arguably, it is V.S.S.U.'s group attendance program that is one of the defining characteristics of its particular brand of intensive probation supervision of sex offenders. As a matter of standard practice, regular probation offices in British Columbia do not engage in this group management approach to probation supervision. At V.S.S.U. the group practice is utilized as a case management strategy to maximize effective supervision in an efficient manner. Out of the average of 90 offenders who are required to report to the V.S.S.U. office, approx. 25 offenders are involved in the group process.

With respect to the origin of this group management approach to sex offenders in the community, V.S.S.U. Local Director Mr. Neil McKenzie relayed that the idea originated from information conveyed in a seminar on sex offenders in the mid 1980's. Mr. McKenzie explained that he had personally attended this seminar whereby the headline speaker, Mr. Gary Lowe\(^8\), discussed the benefits of utilizing a relapse prevention model in a group format with sex offenders. In addition to Dr. Lowe's suggestions, Mr. McKenzie's own past experiences with offenders and the group process, provided the impetus to develop a group approach to case management. This

\(^8\)Mr. Gary Lowe was employed, at that time, as the Director of Specialized Parole Services for Sex Offenders in California.
group management approach has been in operation since V.S.S.U.'s opening in 1987.

The group option is available to suitable offenders on a continuous entry basis with a maximum membership of ten men. However, for maximum group efficiency, a stable membership is desired and encouraged. Group sessions usually last been 1.5 to 2 hours and are co-facilitated by two probation officers. Typically, one probation officer from the V.S.S.U. staff leads the group management session, with one accompanying probation officer assigned to a co-facilitation role. Whenever possible, efforts are made to ensure that one of these is a male officer with the other of female gender. This allows for role modelling of adult male-female interaction and provides for both male and female perspectives. In addition, the men have an opportunity to interact with a woman in a supportive environment. A female presence is believed to be especially critical when discussions turn to issues of victim empathy and appropriate sexual or social interactions with the women. Many of the men involved in group have never spoken about their sexual feelings or experiences with an adult female.

At present there are three groups in operation at V.S.S.U. As of July 1992, participation in all three groups totalled 28 offenders. All groups operate in consultation with the contracted psychologist, Dr. Karl Williams. Dr. Williams
personally attends groups on occasion. Groups are separated into three attendance sessions:

1) **Exhibitionist Group**: This group is reserved primarily for offenders who have been convicted of indecent exposure. The majority of participants in this group generally receive a period of probation for their behavior in lieu of incarceration. Local Director of V.S.S.U., Neil McKenzie, indicated that their group attendance program for exhibitionists is unique, and he is unaware of any other such program in North America. Borzechki and Wormith (1987), in their examination of sex offender treatment programmes in the U.S. and Canada concur. They state:

> Although many programmes claim to accept all types of sex offenders, programmes were clearly oriented to the serious sex offender. In particular, they included rapists, pedophiles, and to a lesser extent incest offenders. Conspicuous by its absence was any mention of services for voyeurs, exhibitionists, and other "nuisance" types of sex offenders. This lack of mention was probably due, at least in part, to the nature of the survey, which began with known prison based services in North America. Nonetheless, few services for the less severe sexual offender emerged in this survey (p.32).

Although V.S.S.U. recognizes that separating sex offenders on the basis of a predominant paraphilia would be frowned upon in the current academic community, this particular split is viewed as a more effective tool towards offender behavior control and disclosure in that common offences are grouped. Abel, et. al (1987) conclusions from a "crossover study" of child molesters found that there was a tremendous overlap across child molestation diagnoses (offenders targeted male or female children, within or outside of their families) and across non-child molestation diagnoses, especially rape and exhibitionism.
2) **Child Molester Groups:** Two groups are in operation for those convicted of child molestation. The majority of participants have been subject to some term of incarceration prior to probationary supervision.

Participants in the group management process normally attend for the duration of their probation order\(^{10}\). As the length of Probation Orders vary, so do the offender’s length of stay within the group process. Prior to offender participation in the group, offenders are provided with a brief outline of the group management program and expectations regarding their participation (see Appendix C).

As opposed to more traditional therapeutic groups there are no "fixed" rules" of participant acceptability in either group other than the similarity of offence conviction. Groups at V.S.S.U. include men with a variety of personal problems and characteristics and those who are characterized by a mixture of motivation, denial and prior group experience. Despite the fact that there are no established or formal criteria for assessing what offenders are eligible for group, V.S.S.U. staff relayed that there are usually two specific steps which are taken prior to a group member’s admission to the group program.

---

\(^{10}\) Certain offenders might be dropped from the group due to non-attendance or re-committal to custody, transfer to another probation office, etc...
Step One

As part of regular intake process, offenders are normally required to undergo an initial psychological consultation with V.S.S.U.’s contracted psychologist (Dr. Karl Williams). Dr. Williams will often make a recommendation (either verbally or in writing in the form of a psychological assessment) to V.S.S.U. staff concerning the subject’s suitability and candidacy for the group and whether this offender could positively benefit from the group experience.

Step Two

V.S.S.U. staff "informally" assess the type of offender and determine whether they could benefit from the relapse prevention model. This assessment process is without the assistance of formal screening tools or tests, but rather is based on the Probation Officer’s experience and knowledge with respect to client suitability for group participation. For example, those offenders with a history of compulsive addictive behavior with respect to offending are considered especially appropriate to the relapse model. As well, offenders who have experienced a sex offender treatment program while incarcerated are also "ideal" candidates due to their familiarity with the relapse model. Further, those offenders who present to staff as lacking in areas such as socialization skills or as requiring a more intense level of emotional support from similar peers are also good candidates.

Most institutional programs (both federally and provincially) utilize relapse prevention principles in their Sex Offender treatment programs.
for group involvement. Types of offenders who are normally not considered for the group process include low functioning offenders, which is loosely defined by V.S.S.U. staff as offender's who lack sufficient mental capacity to understand the relapse prevention model. Low functioning offenders are normally referred to the Socially Handicapped Sex Offender Group, which has been in operation at Forensic Services for the past six years. Offenders who exhibit hostile personalities (offenders adamant in their disinterest in participating) and those offenders who are too entrenched into the denial process (offenders who report that they were wrongfully convicted) are normally excluded from group membership due to the strong possibility that they may sabotage the group process as a whole.

Group Goals

In group, the client is with other men who have all been convicted of some type of sexually deviant behavior and have all agreed to participate in group attendance in an attempt to learn methods of controlling their offending and be accountable for their behaviors. Men enter a group with other men who suffer from a variety of problems but all make a common commitment to work together and learn from each other.

The characteristics of men who are participants in the group are not homogeneous, there is a mixture of personal characteristics (e.g. age, ethnicity, employment history, relationship status), motivation for group participation, level of denial or acceptance surrounding the offence and
prior group experience. Offender participation in the group is voluntary, although V.S.S.U. staff admit that they engage in "strong convincing tactics" to persuade offenders to participate. V.S.S.U. staff explained that most sex offenders are not willing candidates for any type of intervention in their lives.

The group program is a program for sex offenders to not only fulfill their reporting requirement in Probation supervision, but also functions to educate, confront, control and support the sex offender. The groups are not considered "therapy" or "treatment", but focus on maintenance of offender controls through application of the principles of the relapse prevention model.

V.S.S.U.'s group attendance program has an optimum agenda for attainable goals to be achieved throughout the group process. V.S.S.U.'s program manual and V.S.S.U. staff members outline six purposes of group (as well as individual supervision practices) which are outlined below.

1) Denial - A Major Aspect of the Sexual Offender's Behavioral Pattern

Research has found that sex offenders often deny the impact of their behavior on their victims\(^{12}\) and invariably either rationalize their behavior, or minimize their

\(^{12}\)Marshall (1990) reports many sex offenders as holding distorted attitudes and beliefs which help in continuing the sex offending. Specifically, he states: "Many rapists believe that women have a secret desire to be raped. And many child molesters see children as seductive and has suffering no harm as a result of sex with adults" (p.157).
behavior. These cognitive distortions can be dealt with through the group process by confrontation. Furthermore, V.S.S.U. staff view it advantageous, with respect to some offenders (particularly those convicted of indecent exposure), to instruct offenders to keep a diary outlining areas or risk or stress. This is viewed as a useful tool in monitoring their behavior and encouraging accountability for their behavior. This phase of group supervision normally takes approximately four to six months.

2) Victim Awareness

Through the group process, V.S.S.U. hopes to assist offenders to begin to feel some empathy for their victims, as researchers have found a lack of victim awareness within the sex offender population. Marshall (1990) reports "...sex offenders tend to hold distorted views of their crimes and their victims and to lack empathy..." (p.67). Furthermore, researchers have found that empathy for victims represents a critical source of motivation for the offender's treatment and maintenance (Hildebran & Pither, 1989). Marshall (1999) concurs:


\[\text{Maletzky (1991) reports that sexual offender's minimization of their aberrant behavioral patterns are influenced by a number of factors, including: (a) social embarrassment, (b) the threat of divorce, (c) serious economic sanctions, and (d) fear of long-term incarceration (p.39).}\]
...training perpetrators to be empathetic towards their victims - to see them as human beings with the same feelings and needs as they have - is crucial. (p.157)

The V.S.S.U. program hopes to accomplish victim awareness and empathy through the use of audio-video presentations as well as carefully screened victim awareness presentations where victims of sexual offences recount their distress. Empathy training is incorporated in order that clients fully grasp how their offending behavior has impacted victims and families of victims.

3) Offender's Personal Abuse Experience

Contemporary research has found sexual offending to be empirically related to a variety of variables including dysfunctional family life and personal victimization earlier in life. V.S.S.U. adopts the belief that through the support of the group offenders may be assisted to come to terms with the negative experiences they suffered through at early ages.

4) Social Development

Academic research suggests that many sex offenders have poor social skills and often times have not learned to cope with even the most mundane issues such as shopping, cooking, dating, communicating within relationships and relating to large and small social groups. Research has linked deficient social skills with increasing stress and have suggested that

---

15 See Pallone (1990, p.60) for a comprehensive outline of the body of empirical data on the variety of variables linked to sexual offending.
stress can increase the likelihood of any regressive behavior, including sexual offending (Marshall, 1990, p.156).

The V.S.S.U. program works towards providing some education in the area of social skills through group discussions and various written exercises. Additionally, staff occasionally teach these skills by involving the offenders in real life situations.

5) Sex Education

Many sex offenders are lacking in knowledge in this area. V.S.S.U. makes use of skilled personnel from the Ministry of Health in an attempt to provide their clients with accurate information on sexual issues.

6) Offence Cycle

The deviance or crime cycle is a predictable pattern of feelings, thoughts and behaviors leading up to an offence. If one considers a single deviant sexual response as a final culmination of a series of steps, then it is reasonable to analyze this chain and determine its origins, sustenance and endings (Maletzky, 1991). An example of an offender's crime cycle is outlined in the following passage from Maletzky (1991):

An insurance company executive had molested his stepdaughter 20 years earlier, then molested two stepgranddaughters. An analysis of his pattern revealed the following consistent steps:
(a) receiving negative feedback from his company's president,
(b) increasing muscular tension leading to headaches,
(c) drinking alcohol to reduce the pain,
(d) forgetting to take his blood pressure medicine when drinking,
(e) feeling increasing pain,
(f) lying in a dark room to reduce the pain,
(g) experiencing sexual fantasies as the pain diminished,
(h) then calling his stepdaughter to offer to baby-sit,
encouraging her and her husband to go out so he could be
alone with his victims, and
(i) molesting the children. (p.170)

The group process focuses on recognizing individual
danger signs and high risk situations within their deviant
cycle. The group provides an ongoing monitoring of the
individual's point in the cycle and risk level consistent with
the relapse prevention model of maintenance. Offenders develop
techniques which will be of assistance in preventing
involvement in further offences and establish positive
patterns of behavior through mutual support. The completion of
an offender autobiography and the keeping of a diary assist
offenders in the group process.

Autobiography

The autobiography is a foundation for identification and
evaluation of significant life events and encourages the
offender to assume a responsible role in examining his own
sexually deviant behavior. V.S.S.U. staff view this tool as an
essential aspect of teaching offenders to identify and handle
high risk situations in a positive way. The objectives of
preparing an autobiography at the V.S.S.U. unit include the
following:

1) Learn about self
2) Reflect on our life and identify and positives and
negatives.
3) Become more aware of strengths and coping skills.
4) Identify previous and immediate factors that
contribute to deviant behavior
The autobiography also assists in orienting the sexual offender to the group treatment process. Sex offenders are provided with an outline to assist them in completing their autobiography (See Appendix C) within the first three months of attending the Unit.

Diary

Offenders are encouraged by V.S.S.U. staff to maintain a diary and keep track of each episode in which the offender experiences an urge to engage in deviant sexual behavior. Emotional and environmental events, or cues to offending, should be included in the diaries (Appendix C). A diary trains the offender to monitor negative emotional states, deviant sexual fantasies and thoughts about offending. The diary allows the offender to develop various hypotheses about which circumstances facilitate problematic behavior. George & Marlatt (1989) suggest that this type of "self-monitoring" technique is essential in relapse prevention for revealing emotional and environmental events that might serve as cues for urges and lapses (p.19). Those offenders who choose to keep a diary are under no obligation to share the contents with staff members.

In addition to the above optimum agenda for group meetings, each man has an opportunity to discuss any concerns he has had of difficult/positive situations he has encountered during the week. There are no "fixed" rules with respect to topics of discussion within the group. This allows for a group discussion format that includes education and appropriate
socialization and support. Day to day functioning issues are also addressed in the group and can include irrational beliefs, attitudes and communication problems. Examples of this include how much disclosure of their deviant sexual activity they should offer to a potential employer or new girlfriend. Other areas addressed involve negotiating behavior contracts for offenders who will come into frequent contact with children by way of relationships or relatives.
Appendix C

Forms Used at the

Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit
### REerral Criteria for Specialized Supervision Unit of Sex Offenders

#### Name: ____________________________  Referring Officer: ____________________________

#### C.S.O: ____________________________  Probation Officer: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Offender living apart from victim at time of offence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Current crime involved multiple victims</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Offender was a stranger to the victim</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Offender uses denial of crime</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Offender denies need for treatment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Offender used physical/emotional force in commission crime</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Presence of multiple paraphilias</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Offender sexually, physically or emotionally abused as a child</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Offender lacks appropriate adult sexual outlet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Offender uses paid sexual services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Current crime done in response to anger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Offender uses material to stimulate sexual fantasies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Significant others support offender denial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) History of sexual offences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Previous Court History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Offender not currently employed or enrolled in education program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Offender shows unstable record of work/school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Offender has poor financial management skills and is experiencing financial difficulties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Offender is experiencing difficulties with stress related to marital/family relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Offender has poor companions and unsupportive associates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Offenders use of alcohol is disruptive to appropriate functioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Offender uses drugs which is disruptive to appropriate functioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Offender is in poor physical health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL=**

#### P.O.'s Comments:

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________
VALENCER SPECIALIZED SUPERVISION UNIT
LETTER OF EXPECTATION

The Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit is a Probation Office established specifically to provide supervision, in the community, of persons convicted of sexual offences. Protection of society is our primary concern and, for this reason, people required to attend the specialized unit are expected to be accountable and to participate in the program as follows:

A) Reporting
Clients are required to report to the Probation Office as directed by the Probation Officer. Weekly reporting, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 8:30 p.m. Monday to Friday, will be a basic initial requirement. Some clients, depending on circumstances, may be required to report more frequently than once a week and, in some instances, may be expected to maintain daily telephone contact with the Probation Office.

B) Psychological Assessment
A referral for psychological assessment by the unit's staff psychologist will be made within the first month of reporting to the Specialized Supervision Unit. Clients are expected to attend, as directed, for the psychological assessment.

C) Slated Prevention Plan
Client’s will be provided with an outline of a Relapse Prevention plan which they will be expected to complete within the first three months of reporting to the Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit.

D) Autobiography
Client’s will be expected to complete an autobiography as directed by their supervising Probation Officers at Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit.

E) Compliance with Conditions of Probation, Parole and/or Bail Order
Full compliance with conditions of these orders is required. Probation Officer’s will maintain contact with other people in the community (therapists, employers, social workers, spouses, victims, etc.) to ensure that conditions are being followed. The Probation Officer’s will also conduct one interview within the first three months of reporting, at the client’s residence. Home visits will, thereafter, be conducted from time to time and, particularly, when there is a change in the client’s address.

F) Referral to Other Agencies
Client’s will be referred to the Forensic Clinic and, as well, other agencies in accordance with conditions outlined in either Probation Orders or Parole Agreements. Clients, again, will be expected to keep all scheduled appointments.

Sexual offences are criminal acts with serious consequences to the victims and the community. Necessary information will, therefore, be freely shared with appropriate parties (Ministry of Social Services and Housing, Department of Corrections, Crown Counsel, police, Mental Health Services and relevant support persons). Probation Officers are required to, and fully intend to, report, to the appropriate authorities any occurrence, or potential occurrence, of a sexual offence.

The Vancouver Specialised Supervision Unit provides close supervision and support in order to assist you to control your activities in the community. You are ultimately responsible and accountable for your behaviour.

I have read and understand the contents of this document.

[Signatures]

[Date]
GROUP ATTENDANCE PROGRAM

The SESSU group Attendance Program has been established to provide a forum in which participants will have an opportunity to:

a) Establish positive patterns of behaviour through mutual support.

b) Gain insight into and come to terms with past behaviour that has been negative.

c) Develop techniques which will be of assistance in preventing involvement in further offences.

We believe that individuals, as members of society, are accountable for their behaviour and ultimately have a choice as to how they manage their lives. Members of the group are encouraged to:

a) Be honest with themselves and each other.

b) Be supportive of positive efforts.

c) Be constructively critical.

II. Expectations

Attendance Accountability

Members of the SESSU group will be expected to attend weekly. Should you be unable to keep an appointment it is required that you phone the Probation Office, 660-1727 in advance.

Confidentiality

It is suggested that members use only their first names and respect the confidentiality of other participants by confining discussion to the group meeting, i.e. what is said in the group stays in the group. ** In the event that someone wishes to talk about an event that could result in legal action, it is suggested that the individual discuss the matter with his probation officer rather than bringing it to the group.

Two probation officers will lead the groups.

Consulting Psychologist - Dr. Karl M. Williams will be present for some group sessions and available for one-to-one psychological counselling.
Offence:

RELAPSE PREVENTION PLAN

Describe the type of sexual offence, age and sex of victim(s) and the nature of the criminal act committed (e.g. I molested two female children aged 6 and 8 by fondling their genitalia beneath their underwear).

Offence Cycle:

Describe events, including fantasies which lead up to offending and describe physical and emotional reactions after committing offence.

Red Flags:

Danger signs - Examples:
- Feeling depressed
- Dwelling on deviant fantasies
- Buying pornography

Risks:

I am most likely to re-offend under the following circumstances:
VANCOUVER SPECIALIZED SUPERVISION UNIT

Relapse Prevention Plan - (cont'd)

I learned to take positive steps to avoid committing another sexual offence by:

Describe how you will deal with emotional issues - i.e., anger, love, rejection, etc., and describe how you will handle stress.

Employment:

Describe type of employment either presently seeking and/or type of employment in which presently involved - mention types of employment if any, you must avoid.

Residence:

Describe present living situation and/or type of accommodation you are seeking - assess, if any, to avoid.
Relapse Prevention Plan - (cont'd...)

Leisure Time:

A) Structured:


B) Unstructured:


Relationships:


I am accountable for my conduct in the community and realize that I must remain vigilant if I am to avoid a relapse. I will, with respect to my actions, be self-critical and avoid any tendency to rationalize, minimize, normalize or normalize, inappropriate behavior.

Signed

Witnessed
It is suggested that it will be helpful to members of the group to maintain a daily diary. A diary not only provides a means of being accountable for behaviour in the community but is also helpful in terms of identifying factors which contribute to problem behaviour. It is recommended that a diary contain the following information:

1. A brief summary of daily activities;
2. Description of any stressful situations;
3. Feelings/emotions - both good and bad;
4. Red flags - that is incidents which might trigger offences;
5. Risk situations - that is circumstances under which there is a high likelihood of committing an offence;
6. Urges to offend - mark on a scale of 1-10;
7. Intervention techniques - that is steps taken to stop oneself from committing an offence;
8. Relapses - that is new offences and description of feelings afterwards.

It is unlikely that anyone will encounter risk situations or have the urge to offend every single day but it is likely that problems will arise from time to time. It is hoped that, by keeping a diary, people will be able to take steps to avoid offending long before an urge gets out of control.
## Appendix D

### Characteristics of Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit and "Regular" Probation in British Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Population</strong></td>
<td>Adult sex offenders</td>
<td>All offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Model</strong></td>
<td>Relapse prevention</td>
<td>No identified model to guide supervision practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Referral from other probation offices or condition of probation to attend V.S.S.U.</td>
<td>Residential location determines which offender reports to a particular office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caseload Size</strong></td>
<td>30:1 for P.O. 20:1 for local</td>
<td>Varies according to office. Average 80:1 to 100:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting Requirement</strong></td>
<td>Weekly reporting to begin. Some required to report more frequently.</td>
<td>Discretion of P.O. Flexible: weekly, bi-weekly or monthly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewing Technique</strong></td>
<td>Two-on-one interviews to break denial. One-to-one interviews. Group work. Offender completion of &quot;homework&quot; tasks.</td>
<td>One-to-one interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Characteristics of Vancouver Specialized Supervision Unit and "Regular" Probation in British Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>V.S.S.U.</th>
<th>Regular Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Supervision</strong></td>
<td>Case management groups in operation once per week.</td>
<td>No group supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home visitation</strong></td>
<td>Home visit within three months of beginning of Court order, with subsequent visits.</td>
<td>Discretion of P.O. Generally not under-taken due to time constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact with other agencies</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing contact. Easier to facilitate due to lower caseload. equals less contact with outside agencies</td>
<td>Discretion of P.O. High caseloads often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychiatric referral</strong></td>
<td>Immediate referral and ongoing contact maintained with Forensic.</td>
<td>Referral often less immediate due to high caseloads. Less contact with Forensic often a reality due to client numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact with family members</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing contact maintained. Offender encouraged to inform family member(s) of offence and to be involved in supervision.</td>
<td>Discretion of P.O. High caseloads often equals less time for family contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table is not intended as an "empirical" validation of differences between office practices. Of course, there must be recognition that the supervision and management practices of sex offenders at regular probation offices inevitably vary according to the personalities of individual probation officers and offenders, the style of management, and numerous other factors which might impact on the practice of probation (e.g. caseload size, offence seriousness, etc...).
Appendix E

Data Collection Forms
FORM A - OFFENDER DESCRIPTION

Identification
1. Case Number
2. Form Number
3. Record Number
4. Correctional Service Number
5. Coding Date (yy/mm/dd)

Demographic
6. Date of Birth (yy/mm/dd)
7. Province/Country of Birth


20. Manitoba
21. India
22. Fiji
23. Columbia
24. Korea
25. Scotland
26. New Brunswick
27. Finland

8. Racial Origin
1. Caucasian
2. Oriental
3. East Indian
4. Metis
5. Native Indian
6. Negro

9. Religion
1. Atheist
2. Protestant
3. Catholicism
4. Buddhism
5. Muslim
6. Hinduism
7. Jehovah’s Witness
8. Christian World Wide Church
9. No info.
10. Mormon
11. Bahai
12. Bahai
13. Bahai
14. Bahai
15. Bahai
16. Bahai
17. Bahai
18. Bahai
19. Bahai
20. Bahai
21. Bahai
22. Bahai
23. Bahai
24. Bahai
25. Bahai
26. Bahai
27. Bahai
10. Living Circumstances throughout supervision period

1. Stable - one residence  
2. One to 3 residential changes  
3. Four or more residential changes  
4. Transient - periods of street living

Education/Employment History

11. Last Known School Grade (Elementary or High School) Completed

12. Type of School Last Attended

1. Public  
2. Private  
3. Alternate  
4. Inst. Program (ie. Maples/Willingdon)  
5. no information

13. Post Secondary Education

0. No  
1. Yes  
2. No information

14. Type Post Secondary Education

1. Some College/University  
2. Some Vocational/Technical  
3. College Diploma  
4. Vocational Certificate  
5. B.A.  
6. M.A.  
7. Ph.D  
8. Other

15. School Related Problems (High/Grade school)

0. No  
1. Yes  
2. No information

16. Source of Income (At time of Offence)

1. Employment  
2. Student  
3. Welfare  
4. U.I.C.  
5. Pension  
6. Disability  
7. Supported by Parents/Rel  
8. Part time Employment/Welfare  
9. Seasonal Employment  
10. Part time Employment-Stable  
11. Several different full time positions  
12. Self-employed  
13. No information
17. Source of Income (Throughout Supervision Period)

- Employment
- U.I.C.
- Supported by Parents/Rel
- Student
- Pension
- Part time Employment/
- Welfare
- Disability
- Welfare

9. Seasonal Employment
10. Part time Employment-Stable
11. Several different full time positions
12. Self-employed
13. No information

18. Frequency of Employment (Throughout Supervision)

- Full-time - stable
- Part-time - stable
- Seasonal
- Sporadic "on-call" positions - no fixed employment
- Numerous positions throughout period (full/part time)
- Not employed - disability
- Not employed - welfare
- Not employed - Student
- Not employed - inheritance money
- No information

19. Offender's Primary Occupation (Throughout Supervision Period)

- None
- Labourer
- Fisherman/Seaman
- Forestry
- Police/Security
- Retired
- Social Worker
- Construction
- Optician
- Clam Digger
- Letter Carrier
- Driver/Swamper
- Printer/Press Co.
- Welder
- Miner
- Teacher
- Social Assistance
- Warehouseman
- Truck Driver
- Baker
- Restaurant
- Waiter/Waitress
- Corrections Officer
- Electrician
- Painter
- Mechanic
- Pension
- Marine Engineer
- Electronics Repair
- Locksmith
- Taxi Driver
- Maintenance
- Mill Worker
- Businessman
- Salesman
- Cook
- Firefighter
- Surveyor
- Physiotherapist
- Student
- Upholsterer
- Artist
- Communications
- Housesitter
- Store Owner
- Architect
- Real Estate Agent
- Artist
- Railway worker
- Shipper
Farmer
Military
Librarian
Accountant
Janitor
Salestrack personnel
Mover
Student
Ferry worker
Graphic Designer
Mailman
Independent carpenter contractor
Dietician
Boat Builder
Dental Mechanic
Stock Broker
Cashier
Care nurse
Courier

Social Relations History

20. Relationship History.

1. One or more prior marriages (common law relationships).
2. Has been engaged one or more times or has had a long-term relationship (at least two years) involving heterosexual relations or apparent evidence of a "love affair" with one person, but unable to achieve marriage.
3. Long-term relationship (at least two years) involving homosexual relations with one or more persons.
4. Brief or short-term heterosexual or social dating experiences with one or more partners, but no lasting sexual experiences with a single partner.
5. Casual sexual or social relationships with person of either sex, with no deep emotional meaning.
6. Sexual and/or social relationships primarily with the same sex, but may have had occasional homosexual contacts or dating experiences.
7. Minimal sexual or social interest in either sex.
8. Married
9. Unknown/No information.
10. Reports interest in opposite sex but has no contact (relationship or sexual) with opposite sex (e.g. shyness).

21. Marital Status (At time of Offence)

1. Common Law
2. Divorced
3. Married
4. Remarried
5. Single
6. Separated
7. Widowed
8. Married
9. No info.
22. Marital Status (Throughout Supervision Period)

1. Common Law
2. Divorced
3. Married
4. Remarried
5. Single
6. Separated
7. Widowed
8. No info.

23. Espoused Sexual Preference (Throughout Supervision Period)

1. Heterosexual
2. Homosexual
3. Bisexual
4. No information

24. Heterosexual Relations Most Usual Within Supervisory Period

1. Married without divorce or separation
2. Married with conflicts causing brief separations
3. Unmarried or separated, dates infrequently
4. Unmarried or separated, rarely dates
5. Unmarried or separated, never dates
6. Unknown/No information

25. Number of Dependent Children

26. Description of Dependent Children

Sex
1. Male
2. Female

Year of Birth

Biological
0. No
1. Yes

27. Number of Social Relations Most Usual in the Supervisory Period

1. Meets with friends on an average or at least once per week.
2. Meets with friends about once in two weeks
3. Meets with friends about once per month.
4. Does not meet with friends except "over back of fence" or at work or school
5. Does not meet with friends at all.
6. Unknown/No information.
28. Quality of Social Relations (Above) Most Usual in Supervisory Period

1. One or more close relationships.
2. One or more rather close relationships.
3. One or more moderately close relationships.
4. One or more only rather superficial relationships.
5. Only very superficial relationships (e.g. only relationship in saying hello to neighbour).
9. Unknown/No information.

29. Presence of an Age Appropriate Relationship(s) Prior to Offence

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

30. Type of Relationship

0. Heterosexual
1. Homosexual
2. Both
3. Not applicable/No information

31. Social Relations (Friends/Relatives) Aware of Offender’s Sexual Deviance (conviction for current offence)

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

32. Spouse/Significant Partner’s Involvement in Probation Supervision

1. Spouse/Partner unaware of offending and not involved with Probation Services (Probation Service has not asked for involvement).
2. Spouse aware of offending but refuses involvement/co-operation with Probation Services (Probation Service has asked for involvement).
4. No information/Not applicable.
5. Spouse aware of offending is involved in Probation supervision but divorced/separated from offender.
6. Spouse aware of offending but is divorced/separated from offender and not involved in probation supervision.
Family History

33. Offender’s Rank in Birth Order

34. Number of Siblings in Offender’s Family

35. Parenting History

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

36. Ministry of Social Services involvement in Family (ie. apprehension of children/short term custody arrangements/parenting services)

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

37. Age of Offender at time of Ministry apprehension/short term custody arrangement.

38. Number of Foster Home Placements

1. 1-2
2. 3-5
3. 6-10
4. Over 11 placements
5. No fixed number available - depicted as numerous

39. Number of Group Home Placements

1. 1-2
2. 3-5
3. 6-10
4. Over 11 placements
5. No fixed number available - depicted as numerous

40. Problems in Foster/Group Home placements

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

41. Father’s Occupation

42. Mother’s Occupation

43. Father Abuses Alcohol/Drugs?

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

44. Mother Abuses Alcohol/Drugs?

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.
45. Father Physically Abusive?
0. No. 1. Yes 2. No info.

46. Mother Physically Abusive?
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

47. Parents/Family Members Aware of Offending
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

48. Current Contact with Family members (Throughout Supervisory Period)
1. Once or more per week.
2. Once per month.
3. Bi-monthly contact.
4. Two to three times yearly.
5. Irregular contact
6. No contact
7. Lives with one or both parents/sibling.
8. No information available.

49. Record No.

Physical Health History

50. Under Medication through Supervision?
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

51. Types of Medication Being Administered

2. Apresoline 12. Desyrel Hydrate
3. Hydrochlorothiazide 13. Isoniazid
5. Benztropin 15. Tetra
6. Rantidine 16. Climitididine
7. Novoridazine 17. Dilantin
8. Diabeta 18. Phenobarb
10. Capoten 20. Dilatin (epilepsy)
52. Presence of Physical Disability through Supervision?
0. No  1. Yes  2. No Info.
53. Does Disability Impair Sexual Functioning?
0. No  1. Yes  2. No info.

Mental Health History
54. Suicide Ideation (Past History of)?
0. No  1. Yes  2. No info.
55. Suicide ideation (Through Supervision Period)?
0. No  1. Yes  2. No info.
56. Number of Documented Suicide Attempts
57. Family History of Mental Illness
0. No  1. Yes  2. No info.
58. History of Self Mutilation Behavior
0. No  1. Yes  2. No info.
59. Number of Self Mutilations
60. History of Professional Diagnosed Mental Illness (as a Youth)
0. No  1. Yes  2. No info.
61. Types of Mental Illness Diagnosed (Youth)
   1. Schizophrenia
   2. Mental Retardation
   3. Personality Disorder
   4. Psychosis
   5. Depression
   6. conduct disorder
   7. hyperactivity
   8. attention deficit disorder
62. History of Professional Diagnosed Mental Illness (Adult)

0. No  
1. Yes  
2. No info.

63. Types of Mental Illness Diagnosed (Adult)

1. Schizophrenia  
2. Mental Retardation  
3. Personality Disorder  
4. Psychosis  
5. Depression  
6. Anxiety Neurosis  
7. Brain Damage  
8. Pedophilia  
9.  
10. 

64. Prior Mental Health Interventions (Adult)

0. No  
1. Yes  
2. No info.

65. Offender Reports Mental Health Problems through supervision period (But no Professional Diagnosis of Mental Illness)

0. No  
1. Yes  
2. No info.

66. Type of Self-Reported Mental Health Problems

1. Depression  
2. Anxiety  
3.  
4.  
5.  
6.  
7.  

67. History of Avoidance of Mental Health Treatment

0. No  
1. Yes  
2. No info.

68. Historical Pattern of Reporting to Counselling/Treatment

1. Regular compliance (few missed appointments)  
2. Irregular reporter (several missed appointments)  
3. No information

69. Offender Receiving Mental Health Service through Supervision

0. No  
1. Yes  
2. No info.
70. If receiving Mental Health services throughout supervision, agency(s) providing service.

1. Forensic Psychiatric Services
2. Independent psychiatrist/psychologist of offender's choice
3. Independent psychiatrist/psychologist of probation service choice
4. Mental Health Care Team
5. Forensic assessment only (no further counselling)
6. Corrections psychologist (Dr. Hotz/Dr. Williams)
7. Upper Island Sex Offender Program
8. Riverview Hospital

71. Purpose of Mental Health Services

1. Sex Offender Treatment
2. Depression
3. Anxiety Disorder
4. Schizophrenia
5. Anger management
6. Marriage counselling
7. Assessment only
8. Social Skills Training
9. Unknown/not documented

72. Frequency of Mental Health Intervention (Throughout Supervisory Period).

1. One or more sessions weekly
2. Bi-weekly attendance
3. Once per month
4. Less than five times yearly
5. Irregular attendance*(documented as such in probation file)
6. Attended initially (1-6 months) then ceased attending
7. Attended initially (7-12 months) then ceased attending
8. Was referred to counselling only - frequency not documented
73. Attitude towards Participating in Treatment (Throughout Supervision)

1. Reluctant
2. Co-operative
3. No information
4. Attended, but related feelings that it was worthless
5. Refused to Attend
6. No information
7. Sporadic attendance/missed sessions (not motivated)

74. Did Offender Receive Sex Offender Treatment/Counselling when Incarcerated?

0. No
1. Yes
2. No info.

Sexual Abuse History

75. Offender Sexually Abused in the Past (Self Report or formally documented).

0. No
1. Yes
2. No info.

76. Age at First Victimization

77. Perpetrator of Victimization

1. Father
2. Mother
3. Male Sibling
4. Female Sibling
5. Extended Family - male
6. Extended Family - female
7. Male Friend of Family
8. Female Friend of Family
9. Male Acquaintance
10. Female Acquaintance
11. Male Stranger
12. Female Stranger
13. Stepfather/Mother’s Companion
14. Stepmother/Father’s Occup.
15. Person in Authority
16. Foster Father
17. ____________________
18. ____________________
19. ____________________

78. Type of Reported Sexual Victimization

79. Type of Violence in Sexual Victimization

80. Purpose of Violence in Sexual Victimization

1. Instrumental
2. Expressive
2. N/A

81. Effect of Violence

82. Use of Threats during Victimization
83. Duration of Victimization

1. Single incident
2. A few incidents over a short period of time (less 6 mos)
3. A few incidents over a longer period of time (more 6 mos)
4. Multiple incidents over a short period of time (less 6 mos)
5. Multiple incidents over a longer period of time (more 6 mos)

Substance Abuse History

84. Offender Have a History of a Alcohol Abuse Problem?

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

85. Offender Have a History of a Drug Abuse Problem?

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

86. Offender Have a History of a combined Drug/Alcohol Abuse Problem?

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

87. Age of Offender at Onset of Alcohol/Drug Use?

88. Estimated Level of Alcohol Consumption (Throughout Supervisory Period)


89. Estimated Level of Drug Consumption (Throughout Supervisory Period)


90. Substance(s) Abused (Throughout Supervisory Period)

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.
91. Offender Have an Alcohol Abuse Problem through Sup.
0. No  
   1. Yes  
   2. No info.
92. Offender Have a Drug Abuse Problem through Sup.
0. No  
   1. Yes  
   2. No info.
93. Offender Have combined Drug/Alcohol Problem through Sup.
0. No  
   1. Yes  
   2. No info.
94. Offender Completed Residential Substance Abuse Program?
0. No  
   1. Yes  
   2. No info.
95. Alcohol/Drug Abuse a Factor in Offender Behavior?
0. No  
   1. Yes  
   2. No info.
96. Probation Officer refer offender to Alcohol/Drug Counselling.
0. No  
   1. Yes  
   2. No info
97. P.O. refer for psych assessment during supervision?
0. No  
   1. Yes  
   2. No info
## FORM A - Offender Description

### Identification

1. Case Number 001-004
2. Form Number 005
3. Record Number 006
4. Correctional Service Number 007-014
5. Coding Date 015-020

### Demographic

6. Date of Birth 021-026
7. Province/Country of Birth 027-028
8. Racial Origin 029
9. Religion 030-031
10. Living Circumstances throughout Supervision 032

### Education/Employment History

11. Last known School Grade Completed 033-034
12. Type of School Attended 035
13. Post Secondary Education 036
14. Type Post Secondary Education 037
15. School-Related Problems

1. Poor Grades
2. Truancy
3. Dropped Out
4. Suspensions or Expulsions
5. Learning Disability
6. Threatening/Aggressive to Peers
7. Hyperactivity

16. Source of Income (Time of Offence) ____________ 045-046
17. Source of Income (Throughout Supervision) ____________ 047-048
18. Frequency of Employment (Throughout Supervision) ________ 049-050
19. Offender's Occupation (Throughout Supervision) ________ 051-052

Social Relations History

20. Relationship History ________ 053-054
21. Marital Status (Time of Offence) ________ 055
22. Marital Status (Throughout Supervision) ________ 056
23. Espoused Sexual Preference (Through Supervision) ________ 057
24. Heterosexual Relations Most Usual (Through Sup.) ________ 058
25. Number of Dependent Children ________ 059
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Dependent Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Child #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child #4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Number of Social Relations Most Usual in Sup. Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. Quality of Social Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_________081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29. Presence of Age Appropriate Relationship Prior to Offence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30. Type of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31. Social Relations Aware of Offender’s Sexual Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32. Spouse/Significant Partner’s Involvement in Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33. Offender’s Rank in Birth Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_________086-087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34. Number of Siblings in Offender’s Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_________088-089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. Parenting History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mother and Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mother Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Father Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mother and Companion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Father and Companion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other Family Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Foster Home(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Group Home(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. MSSH involvement in Family

37. Age of Offender at MSSH involvement

38. Number of Foster Home Placements

39. Number of Group Home Placements

40. Problems in Foster/Group Home Placements
   1. Absent
   2. Aggressive Behavior
   3. Destructive Behavior (property damage)
   4. Suicide attempts
   5. Non-attendance at School
   6.
   7.
   8.
   9.

41. Father’s Occupation

42. Mother’s Occupation

43. Father Abuses Alcohol/Drugs

44. Mother Abuses Alcohol/Drugs

45. Father Physically Abusive

46. Mother Physically Abusive

47. Parents/Family Members Aware of Offending

48. Current Contact with Family Members (Throughout Supervision)
### Identification

1. Case Number
   ---------------  001-004
2. Form Number
   ---------------  005
3. Record Number
   ---------------  006

### Physical Health History

50. Currently under Medication?  
   ---------------  007

51. Types of Medication Being Administered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug #1</td>
<td>008-009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug #2</td>
<td>010-011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug #3</td>
<td>012-013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug #4</td>
<td>014-015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Presence of Physical Disability?  
   ---------------  016

53. Does Disability Impair Sexual Functioning?  
   ---------------  017

### Mental Health History

54. Suicide Ideation (Past History of)  
   ---------------  018

55. Suicide Ideation (Through Supervision)  
   ---------------  019

56. Number of Suicide Attempts  
   ---------------  020

57. Family History of Mental Illness  
   ---------------  021

58. History of Self Mutilation Behavior  
   ---------------  022

59. Number of Self Mutilations  
   ---------------  023

60. History of Professional Diagnosed Mental Illness (Youth)  
   ___  024

61. Types of Mental Illness Diagnosed (Youth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type #1</td>
<td>025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type #2</td>
<td>026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type #3</td>
<td>027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type #4</td>
<td>028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. History of Professional Diagnosed Mental Illness (Adult)  
   ___  029
63. Types of Mental Illness Diagnosed (Adult)
   Type #1
   _________030
   Type #2
   _________031
   Type #3
   _________032
   Type #4
   _________033
   Type #5
   _________034

64. Prior Mental Health Interventions (Adult)
   1. Admission to Residential Care/Psychiatric Hospital
      _________035
   2. Outpatient Counselling (Forensic)
      _________036
   3. Independent Psychiatric Counselling
      _________037
   4. Other: Broadway Health Team
      _________038

65. Offender Self-Report of Mental Problems
    _________039

66. Type of Self-Reported Mental Problems
   Type #1
   _________040
   Type #2
   _________041
   Type #3
   _________042
   Type #4
   _________043
   Type #5
   _________044

67. History of Avoidance of Mental Health Treatment
    _________045

68. Historical Pattern of Reporting to Counselling
    _________046

69. Receiving Mental Health Service through Supervision
    _________047

70. If Yes to #62, agency providing service
    1. Agency #1
       _________048
    2. Agency #2
       _________049
    3. Agency #3
       _________050
71. Purpose of Mental Health Service

72. Frequency of Mental Health Inter. (Through Sup.)

73. Attitude towards Participating in Treatment (Through Sup.)

74. Offender Receive Sex Offender Treatment/Counselling when Incarcerated?
   1. Yes
   2. No info.

   1. Group Therapy
   2. Individual Counselling
   3. Medication
   4. Other

75. Offender Sexually Abused in the Past?

76. Age at First Victimization

77. Perpetrator(s) of Victimization
   1. Perpetrator #1
   2. Perpetrator #2
   3. Perpetrator #3

78. Type of Reported Sexual Victimization
   1. Fondling
   2. Masturbation
   3. Oral Contact
   4. Digital Penetration
   5. Anal Intercourse
   6. Vaginal Intercourse
   7. Other
79. Type of Violence in Sexual Victimization

1. Holding/Restraint
2. Beating with Fists/Kicking with Feet
3. Beating with Objects
4. Cutting/Slashing
5. Other

80. Purpose of Violence in Sexual Victimization

81. Effect of Violence
1. Tissue damage
2. Bruising
3. Bone Damage
4. Pain, No Visible Injury
5. Other

82. Use of Threats During Victimization
1. To Inflict Psychological Suffering
2. To do Bodily Injury
3. To Kill
4. Other

83. Duration of Victimization

Substance Abuse History

84. Offender Have History of Alcohol Abuse Problem?
85. Offender Have History of Drug Abuse Problem?
86. Offender Have History of Combined Alcohol/Drug Abuse Problem?

87. Age of Offender at Onset of Alcohol/Drug
88. Estimated Level of Alcohol Consumption (Through Sup.)

89. Estimated Level of Drug Consumption (Through Sup.)

90. Type of Substances Abused (Through Supervision)
   1. Alcohol
   2. Cannabis
   3. Narcotics/Analgesics
   4. Stimulants
   5. Sedatives/Hypnotics
   6. Tranquilizers
   7. Hallucinogens
   8. Solvents/Inhalants

91. Offender Have an Alcohol Abuse Problem through Sup

92. Offender Have a Drug Abuse Problem through Sup.

93. Offender Have combined Drug/Alcohol Problem through Sup.

94. Offender Completed Residential Substance Abuse Program?

95. Alcohol/Drug Abuse a Factor in Offender Behavior?

96. Probation Officer refer offender to alcohol/Drug abuse Counselling

97. P.O. refer for psych assessment during supervision?
FORM B - CURRENT OFFENCE DESCRIPTION

Identification

1. Case Number
2. Form Number
3. Record Number
5. Coding Date

Legal Description of Offence

6. Legal Categorization of Offense
7. Date of Conviction (yy/mm/dd)
8. Plea Entered
   1. Guilty
   2. Not Guilty
   3. Unknown

9. Disposition of Offence
   0. No.
   1. Yes

10. Disposition to be Served
    1. Consecutive to Others
    2. Concurrent to Others
    3. Not applicable

11. If disposition includes custodial term, length in days to be served.

12. Probation Conditions
    1. Report Change of Address
    2. Attend Residential Program
    3. Attend School/Maintain Employment
    4. Psychiatric/Psychological Counselling
    5. Alcohol/Drug Counselling
    6. Report to Probation Officer (unstructured reporting)
    7. Report to Probation Officer (structured reporting)
    8. Participate in Intensive Probation Supervision
    9. Not to be in Company of Children under 16 Years
    10. Not to be in Company of Children under 19 years
    11. Not to be in Company of Children under 15 years
12. Not to be in Company of Children under 14 years
13. Shall Not Loiter in Areas Frequent by Children
14. No Direct or Indirect Contact with the Victim
15. Remain in British Columbia
16. Abstain from Alcohol
17. Submit to Breathalyzer upon Request
18. Submit to Substance Testing upon Request
19. No Contact with Parents of Victim
20. Take medication as Directed
21. Social Skills Training/Sex Education Training
22. Reside where directed by P.O.
23. Inform P.O. of changes in employment
24. Area Restriction
25. Inform P.O. of progress with counsellor
26. Attend for psychiatric/psychological assessment
27. Advise P.O. if applying for UI or welfare
28. Letter of Apology to Victim
29. Participate in Intensive Supervision (V.S.S.U.)
30. Any breaches to be reported back to Court without discretion of P.O.
31. Assertiveness Training
32. Notify Court if he does not attend counselling
33. Not be in presence of female under 17
34. Attend for medical treatment as directed by P.O.
35. Do not enter washrooms at Hotels

13. Sentencing Court

5. West Vancouver 11. Port Coquitlam 17. Kamloops

19. Vernon
20. Courtney
21. Nelson
22. Bella Bella
23. Toronto

14. Judicial Recommendation for Treatment While Incarcerated

0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.
General Description of Offence

15. Age at Time of Current Offence

16. Status at Time of Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status at Time of Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Free Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On Supervised Probation Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Escapee from Incarceration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Location of Initial Encounter Between Offender and Victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Initial Encounter Between Offender and Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offender’s residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Victim’s residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(club/dance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offender’s/Victim’s residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Schoolyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Offender’s vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wooded/bush area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Friend/Acq. Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Place of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Relative Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hotel Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Swimming Pool (Public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Garage/Gas Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Tent (Camping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Office (victim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Victim’s place of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. School (building)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Location of Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Offence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offender’s residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Victim’s residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(club/dance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offender’s/Victim’s residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Schoolyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Offender’s vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wooded/bush area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Friend/Acq. Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Place of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Relative residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hotel Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Swimming Pool (Public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Garage/Gas Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Degree of Planning in Offence

1. None/Impulsive
2. Some
3. Extensive
4. No info.

20. Degree of Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Effect of Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. Use of Weapon During Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. Use of Threats During Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. Purpose of Violence

1. Instrumental
2. Expressive
3. N/A

25. Did Offender Make Physical Contact with Victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Fondling Behavior During Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. Oral Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Vaginal Penetration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. Anal Penetration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

30. Miscellaneous Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31. Duration of Offence

1. Years
2. Months
3. Days
4. Hours
5. Minutes
6. Unspecified

32. Offender Impaired at Time of Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0. No</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>info.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. Party Who Reported Offence to CJS

1. Victim
2. Offender
3. Witness
4. Parent
5. Relative
6. Friend
7. Neighbour
8. Co-Worker
9. Social Worker
10. Probation Officer
11. Other Professional
12. Spouse of Offender
13. 

Description of Victim

34. Age at Onset of Victimization

35. Sex of Victim

1. Male
2. Female

36. Racial Origin of Victim

1. Caucasian
2. Oriental
3. East Indian
4. Metis
5. Native Indian
6. Negro
7. Hispanic
8. No info.

37. Marital Status of Victim

1. Common Law
2. Divorced
3. Married
4. Remarried
5. Single
6. Separated
7. Widowwed
8. No info.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship of Victim to Offender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foster Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Foster Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Step Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Step Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Adopted Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Casual Acquaintance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Stranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Granddaughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Step Sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Prostitute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. niece/nephew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Met in nightclub night of offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sister of wife/girlfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Child of roommate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Paper delivery boy/girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. School mate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Co-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Ex-girlfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. No info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. No info.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. Victim's Degree of Resistance
1. None
2. Verbally Resisting
3. Struggling
4. Hitting/Beating Offender
5. Pushing Offender Away
6. No information

43. Victim Impaired at Time of Offence
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

44. Victim Required Hospitalization Subsequent to Offence
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

45. Victim Required Medical Attention, But Not Hospitalization
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

46. Victim Underwent Psychological Intervention Subsequent to Offence
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.

47. Victim Receiving Medication
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info.
# FORM B - CURRENT OFFENCE DESCRIPTION

## Identification

1. Case Number
   - ___________001-004
2. Form Number
   - 005
3. Record Number
   - ___________006
   - ___________007-014
5. Coding Date
   - ___________015-020

## Legal Description of Offence

6. Legal Categorization of Offence
   - ___________021-022
7. Date of Conviction (yy/mm/dd)
   - ___________023-028
8. Plea Entered
   - ___________029
9. Disposition of Offence
   - 1. Suspended Sentence
     - ___________030
   - 2. Fine
     - ___________031
   - 3. Community Service Hours
     - ___________032
   - 4. Probation
     - ___________033
   - 5. Incarceration
     - ___________034
   - 6. Discharge
     - ___________035
10. Disposition to be Served
    - ___________036

11. If disposition was custodial sentence, length in days
    - ___________037-040
12. Probation Conditions

1. Condition #1

2. Condition #2

3. Condition #3

4. Condition #4

5. Condition #5

6. Condition #6

7. Condition #7

8. Condition #8

9. Condition #9

10. Condition #10

11. Condition #11

13. Sentencing Court


General Description of Offence

15. Age at Current Offence

16. Status at Time of Arrest

17. Location of Initial Encounter Btw Victim and Offend

18. Location of Offence

19. Degree of Planning in Offence
20. Degree of Violence
   1. None
   2. Holding/Restraint
   3. Beating with Fists/Kicking
   4. Beating with Objects/Weapon
   5. Cutting/Slashing
   6. Other (Grabbing Breasts/Penis/Buttocks)

21. Effect of Violence
   1. Tissue Damage
   2. Bone Damage
   3. Bruising
   4. Pain/No Visible Injuries
   5. Other
   6. N/A

22. Use of Weapon During Offence
   1. Knife
   2. Gun
   3. Stick/Club
   4. Other
   5. N/A
23. Use of Threats During Offence

24. Purpose of Violence

25. Did Offender Make Physical Contact with Victim

26. Fondling Behavior During Offence
   1. None
   2. Offender Fondles Victim’s Genitals
   3. Victim Fondles Offender’s Genitals
   4. Fondle Breasts
   5. Fondle Buttocks
   6. Assaultive Fondling
   7. Other (Rubbing Penis)

27. Oral Sex
   1. None
   2. Mutual
   3. Fellatio
   4. Cunnilingus
   5. Analingus

28. Vaginal Penetration
   1. None
   2. With Penis
   3. Digitally
   4. Foreign Object
29. Anal Penetration
1. None
2. With Penis
3. Digitally
4. Foreign Object

30. Miscellaneous Behavior
1. Taking pornographic pictures of victim
2. Exposing Genitals (No Contact)
3. Victim Masturbated Subject
4. Offender Mast. in Front of Victim
5. Offender Mast. Victim
6. Exposing Buttocks
7. Rubbed Penis on Victim
8. Infliction of hicky

31. Duration of Offence

32. Offender Impaired at Time of Offence

33. Party Who reported Offence to CJS

Description of Victim
34. Age at Onset of Victimization
35. Sex of Victim
36. Racial Origin of Victim
37. Marital Status of Victim
38. Relationship of Victim to Offender
39. Was Victim a Member of Offender’s Household
40. Amount of Time Victim Knew Offender Prior to
41. Victim’s Degree of Compliance
42. Victim’s Degree of Resistance 134
43. Victim Impaired at Time of Offence 135
44. Victim Required Hospitalization Subsequent to Offence 136
45. Victim Required Medical Attention, But Not Hospitalization 137
46. Victim Underwent Psychological Intervention Sub. to Offence 138
47. Victim Receiving Medication 139
FORM C - PAST OFFENCE HISTORY

Identification
1. Case Number
2. Form Number
3. Record Number
5. Coding Date

Description of Prior Offence History

6. Previous Sexual Offence Convictions as an Adult
0. No 1. Yes

7. Description of Previous Adult Sex Offence Conviction(s)
   CCC Number
   Date of Conviction (yy/mm/dd)

8. Previous Non-Sexual Offence Conviction(s) as an Adult
0. No 1. Yes

9. Description of Previous Non-Sexual Offence Conviction(s)
   CCC Number
   Date of Conviction (yy/mm/dd)

10. Prior Custodial Commitments for Sexual Offence
    1. None
    2. One or two
    3. Three or more

11. Prior Custodial Commitments for Non-Sexual Offences
    1. None
    2. One or two
    3. Three or more
12. Recent Commitment-Free Period (Three Years)
(No prior commitment of more than thirty days or released to
the community from last such commitment at least three years
prior to the commencement of the current offence)
0. No 1. Yes

Response to Prior Community Supervision Practices
(Parole/Probation/Bail/Court Appearance)

13. Previous Parole Violations
0. No 1. Yes 2. No Info.

14. Previous Parole Revocation
0. No 1. Yes 2. No Info.

15. Previous Breach of Probation Convictions
0. No 1. Yes

16. If yes to #18, Number of Breach of Probation Convictions

17. History of Prison Escape
0. No 1. Yes 2. No Info.

18. History of Failure to Appear in Court
0. No 1. Yes 2. No Info.

19. Number of Failures to Appear in Court

29. Overall Performance on Prior Community Supervision (Bail)

1. Excellent. No missed scheduled appointments - fulfillment
   of all conditions.
2. Good. Occasionally missed scheduled appointments but
   contacted office to reschedule. Acceptable explanations for
   missing appointments (ie. illness). Fulfillment of
   significant bail conditions.
3. Satisfactory. Regularly missed scheduled appointments but
   contacted office to reschedule. Unacceptable explanations for
   missing appointments (ie. slept in/forgot). General fulfillment
   of all significant bail conditions.
   Failed to contact office to reschedule. Required frequent
   telephone or written reminders to report. Failed to honour one
   or more bail conditions.
5. Failure. Breach report submitted to Crown for lack of
   reporting and/or failure to abide by imposed bail conditions.
21. Overall Performance on Prior Community Supervision
(Probation)

1. Excellent. No missed scheduled appointments - fulfillment of all conditions.
2. Good. Occasionally missed scheduled appointments but contacted office to reschedule. Acceptable explanations for missing appointments (ie. illness). Fulfillment of significant probationary conditions.
3. Satisfactory. Regularly missed scheduled appointments but contacted office to reschedule. Unacceptable explanations for missing appointments (ie. slept in/forgot). General fulfillment of all significant probation conditions.
4. Poor performance. Missed numerous scheduled appointments. Failed to contact office to reschedule. Required frequent telephone or written reminders to report. Failed to honour one or more probationary conditions.
5. Failure. Breach report submitted to Crown for lack of reporting and/or failure to abide by imposed conditions.
FORM C - PAST OFFENCE HISTORY

Identification
1. Case Number 001-004
2. Form Number 005
3. Record Number 006
4. Correctional Service No. 007-014
5. Coding Date 015-020

Description of Prior Offence History
6. Previous Sexual Offence Convictions as an Adult 021

7. Description of Previous Adult Sex Offence Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Desc.</th>
<th>Days Sent</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Cws</th>
<th>Days Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/25/26</td>
<td>27/28/29/30/31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34/35/36/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Offence #1 022-037
2. Offence #2 038-53
3. Offence #3 054-69
4. Offence #4 070-85
5. Offence #5 086-101

1. Case Number 001-004
2. Form Number 005
3. Record Number 006
4. Previous Non-Sexual Offences 007
5. Description of Non-Sexual Adult Sex Offence Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Desc.</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Cws</th>
<th>Days Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offence #1</td>
<td>008-023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offence #2</td>
<td>024-039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offence #3</td>
<td>040-055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offence #4</td>
<td>056-071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Offence #5</td>
<td>072-087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Offence #6</td>
<td>088-103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Offence #7</td>
<td>104-119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Offence #8</td>
<td>120-135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Prior Custodial Commitments for Sexual Offence _______136

7. Prior Custodial Commitments for Non-Sexual Offences of More than 30 days (Adult) _______137

8. Recent Commitment-Free Period (Three Years) _______138

9. Over 8 prior property offences _______139

10. Number of Property Offences _______140
FORM D - SUPERVISION PERIOD

Identification
1. Case Number
2. Form Number
3. Record Number
5. Coding Date
6. Date of Start of Probation Supervision (yy/mm/dd)
7. Termination Date of Probation Supervision (yy/mm/dd)

Reporting Practices
8. Number of Face to Face Contacts Between Probation Officer and Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in First Year of Order.

   M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  M7  M8  M9  M10  M11  M12
   P.O.
   Home Visit
   Other

9. Number of Face to Face Contacts Between Probation Officer and Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in Second Year of Order.

   M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  M7  M8  M9  M10  M11  M12
   P.O.
   Home Visit
   Other

10. Number of Face to Face Contacts Between Probation Officer and Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in Third Year of Order.

    M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  M7  M8  M9  M10  M11  M12
    P.O.
    Home Visit
    Work/School
11. Number of Phone Contacts Between Probation Officer and Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in First Year of Order.

P.O.  
At Home  
Work/School

12. Number of Phone Contacts Between Probation Officer and Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in Second Year of Order.

P.O.  
At Home  
Work/School

13. Number of Phone Contacts Between Probation Officer and Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in Third Year of Order.

P.O.  
At Home  
Work/School

14. Nature of Reporting Practice required by PO in 1 to 6 mos of 1st year of Order

1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.

15. Nature of Reporting Practice required 7 to 12 mos of 1st year of Order

1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.

16. Nature of Reporting Practice required by PO in 1 to 6 mos of 2nd year of Order
1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.

17. Nature of Reporting Practice required 7 to 12 mos of 2nd year of Order
1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.

18. Nature of Reporting Practice required by PO in 1 to 6 mos of 3rd year of Order
1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.

19. Nature of Reporting Practice required 7 to 12 mos of 3rd year of Order
1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.

Monitoring Checks Performed by Probation Services

20. Law enforcement checks throughout full supervision period
  0. No
  1. Yes

21. If yes to #15, number of Law enforcement checks.

22. Alcohol/Drug testing checks throughout full supervision period
  0. No
  1. Yes

23. If yes to #17, number of drug/alcohol checks.

24. Employment Verification Checks throughout supervision period

25. If yes to #19, number of employment verification checks
26. Warrants issued throughout supervision period?
0. No 1. Yes

27. If yes to #21, number of warrants issued.

28. Contact (s) with Spouse/significant other throughout supervision period?
0. No 1. Yes

29. If yes to #23, number of checks.

30. Counselling verification checks throughout supervision period
0. No 1. Yes

31. If yes to #25, number of checks.

**Participation in Counselling/Treatment throughout supervision period.**

32. Probation order condition for psychological/psychiatric counselling?
0. No 1. Yes

33. Probation officer referral to psychological/psychiatric counselling?
0. No 1. Yes

34. Offender attending psychological counselling for sex offending
0. No 1. Yes

35. If yes to #29, what agency providing counselling services
1. Forensic
2. Private psychologist of offender’s choice
3. Riverview
4. Mental Health Team
5. Correctional Psychologist

36. If attending Forensic Sex Offender program, what kind of services provided.
0. No 1. Yes 2. No info

1. Group Counselling
2. Individual counselling
3. Medication therapy
4. Other
5. Ass. only

37. Number of Sessions in Individual Psychological Counselling Per Supervision Period (Forensic Services)

38. Number of Sessions in Group Psychological Counselling Per Supervision Period (Forensic)

39. Attending Group Management Supervision at V.S.S.U.

   0. No
   1. Yes

40. If Yes to #20, how long in Group Management Program.

   1. Less than 1 month
   2. 1 to 2 months
   3. 3 to 4 months
   4. 5 to 6 months
   5. 7 to 8 months
   6. 9 to 10 months
   7. 11 to 12 months
   8. 13 to 14 months
   9. 15 to 16 months
   10. 17 months plus

41. Pattern of attendance in Group Management Program

   1. No missed sessions
   2. One to three missed sessions
   3. Four to seven missed sessions
   4. Terminated from group to non-attendance

42. Pattern of participation in Group

   1. Regular participant-involved in verbalizing feelings and completing assigned activities (ie. bibliography)
   2. Irregular participant-occassionally involved in verbalizing feelings
   3. Reluctant participant-verbalizes feelings/comments when pressured by other group members

43. For V.S.S.U. clients only. Participant in the following:

   1. Bibliography
   2. Relapse Prevention Cycle Explanation and Risk factor planning
   3. Plan to Live By
   4. Diary
   5. Plan of control

   0. No
   1. Yes
44. Number of Sessions in Drug/Alcohol Counselling per Supervision Period

45. Participation in Educational/Vocational Training Throughout Supervision

45. Probation Officer referral to Employment Officer/Education/Vocational Program?

0. No

1. Yes

46. Offender Attendance at Employment/ Education/Vocational Program?

0. No

1. Yes

47. If enrolled in Educational/Vocational Program, was there Completion?

0. No

1. Yes

48. Attendance Record at Probation Services

48. Attitude towards reporting to Probation Office

1. Reluctant

2. Co-operative

3. No information

4. Variable

49. Reporting Requirement to Probation Office During First Year of Supervision (as directed by Probation Officer) First 1-6 months

1. More than two appointments weekly

2. Two appointments weekly

3. One appointment weekly

4. Bi-weekly

5. Monthly

6. Once every two months

7. AWOL

8. Re-offence (incarcerated)

9. Variable

50. Frequency of Reporting Requirement to Probation Office During First Year of Supervision (7 - 12 months)

1. More than two appointments weekly

2. Two appointments weekly

3. One appointment weekly

4. Bi-weekly

5. Monthly
51. Frequency of Reporting Requirement to Probation Office During Second Year of Supervision (1 - 6 months)

1. More than two appointments weekly
2. Two appointments weekly
3. One appointment weekly
4. Bi-weekly
5. Monthly
6. Once every two months
7. AWOL
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

52. Frequency of Reporting Requirement to Probation Office During Second Year of Supervision (7 - 12 months)

1. More than two appointments weekly
2. Two appointments weekly
3. One appointment weekly
4. Bi-weekly
5. Monthly
6. Once every two months
7. AWOL
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

53. Frequency of Reporting Requirement to Probation Office During Third Year of Supervision (1 - 6 months)

1. More than two appointments weekly
2. Two appointments weekly
3. One appointment weekly
4. Bi-weekly
5. Monthly
6. Once every two months
7. AWOL
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

54. Frequency of Reporting Requirement to Probation Office During Third Year of Supervision (7 - 12 months)

1. More than two appointments weekly
2. Two appointments weekly
3. One appointment weekly
4. Bi-weekly
5. Monthly
6. Once every two months
7. AWOL
55. Pattern of Offender’s Reporting to Probation Office During First Year of Supervision (1 - 6 months)

1. Perfect compliance (no missed appointments)
2. Fairly regular reporter (missed appointments, but subject would contact probation office with valid excuse for missed appointment)
3. Irregular reporter (missed appointments without contacting office prior. Probation Officer required to telephone subject for reminder and appointment rescheduling)
5. Not applicable/unknown.
6. Disappeared - no breach filed
7. AWOL - breach filed
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

56. Pattern of Offender’s Reporting to Probation Office During First Year of Supervision (7 - 12 months)

1. Perfect compliance (no missed appointments)
2. Fairly regular reporter (missed appointments, but subject would contact probation office with valid excuse for missed appointment)
3. Irregular reporter (missed appointments without contacting office prior. Probation Officer required to telephone subject for reminder and appointment rescheduling)
5. Not applicable/unknown.
6. Disappeared - no breach filed
7. AWOL
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

57. Pattern of Offender’s Reporting to Probation Office During Second Year of Supervision (1 - 6 months)

1. Perfect compliance (no missed appointments)
2. Fairly regular reporter (missed appointments, but subject would contact probation office with valid excuse for missed appointment)
3. Irregular reporter (missed appointments without contacting office prior. Probation Officer required to telephone subject for reminder and appointment rescheduling)
5. Not applicable
6. Disappeared - did not report but no breach filed.
7. AWOL
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

58. Pattern of Offender's Reporting to Probation Office During Second Year of Supervision (7 - 12 months)

1. Perfect compliance (no missed appointments)
2. Fairly regular reporter (missed appointments, but subject would contact probation office with valid excuse for missed appointment)
3. Irregular reporter (missed appointments without contacting office prior. Probation Officer required to telephone subject for reminder and appointment rescheduling)
5. Not applicable
6. Disappeared - did not report but no breach filed.
7. AWOL
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

59. Pattern of Offender's Reporting to Probation Office During Third Year of Supervision (1 - 6 months)

1. Perfect compliance (no missed appointments)
2. Fairly regular reporter (missed appointments, but subject would contact probation office with valid excuse for missed appointment)
3. Irregular reporter (missed appointments without contacting office prior. Probation Officer required to telephone subject for reminder and appointment rescheduling)
5. Not applicable
6. Disappeared - did not report but no breach filed.
7. AWOL
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

60. Pattern of Offender's Reporting to Probation Office During Third Year of Supervision (7 - 12 months)

1. Perfect compliance (no missed appointments)
2. Fairly regular reporter (missed appointments, but subject would contact probation office with valid excuse for missed appointment)
3. Irregular reporter (missed appointments without contacting office prior. Probation Officer required to telephone subject for reminder and appointment rescheduling)
5. Not applicable
6. Disappeared - did not report but no breach filed.
7. AWOL
8. Re-offence (incarcerated)
9. Variable

**Reporting Pattern Interruptions**

61. Reporting Interrupted by Offender Transferring Probation Supervision to other Probation Office
   0. No
   1. Yes

62. Reporting Interrupted by Offender Returning to Custody
   0. No
   1. Yes

63. Reporting Interrupted by Offender’s Work (ie. seasonal fishing)
   0. No
   1. Yes

64. Same P.O. through supervision period?

65. If Yes to #58, how long at V.S.S.U. (or at regular office)
   1) 1 - 6 months
   2) 7 - 12 months
   3) 13 - 24 months
   4) 25 - 48 months
   5) 49 months plus

**New Arrests and Technical Violations During Period of Supervision**

1. Subject completed supervision period with no new arrests (sexual or non-sexual offences) Note: does not refer to technical violations
   0. No
   1. Yes

2. Arrest for Sexual Offence During Supervision Period
   0. No
   1. Yes

3. Description of New Sexual Offence Arrests
   CCC Number

4. Conviction for New Sexual Offence Arrest During Supervision Period
   0. No
   1. Yes
5. Description of New Sexual Offence Conviction(s)
   Year/Month/Day                      Offence Description

6. Arrest for Nonsexual Offence During Supervision Period
   0. No                                1. Yes

7. Description of New Arrest for Nonsexual Offences During Supervision Period
   CCC Number

8. Conviction(s) for New NonSexual Offence During Supervision Period
   0. No                                1. Yes

9. Breach of Probation Form submitted to Crown Counsel During Supervision Period
   0. No                                1. Yes

10. Conviction for Breach of Probation During Supervision Period
    0. No                                1. Yes

11. Technical Violations Documented in Probation File
    0. No                                1. Yes

12. Type of Technical Violations
    0. No                                1. Yes

**File Contents Information**

    0. No                                1. Yes

   1. Police Report
   2. Victim Statement(s)
   3. Psychiatric Assessment
   4. Pre-Sentence Report
   5. Letters of Reference (offender)
   6. Case Management Information
   7. Police Interview (witness)
   8. Offender Statement
14. Written Documentation of every contact with offender as per Ministry policy guidelines
   0. No                    1. Yes

15. Stave Lake incarceration?
   0. No                    1. Yes

16. Psych Assessment Prior to Sentencing?
   0. No                    1. Yes

17. Probation Officer send offender for psych assessment during supervision period?
   0. No                    1. Yes

18. Home Visit?
   0. No                    1. Yes

19. Same Probation Officer through supervision period?
   0. No                    1. Yes

20. Psych Assessment Completed Prior to Sentencing?
   0. No                    1. Yes

21. Sentence served as Stave Lake?
   0. No                    1. Yes                2. Not Applicable

22. P.O. discuss offence and related information?
   0. No                    1. Yes
FORM D - SUPERVISION PERIOD

Identification

1. Case Number
   ___________001-004

2. Form Number
   ___________005

3. Record Number
   ___________006

   ___________007-014

5. Coding Date
   ___________015-020

6. Date of Start of Probation Supervision (yy/mm/dd)
   ___021-026

7. Termination Date of Probation Supervision
   ___________027-032

Reporting Practices

8. Number of Face to Face Contacts Between Probation Officer and
   Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in First Year
   of Order.

   1. Month #1 
      ___________033
   2. Month #2 
      ___________034
   3. Month #3 
      ___________035
   4. Month #4 
      ___________036
   5. Month #5 
      ___________037
   6. Month #6 
      ___________038
   7. Month #7 
      ___________039
   8. Month #8 
      ___________040
   9. Month #9 
      ___________041
  10. Month #10
      ___________042
  11. Month #11
      ___________043
  12. Month #12
      ___________044
9. Number of Face to Face Contacts Between Probation Officer and Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in Second Year of Order.

1. Month #1 045
2. Month #2 046
3. Month #3 047
4. Month #4 048
5. Month #5 049
6. Month #6 050
7. Month #7 051
8. Month #8 052
9. Month #9 053
10. Month #10 054
11. Month #11 055
12. Month #12 056

10. Number of Face to Face Contacts Between Probation Officer and Client per Month throughout Supervisory Period in Third Year of Order.

1. Month #1 057
2. Month #2 058
3. Month #3 059
4. Month #4 060
5. Month #5 061
6. Month #6 062
7. Month #7 063
8. Month #8 064
9. Month #9 065
10. Month #10 066
11. Month #11 067
12. Month #12 068

11. Nature of Reporting Practice required 1 to 6 mos of 1st year of Order

1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required
4. Not applicable
5. Not documented
12. Nature of Reporting Practice required 7 to 12 mos of 1st year of Order

1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.
4. Not applicable
5. Not documented

13. Nature of Reporting Practice required 1 to 6 mos of 2nd year of Order

1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.
4. Not applicable
5. Not documented

14. Nature of Reporting Practice required 7 to 12 mos of 2nd year of Order

1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.
4. Not applicable
5. Not documented

15. Nature of Reporting Practice required 1 to 6 mos of 3rd Year of Order

1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.
4. Not applicable
5. Not documented

16. Nature of Reporting Practice required 1 to 6 mos of 3rd Year of Order

1. In person attendance required - telephone/written not accepted
2. Both in person and telephone attendance accepted
3. Minimal supervision - "sign-in" practice - no in person interview required.
4. Not applicable
Monitoring Checks Performed by Probation Officer

17. Law Enforcement Checks Throughout Full Supervision Period
   0. No
   1. Yes

18. If Yes to #9, number of Law Enforcement Checks

19. Alcohol/Drug Testing Checks Throughout Supervision Period
   0. No
   1. Yes

20. If yes to #19, number of drug/alcohol checks

21. Employment Verification checks Throughout Supervision Period

22. If yes to #21, number of employment verification checks

23. Warrants Issued Throughout Supervision Period

24. If yes to #23, Number of warrants issued

25. Contact (s) with Spouse/Significant Other through Sup. Period

26. If yes to #25, number of contacts with spouse

27. Counselling Verification Checks Throughout Supervision Period?
   0. No
   1. Yes

28. If yes to #19, number of counselling verification checks
Participation in Counselling/Treatment Throughout Supervision Period

29. Probation Order condition for psychological/psychiatric counselling?
   0. No  1. Yes

30. Probation Officer referral to psychological/psychiatric counselling?
   0. No  1. Yes

31. Offender Attending Psychological Counselling for Sex Offending (does not include if offender attended for assessment purposes)
   0. No  1. Yes  2. No Info.

32. If Yes to #21, what agency providing counselling services
   1. Forensic
   2. Private psychologist/psychiatrist of offender’s choice
   3. Riverview
   4. Mental Health Team
   5. Correctional Psychologist

33. If attending Forensic Sex Offender Program, what kind of services provided.
   1. Service Number #1
   2. Service Number #2
   3. Service Number #3

34. Number of Sessions in Individual Psychological Counselling Per Supervision Period (Forensic Services)

35. Number of Sessions in Group Psychological Counselling Per Supervision Period (Forensic)

36. Attending Group Management Supervision at V.S.S.U.
   0. No  1. Yes

37. If Yes to #20, how long in Group Management Program.

38. Pattern of attendance in Group Management Program
39. Pattern of participation in Group

40. For V.S.S.U. clients only. Participant in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity #1</th>
<th>Activity #2</th>
<th>Activity #3</th>
<th>Activity #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Number of Sessions in Drug/Alcohol Counselling per Supervision Period

42. Probation Officer referral to Employment Officer/Education/Vocational Program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Offender Attendance at Employment/ Education/Vocational Program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. If enrolled in Educational/Vocational Program, was there Completion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Attitude towards reporting to Probation Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Reporting Requirement to Probation Office During First Year of Supervision (as directed by Probation Officer) First 1 - 6 months

47. Reporting Requirement in First Year 7 - 12 months
48. Reporting Requirement in Second Year 1 - 6 months
   ________________111
49. Reporting Requirement in Second Year 7 - 12 months
   ________________112
50. Reporting Requirement in Third Year 1 - 6 months
   ________________113
51. Reporting Requirement in Third Year 7 - 12 months
   ________________114
52. Pattern of Offender's Reporting to Probation Office During First Year of Supervision First 1 - 6 months
   ________________115
53. Pattern of Reporting in First Year 7 - 12 months
   ________________116
54. Pattern of Reporting in Second Year 1 - 6 months
   ________________117
55. Pattern of Reporting in Second Year 7 - 12 months
   ________________118
56. Pattern of Reporting in Third Year 1 - 6 months
   ________________119
57. Pattern of Reporting in Third year 7 - 12 months
   ________________120

Reporting Pattern Interruptions

58. Reporting Interrupted by Offender Transferring Probation Supervision to other Probation Office
   0. No 1. Yes ________________121
59. Reporting Interrupted by Offender Returning to Custody
   0. No 1. Yes ________________122
60. Reporting Interrupted by Offender's Work (ie. seasonal fishing)
   0. No 1. Yes ________________123
61. If yes to #57, how long at V.S.S.U. (or at regular office)
   ________________124
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Case Number</td>
<td>________001-004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Form Number</td>
<td>________005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Record Number</td>
<td>________006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Arrests and Technical Violations During Period of Supervision**

1. Subject completed supervision period with no new arrests (sexual or non-sexual offences) (does not refer to technical violations)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. No</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Arrest for Sexual Offence During Supervision Period

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. No</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Description of New Sexual Offence Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Month/Day</th>
<th>Offence Descr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offence #1</td>
<td>________009-016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offence #2</td>
<td>________017-024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offence #3</td>
<td>________025-032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offence #4</td>
<td>________033-040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Conviction for New Sexual Offence Arrest During Supervision Period

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. No</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Description of New Sexual Offence Conviction(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Month/Day</th>
<th>Offence Descr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offence #1</td>
<td>________043-050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offence #2</td>
<td>________051-058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offence #3</td>
<td>________059-066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offence #4</td>
<td>________067-074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Arrest for Nonsexual Offence During Supervision Period

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. No</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Description of New Arrest for Nonsexual Offences During Supervision Period

Year/Month/Day Offence Descrip.
009-011 012-014

1. Offence #1
2. Offence #2
3. Offence #3
4. Offence #4

8. Conviction(s) for New NonSexual Offence During Supervision Period

0. No
1. Yes

9. Description of New Conviction for Nonsexual Offences During Supervision Period

Year/Month/Day Offence Descrip.
009-011 012-014

1. Offence #1
2. Offence #2
3. Offence #3
4. Offence #4

10. Breach of Probation Form submitted to Crown Counsel During Supervision Period

0. No
1. Yes

11. Conviction for Breach of Probation During Supervision Period

0. No
1. Yes

12. Technical Violations Documented in Probation File

0. No
1. Yes

13. Type of Technical Violations

1. Periods of Non Reporting
2. Not attending counselling
3. Refusal to attend Alcohol and Drug
4. Incarcerated for new offence
5. Did not attend res. treatment (A&D)
6. Did not abide by structured reporting
7. 
8. 
9.
File Contents Information


0. No 1. Yes

File Contains Police Report 154
File Contains Victim Statement(s) 155
File Contains Psychiatric Assessment 156
File Contains Pre-Sentence Report 157
File Contains Letters of Reference (offender) 158

15. Written Documentation of every contact with offender as per Ministry policy guidelines

0. No 1. Yes 159

16. Stave Lake incarceration?

0. No 1. Yes 160

17. Psych Assessment Prior to Sentencing?

0. No 1. Yes 161

18. Probation Officer Send Offender for Psych Assessment during supervision period?

0. No 1. Yes 162

19. Home Visit by Probation Officer?

0. No 1. Yes 163

20. Same Probation Officer through supervision period?

0. No 1. Yes 164
# FORM E: RECIDIVISM

## Identification

1. Case Number
   - 001-004
2. Form Number
   - 005
3. Record Number
   - 006
   - 007-014
5. Coding Date
   - 015-020

## New Arrests/Convictions Following Completed Period of Probation Supervision

6. Follow-up time period (End of Probation Supervision to Oct.31/92)-months
   - 021-026
7. Subject completed follow-up period with no new arrests or convictions (refers to both sex/other offences)
   - 027
8. Arrest for Sex Offence During Follow-up period
   - 028

## Legal Categorization of New Sexual Offence Arrest(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Desc.</th>
<th>Days Sent</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>CWS</th>
<th>Days Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offence #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>029-044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offence #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>045-060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offence #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>061-076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offence #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>077-092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Conviction for New Sexual Offence During Supervision Period

11. If Yes to #10, Legal Categorization of Offence Conviction (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Desc.</th>
<th>Days Sent</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>CWS</th>
<th>Days Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Offence #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>094-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Offence #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Offence #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Offence #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142-157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Case Number: 001-004
2. Form Number: 005
3. Record Number: 006
4. Correctional Service No.: 007-014

5. Arrest for Non-Sexual Offence During Follow-up Period: 015

6. If Yes to #12, Legal Categorization of Non-Sexual Offence Arrest(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Desc.</th>
<th>Days Sent</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>CWS</th>
<th>Days Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offence #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>016-031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offence #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>032-047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offence #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>048-063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offence #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>064-079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Conviction for Non-Sexual Offence During Follow-up Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Desc.</th>
<th>Days Sent</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>CWS</th>
<th>Days Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If Yes to #7, Legal Categorization of Non-Sexual Offence Conviction (s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Desc.</th>
<th>Days Sent</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>CWS</th>
<th>Days Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offence #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>081-096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offence #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>032-047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offence #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>048-063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offence #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>064-079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Source of Recidivism Information

1. CPIC Printout: 145
2. Provincial Case File Printout: 146
3. Local Police Record: 147

10. CPIC Printout Document Current Offence: 148