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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Priority Prolific Offender Program (PPOP) joins a growing number of programs in Canada designed to collaboratively address the behaviour of prolific offenders using a combination of monitoring, enforcement, and rehabilitative services. The objectives of Alberta’s program aim to ensure Crown prosecutors have complete, accurate, and up-to-date information on prolific offenders, promote rehabilitation through the provision of appropriate support services, and ensure the consequences of offending and reoffending are meaningful.

PPOP contracted the Canadian Research Institute for Law and the Family in 2012 to begin the first year of a three-year process and outcome evaluation involving multiple methodologies. The report from the first year of the process and outcome evaluation (MacRae-Krisa & Paetsch, 2013) used program data on offenders who had been de-selected from the program, a survey of PPOP staff and a survey of PPOP stakeholders to re-examine program processes and, in particular, to provide a profile of the offenders in the program as a foundation for examining outcomes in the proposed second and third years of the evaluation.

Following an internal review of the program in 2013, PPOP contracted the Institute to conduct the second year of the evaluation and it was determined that a comparison of clients at the program sites in Calgary, Edmonton and the RCMP locations would be desirable. The current report focuses on updating the profile of individuals in the retrospective sample who had been PPOP clients and were subsequently de-selected, and conducting comparisons across program sites. An additional 22 clients who were de-selected from the program since the last report have been added to this sample. Further, this report examined these clients’ re-offending behaviour during their time in the program and after leaving it using data obtained from the Justice On-line Information Network (JOIN) to determine the longer-term efficacy of PPOP in reducing offending behaviour.

The purpose of the current report is to discuss the findings of the second year of the evaluation. The objectives of the report are to:

(1) report findings from the retrospective data collection;

(2) report preliminary findings from the longitudinal data collection;

(3) examine any differences in offender characteristics and program procedures across program locations;
(4) develop a strategy for a cost/benefit analysis of PPOP; and

(5) make recommendations for the program as it moves forward.

Methodology

The present report utilizes two methodologies to examine characteristics of PPOP clients at the time of their program entry and following their de-selection from the program. The retrospective time series analysis is designed to focus on collecting information about the offenders who entered the program prior to November 1, 2012 and who have subsequently exited the program to determine whether their offending behaviour appeared to be altered by the program.

In addition, a pre-test post-test longitudinal sample was identified. This sample includes all offenders selected into PPOP after November 1, 2012. An Offender Entry Data Collection Form was completed by program personnel upon an offender’s selection into the program. An Offender Exit Data Collection Form was developed to be completed by program personnel upon an offender’s de-selection from PPOP. As of May 31, 2014, only four offenders in the longitudinal sample had been de-selected from the program; thus, due to this small sample, data from the exit data collection form were not analyzed for this report.

Conclusions

Findings from the second year of the PPOP program evaluation yielded many interesting results and highlighted differences across program sites both in terms of their offender populations and their internal processes and procedures. The results also strongly suggest that PPOP has been successful in reducing its clients’ offending behaviour, not only during their time in the program but after exiting it as well.

It was recommended in the Year 1 evaluation report (MacRae-Krisa & Paetsch, 2013) that the name of the comprehensive bail packages be reviewed to emphasize that the detailed information contained in them can be used for purposes other than bail hearings such as at trial and sentencing. This recommendation was adopted and the name has been changed from the Show Cause Report to the Comprehensive Offender Management Package (COMP). Information contained in the COMP has allowed the program to be specific about individual offender’s needs which facilitates development of a detailed case plan. Following the examination of program data used in this report, it is apparent that there are slightly different versions of this document currently in use. These versions should be examined and, to the extent possible, a single version of the COMP should be used across all PPOP sites to facilitate collection of consistent program information.
The Year 1 evaluation report also suggested that communication between PPOP and Crown prosecutors could be improved with regard to the COMP and each offender. Further, the importance of continued education and advocacy for the program among the Crown and judges was noted. According to the program, efforts to improve engagement with stakeholders have been ongoing, but have been challenging. Over the course of the program, many attempts to enhance awareness of PPOP among its stakeholders have taken place, several of which have occurred since the Year 1 evaluation report was completed. A future stakeholder survey should be conducted to assess whether these further efforts have been successful in enhancing knowledge and understanding of the work of PPOP.

The analyses conducted for the current report indicated that the ratings of the motivation of clients in the longitudinal sample upon entering PPOP were overall quite low. As the number of clients de-selected from this sample increases, it will be important to examine the effects of their motivation level on their program outcomes. It is perhaps not surprising that these clients would have low motivation upon entering the program, and one of the challenges of the program is to increase offenders’ motivation to change their behaviour. The exit survey used with the longitudinal sample collects information on clients’ motivation levels upon leaving the program. As more clients in this sample exit the program, future analyses will be able to examine changes in their motivation after participating in PPOP.

Given that almost three-quarters of offenders in the longitudinal sample were unemployed at PPOP entry, it is somewhat surprising that less than one-half of program clients had employment goals as part of their case plan. Similarly, even though over one-half of clients had not completed high school, only one-fifth of offenders had educational goals as part of their case plans. Also, a very small number of clients had their own residence, but only one-fifth were reported as having housing goals. There are relatively high levels of substance abuse issues among program clients, particularly at the EPS site. It may be that setting goals in tangible areas such as employment, education and housing is delayed until after the substance abuse issues are dealt with. The process for goal setting for PPOP offenders should be reviewed, since clearly articulated goals can help to ensure that referrals to appropriate services are made.

Findings from the longitudinal sample in the present report indicated that the services clients were referred to differed across program locations. For example, while over one-half of clients at the EPS and RCMP locations received referrals to family/children’s services and addictions services, no clients at the CPS site received referrals to these services. Similarly, while over one-third of CPS clients were referred to mental health services, only one RCMP client and no EPS clients received this type of referral. It is not clear whether these variations in practice reflect differences in need across program locations or differences in the availability of services at the various program sites. The Year 1 evaluation report noted that treatment and support services were not sufficient to meet the needs of PPOP clients and this is likely still the case. It
would be useful to repeat the staff and stakeholder surveys to determine if the availability of services and the needs of clients have changed over the past two years.

There were substantial differences in the length of time offenders in the longitudinal sample spent on the wait list prior to entering PPOP. While EPS clients all entered the program immediately with no wait time, RCMP clients spent an average of 9 days on the wait list while CPS clients were on the wait list for an average of 24 days. It is unclear whether this is related to differences in program capacity at the various locations. There is evidence in the present report that clients in the EPS program represent a group of more serious prolific offenders; thus, it may be that enrolling them in the program is viewed as more urgent than at the other program sites.

Findings from the retrospective sample indicated that offenders at the EPS program location had a greater number of convictions in the five years prior to entering PPOP than clients at either the CPS or RCMP sites. EPS clients also had received a considerably higher average number of custodial sentences in their lifetime and had spent the greatest amount of time in custody since their first conviction. Clients’ ages at the EPS program site were comparable to those at the other programs, so these differences are not attributable to the EPS offenders representing an older cohort of PPOP clients. Thus, it appears that clients at the EPS program location represent a qualitatively different sample of offenders who were more criminally active prior to entering the program and accordingly had greater involvement with the correctional system.

This conclusion is also supported to some extent in findings from the longitudinal sample. Clients at the EPS program location had the highest number of lifetime convictions, had spent the greatest amount of time in custody by a considerable margin and were more likely to be rated as having low motivation upon their entry to PPOP. However, in this sample, EPS clients were substantially older than CPS and RCMP clients, which could account, at least in part, for their higher number of convictions and longer periods in custody. Once there are a greater number of clients in the sample at each location, it will be possible to control for these age differences in subsequent analyses.

Interestingly, even though EPS offenders had more lifetime convictions and had spent more time in custody than offenders at the other program sites, their number of substantive convictions in the five years before PPOP selection were lower than clients at either of the other program locations. This could indicate that EPS clients had spent more time in custody during the five years before entering the program and thus were not in a position to be committing crime. However, it could also indicate that EPS clients were committing more serious crimes and receiving longer custodial sentences. Adding support to the hypothesis that these offenders were committing more serious offences is the fact that EPS clients in the retrospective sample had a higher number of convictions on secondary grounds charges, which include substantive offences where
detention is necessary to ensure public safety. This also suggests that EPS clients may have a history of committing more serious offences.

There was a substantial difference in the average length of time RCMP program clients had spent in custody since their first conviction for the retrospective (63 months) and the longitudinal (16 months) samples. It is unclear what accounts for this difference. Given the small sample size for the longitudinal sample at this point, this may simply reflect a random fluctuation rather than a systematic difference between the two samples. A further data collection period would increase the sample size and allow this difference to be examined further.

There were also some differences across program locations in terms of the use of selection criteria for PPOP. Almost all offenders at the EPS location met all six mandatory selection criteria; however, one-quarter of RCMP program clients in the retrospective sample did not meet the mandatory criterion of being currently active in committing criminal activity. Further, one-quarter of clients in the longitudinal sample at the CPS program did not meet the mandatory criterion of being considered a high risk to re-offend, and over one-third did not meet the criterion of committing substantive offences while on release. This indicates that some clients who meet most, but not all, mandatory criteria are being selected into PPOP. To avoid confusion regarding the use of these criteria, the program should consider changing the names from “Mandatory” and “Discretionary” criteria to “Primary” and “Secondary” criteria.

With regard to the discretionary criteria, across program locations, few offenders in either sample were rated as meeting the criterion that their criminal behaviour is correlated with mental illness. Since one-half of the clients in the longitudinal sample were rated as having a confirmed or suspected mental health issue (comparable data were not available for the retrospective sample), it may be that these mental health issues were not viewed as contributing to clients’ criminal behaviour. Alternatively, it is possible that the referring agency was not aware of a mental health diagnosis or that the offenders had not received a complete mental health assessment prior to entering PPOP. While conducting mental health assessments is not within the purview of PPOP, given the prevalence of mental health issues among the longitudinal sample, it is important that the program has the resources in place to provide adequate support to these clients.

EPS clients in the retrospective sample were most likely to be de-selected from PPOP because they had been incarcerated for a period of one year or more and were least likely to be de-selected because they no longer were committing substantive offences for a period of six months or more. EPS clients in the longitudinal sample were also considerably more likely to be incarcerated upon entering PPOP and, consequently, to be unemployed and have no income. These findings also suggest that the EPS offenders are qualitatively different than those at the other program locations and may represent a group with a more entrenched and serious pattern of criminal behaviour.
The results obtained when examining offending behaviour before, during and after the program for clients in the retrospective sample are extremely positive and strongly suggestive of the efficacy of PPOP in having a positive effect on individuals not only during their time in the program, but after de-selection as well. Across all program locations, and for both substantive and administrative offences, the number of convictions during the program was substantially lower than in the five years prior to PPOP and, with the exception of substantive offences among EPS program clients, decreased even further or remained the same following de-selection.

The positive findings with regard to decreased offending observed in the present analysis argue strongly for continuing the evaluation of PPOP for an additional year as originally envisioned. A further year of data collection will expand the sizes of both the retrospective and longitudinal samples, which will enable more robust comparisons across program sites. Further, the additional data collection period will allow for more offenders in the longitudinal sample to be de-selected from the program, which will afford the opportunity for detailed pre/post program analyses, provide a larger pool of de-selected clients who could be interviewed about their experiences with the program, and allow comparative analyses between individuals who have been in PPOP and those in the comparison group. Once more outcome data are available, a solid foundation for a cost-effectiveness analysis will be laid. Most importantly, further data collection will provide the opportunity to determine if the effects of PPOP in decreasing recidivism are realized in the long term.

Recommendations

The findings from the Year 2 evaluation of PPOP yielded the following recommendations:

1. **Comprehensive Offender Management Package (COMP):** Slightly different versions of the COMP are currently in use. The COMP should be reviewed to ensure that, to the extent possible, a standard version is used across program locations.

2. **PPOP Selection Criteria:** While the mandatory selection criteria for PPOP are being met for the majority of offenders at each program location, there were some important systematic differences across locations. Given that some clients who have met most, but not all, mandatory criteria are being selected into PPOP, the program should consider changing the names from “Mandatory” and “Discretionary” criteria to “Primary” and “Secondary” criteria.

3. **Mental Health and Substance Use Services:** Given the substantial number of program clients with mental health and substance use issues, the program should review its capacity for providing appropriate service referrals.
(4) **Offenders’ Motivation Levels:** Given the substantial number of PPOP clients with low motivation upon entering the program, as more clients are de-selected from the longitudinal sample, the program should more closely examine their levels of motivation to address their criminal behaviour, substance use and mental health issues in relation to program outcomes.

(5) **Goal Setting:** Given the low number of goals documented for the longitudinal sample, it is recommended that the program review the procedures used for setting goals in the case plans. Clearly defined goals will help to ensure that appropriate service referrals are made.

(6) **Service Referrals:** Given the differences in service referrals across program sites, the program should review the services available at the various locations and determine if they are sufficient to meet the clients’ needs.

(7) **Data Collection Forms:** If the evaluation is not continued beyond the current year, it is recommended that the program continue to use the Offender Entry Data Collection Form and the Offender Exit Data Collection Form to allow for internal monitoring of clients’ progress.

(8) **Staff and Stakeholder Surveys:** Another wave of staff and stakeholder surveys should be conducted to determine if communication between Crown prosecutors and PPOP has improved with regard to the COMP and each offender and whether attempts at continued education and advocacy for PPOP among prosecutors and the judiciary has resulted in enhanced knowledge of the program. These surveys would also determine if client needs and the availability of services have changed in the last two years.

(9) **Continuation of the Evaluation:** Given the extremely positive preliminary findings regarding decreases in recidivism among PPOP clients both during their time in the program and after de-selection, it is recommended that the evaluation be continued for another year as originally envisioned. This will allow for a determination of whether the positive results reported in the current analysis are sustained over a longer term with a greater number of PPOP clients. Another round of staff and stakeholder surveys, as well as interviews with de-selected clients in the longitudinal sample could be incorporated into a final evaluation year.

(10) **Social Return on Investment (SROI) Analysis:** Given the positive findings contained in this report, an analysis of the social value created by PPOP should be conducted once additional outcome data are available. A strategy for this analysis is outlined in this report, which could be carried out as part of a final evaluation year.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The problem of repeat offenders is well documented. The correctional literature indicates that a small percentage of offenders, commonly referred to as chronic, persistent, or prolific offenders, commit a disproportionate amount of crime. Studies by the Canadian Research Institute for Law and the Family in the area of chronic and persistent youth offenders have contributed to this body of research (Smith, Bertrand, Arnold, & Hornick, 1995; MacRae, Bertrand, Paetsch, & Hornick, 2008). In a study of serious habitual youth offenders, Smith et al. (1995) found that although they composed only 3% of the youth offender population, the serious habitual offenders were responsible for 14% of the criminal occurrences. This finding was reinforced by MacRae et al. (2008), who found that serious habitual offenders comprised only 1% of youth offenders in Calgary in 2006 but were responsible for 6% of chargeable incidents. These findings are consistent with research in the United Kingdom, which revealed that approximately 100,000 of the total offending population of one million offenders were responsible for 50% of the crime in England and Wales but that 5,000 of the most prolific offenders were responsible for approximately 10% of offences (Home Office, 2010).

With the study of chronic, persistent and prolific offenders becoming a priority in recent years, it has become increasingly evident that this population faces a number of unique challenges—untreated mental health issues, substance abuse, and poverty—that contribute to their offending behaviour and ongoing involvement with the criminal justice system (Pottruff, 2010). As noted by Alberta’s Crime Reduction and Safe Communities Task Force (2007), these offenders consume a tremendous proportion of the criminal justice system’s time and resources. The Task Force recommended that targeted action be taken “to address the problem of repeat offenders” (p. 61).

In response to this recommendation, the Alberta Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General, in partnership with the Calgary Police Service, Edmonton Police Service and RCMP, developed and piloted the Priority Prolific Offender Program (PPOP). With PPOP, Alberta joins British Columbia and the Yukon as Canadian jurisdictions that have recently piloted uniquely designed and targeted prolific offender management programs. Modelled on the Prolific and Other Priority Offender program introduced in England and Wales in 2004, these programs involve collaboration among justice sectors, such as police, Crown prosecutors, corrections, and social services, to increase supervision, timely and meaningful responses to re-offending, and services that support rehabilitation and reform (British Columbia Criminal Justice Reform Secretariat, 2009; Alberta Solicitor General and Public Security, 2010).
1.2 Objectives of PPOP

Alberta’s PPOP has three key objectives:

(1) to ensure that Crown prosecutors have complete, accurate, and up-to-date information when prosecuting priority prolific offenders through a comprehensive offender management package;

(2) to promote rehabilitation through the provision of appropriate support services for the offender; and

(3) to promote meaningful consequences for offenders.

To accomplish these objectives, PPOP has established a focused and integrated strategy to manage offenders in a systematic, methodical, and collaborative way, balancing law enforcement and social service provision. As a result, many partners and stakeholders have been involved in the implementation of the program, all of whom play a key role in its operation. The involvement of multiple partners has allowed PPOP to maximize its adaptability to the unique needs of the communities and offenders it serves and to enhance its flexibility in responding to those needs. PPOP involves police officers, criminal intelligence analysts, program support analysts and probation officers. As stated on Public Safety Canada’s website:

PPOP receives referrals from law enforcement on repeat offenders who primarily commit low-complexity crimes (e.g., break and enters or property crimes). PPOP works to ensure that the courts have the most comprehensive information available on these offenders so that the most appropriate sentences are imposed and rehabilitation opportunities are realized. The PPOP unit monitors court procedures, makes recommendations to the Crown or probation officer regarding support services that could promote rehabilitation, and facilitates access to services upon the offender’s release.

1.3 Process Analysis Report

The Canadian Research Institute for Law and the Family was contracted in the fall of 2010 to conduct a process analysis as the first phase of the evaluation. The goal of the process analysis was to determine the extent to which the implementation procedures had been effective, efficient, and in line with the objectives and desired outcomes. In April 2011, a report by MacRae, Bertrand, Paetsch, and Hornick presented the results of the process evaluation and concluded that PPOP offers a promising and beneficial approach in addressing the issue of prolific offenders in Alberta. Based on the findings of the evaluation, a number of recommendations were made, all of which have since been implemented:
(1) the development of an operations manual;
(2) a review of the comprehensive bail packages;
(3) a review of the funding and resource structure;
(4) increased education and awareness; and
(5) a process and outcomes evaluation.

The process evaluation report also yielded a detailed logic model articulating the objectives, inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes of the program (see Table 1.1).

1.4 Process and Outcomes Evaluation

In 2012, PPOP decided to continue the process evaluation, following the recommendation of the initial evaluation report and to conduct a thorough outcomes evaluation. The Institute was contracted to conduct the first of a proposed three-year process and outcomes evaluation. The objectives listed in the logic model as well as the results of the initial process analysis contained in the MacRae et al. (2011) report suggested the need for a comprehensive research evaluation strategy to test the impact of PPOP. The strategy has three major components as follows:

(1) a process analysis designed to monitor and document program implementation, and, specifically, to assess whether the process evaluation recommendations have been addressed;

(2) an outcome analysis designed to track anticipated changes that result from the activities of the program; and

(3) a cost and potential benefit analysis of the program.

The process analysis examines how PPOP is actually implemented and addresses the question of whether the program has been carried out as it was intended. It primarily involves monitoring and documenting program activities and outputs using multiple data sources—PPOP records, comprehensive bail packages, exit interviews with de-selected offenders, survey of service providers and PPOP staff.

The outcome analysis includes a measurement of short-term and long-term outcomes to determine whether the program is having its intended effect in achieving specific program objectives. The outcome analysis uses multiple data sources, such as PPOP records, comprehensive bail packages, exit interviews with de-selected offenders, surveys of service providers and PPOP staff, as well as a combination of retrospective time series design and longitudinal pre-test post-test comparison group design.
The results of the first year of the process and outcome evaluation were presented in a report by MacRae-Krisa and Paetsch (2013), and indicated that PPOP processes are largely in line with the intention of the program. Findings of this report revealed that the PPOP selection criteria are for the most part being followed. In addition to clearly meeting the mandatory offending criteria for selection, the offenders demonstrate the presence of a number of co-morbid risk factors, including substance addiction, homelessness, lack of employment, and criminal association. Though the analysis of discretionary criteria among the retrospective sample showed that mental health issues were largely absent among the sample, it is expected that this is an underestimation due to the referring agency not being aware of a mental health diagnosis, or to the fact that many offenders likely had not had a proper assessment at the time of referral. It is expected that future analysis of outcomes data will yield better information with regard to the presence of mental health issues among the prolific offender population, and the resultant need for PPOP to provide adequate resources and support. With regard to the process of selection, the staff and stakeholder survey yielded a number of suggestions to improve the process, including increasing the number of requisite convictions or consideration of the ratio of charges to convictions, development of a program risk assessment tool to ensure consistency in this regard, and expanding the source of referrals from police to include other sources, such as probation officers.

The development and distribution of the comprehensive bail packages continue to be a feature of PPOP that was viewed very positively. Overall, staff and stakeholders believed the information contained in the packages to be appropriate and effective for making recommendations regarding bail and sentencing, and the process for providing this information to the Crown was efficient. A need to change the format of the bail package emerged, and specifically, to change the name of the bail package so that it was not viewed purely as a source of information for bail hearings. It was further suggested that communication between PPOP and the Crown could improve with regard to the bail package and each offender. The importance of continued education and advocacy for the program among Crown prosecutors and judges was also revealed. Analysis of the information provided in the bail packages demonstrated a complete picture of each offender, with the recommendations for conditions being comprehensive and appropriate to each individual’s needs and risk profile.

The discretionary criteria used to select many offenders demonstrated the complex needs of the offender group, and the resultant need for PPOP to provide a range of services and resources to support the offenders in changing their lives. Findings related to the provision of community services were similar to the initial process evaluation, in that both the staff and stakeholder surveys revealed that existing treatment and support services are not sufficient to meet the needs of PPOP offenders. Though PPOP endeavours to link offenders with necessary support services, the services themselves are often limited in their selection criteria, willingness to accept
those with a criminal record, appropriateness, and availability. As revealed in the surveys, inability to provide appropriate support services when they are needed, such as immediately following an offender’s release from custody, often contributes to recidivism. However, it is also important to note that the offender’s willingness to engage in services is a key factor to success. The continued development of formal partnerships with service providers is an important consideration for the program moving forward.

Overall, staff and stakeholders believed that monitoring and the response to relapse and reoffending by PPOP is timely and adequate. However, it was reported that effectiveness of monitoring and surveillance is largely dependent on the cooperation of justice system partners, such as referring agencies and probation, as well as a better understanding of which organization is responsible for filing breaches and new charges. The availability of surveillance and monitoring was also a common theme, with many staff and stakeholders pointing to the need for more resources in this area in order for it to be effective. As PPOP moves forward, it was recommended that communication with external agencies regarding responsibilities for monitoring, compliance, and charges be revisited.

With regard to compliance, staff and stakeholders were somewhat less positive about offenders’ ability to follow their conditions. As the evaluation continues, an examination of offending data while offenders are in the program will further reveal outcomes regarding compliance.

The staff and stakeholder surveys revealed a number of considerations for the future of PPOP. Though response to the program and any possible expansion was overwhelmingly positive, it was also recognized that the program must have appropriate processes and resources before it increases its current caseload or is offered in other communities.

The preliminary findings from Year 1 of the comprehensive process and outcome evaluation revealed a number of themes and considerations for the program. The retrospective analysis showed an offender population with complex needs and risk profiles, pointing to the need for a comprehensive and coordinated response. Re-examining PPOP processes revealed that although many of the recommendations from the 2011 process evaluation have been followed, the program needs to continue to address the format of the comprehensive bail packages, communication with the Crown and courts, monitoring and surveillance resources, and importantly, community supports and services.

1.5 Purpose of this Report

This report presents the findings of the second year of the evaluation, as well as a comparison of clients at the program sites in Calgary, Edmonton and the RCMP
locations. This comparison is a major focus of the report. The objectives of the report are to:

(1) report findings from the retrospective data collection;

(2) report preliminary findings from the longitudinal data collection;

(3) examine any differences in offender characteristics and program procedures across program locations;

(4) develop a strategy for a cost/benefit analysis of PPOP; and

(5) make recommendations for the program as it moves forward.

1.6 Organization of the Report

The following chapter discusses the methodologies used to collect the data discussed in this report. Chapter 3.0 presents results of the retrospective data analysis, and Chapter 4.0 presents results of the longitudinal data analysis. A strategy for a cost/benefit analysis of PPOP is presented in Chapter 5.0, and Chapter 6.0 summarizes the findings of the second year of the evaluation and makes recommendations for the program as it goes forward.
### Table 1.1

**PPOP Logic Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Crown prosecutors have complete, accurate, and up-to-date information when prosecuting prolific offenders</td>
<td>- Program funding</td>
<td>- PPOP offenders selected</td>
<td>- Selection criteria are followed</td>
<td>- Crown and Judge/JP recommends/orders conditions for PPOP offender reflective of Bail Package information</td>
<td>- Decrease reoffending for PPOP offenders after they are deselected from the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PPOP project manager</td>
<td>- PPOP offenders notified</td>
<td>- 20 PPOP offenders are monitored in each of three locations</td>
<td>- PPOP offender receives conditions which are reflective of their needs and risk profile</td>
<td>- Reduce the crime severity index for PPOP offenders after they are deselected from the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4 Police Constables (1 EPS, 1 CPS, 2 RCMP)</td>
<td>- Information is gathered by the Criminal Intelligence Analyst for preparation of the comprehensive bail packages</td>
<td>- Complete, accurate and up to date Bail Packages are provided to the Crown by PPOP</td>
<td>- Decrease reoffending for PPOP offenders while in the program</td>
<td>- Reduce the overall crime rate in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 Probation Officers</td>
<td>- Crown is notified that an individual is a PPOP client and provided with the comprehensive bail package to inform decision making on bail and sentencing</td>
<td>- Crown requesting court to consider bail and sentencing recommendations as per the Bail Package</td>
<td>- Reduce the crime severity index for the community</td>
<td>- Reduce the level of victimization in the community by PPOP offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 Criminal Intelligence Analysts</td>
<td>- Administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Objectives</td>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Short-term Outcomes</td>
<td>Long-term Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective #2</td>
<td>Program funding</td>
<td>- PPOP offenders selected</td>
<td>- Case plan completed and reviewed in a timely fashion</td>
<td>- Services are coordinated</td>
<td>- Decrease reoffending for PPOP offenders after they are de-selected from the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPOP Project Manager</td>
<td>- PPOP offenders notified</td>
<td>- Meetings held with agencies identified in the case plan</td>
<td>- PPOP offenders receive services in a timely fashion</td>
<td>- Reduce the crime severity index for the PPOP offenders after they are de-selected from the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Police Constables (1 EPS, 1 CPS, 2 RCMP)</td>
<td>- Case Management Plans completed/updated for each PPOP offender</td>
<td>- Most appropriate services are received</td>
<td>- PPOP offenders increase compliance with conditions</td>
<td>- Reduce the overall crime rate in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Probation Officers</td>
<td>- Referrals made to appropriate programs and services</td>
<td>- De-selected PPOP offenders no longer require the support of the program</td>
<td>- PPOP offenders’ needs are met with unique combinations of services</td>
<td>- Reduce the crime severity index for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>- PPOP offenders are de-selected</td>
<td>- The sentence and conditions contribute to the rehabilitation of the PPOP offender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Reduce the level of victimization in the community by PPOP offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crown Prosecutors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation and support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1

PPOP Logic Model (cont’d)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective #3</td>
<td>Promote meaningful consequences for offenders</td>
<td>- Program funding&lt;br&gt;- PPOP Project Manager&lt;br&gt;- 4 Police Constables (1 EPS, 1 CPS, 2 RCMP)&lt;br&gt;- 2 Probation Officers&lt;br&gt;- Administrative support&lt;br&gt;- Crown Prosecutors&lt;br&gt;- Rehabilitation and support services</td>
<td>- Increased monitoring by EPS, CPS, RCMP and PPOP probation officers&lt;br&gt;- breaches&lt;br&gt;- new charges&lt;br&gt;- curfew checks&lt;br&gt;- PPOP unit meets to discuss individual clients</td>
<td>- Breaches or new charges laid quickly&lt;br&gt;- Increased number of curfew checks&lt;br&gt;- De-selection criteria are being followed</td>
<td>- Initial increase in the number of breaches for PPOP offenders&lt;br&gt;- Decrease in the number of breaches for PPOP offenders over time while in the program&lt;br&gt;- PPOP offenders increase compliance with conditions&lt;br&gt;- Decrease reoffending for PPOP offenders after they are deselected from the program&lt;br&gt;- Reduce the crime severity index for the PPOP offenders after they are deselected from the program&lt;br&gt;- Reduce the overall crime rate in the community&lt;br&gt;- Reduce the crime severity index for the community&lt;br&gt;- Reduce the level of victimization in the community by PPOP offenders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Questions

This report addresses the following research questions:

(1) What are the profiles of PPOP clients at each program location at the point of selection into the program?

(2) Are there differences in clients’ offending patterns prior to PPOP entry at each program location?

(3) Are the PPOP selection criteria being followed?

(4) What service referrals are PPOP clients receiving as part of their case plan?

(5) Are there differences in the reasons for de-selection across program locations?

(6) Has reoffending for PPOP clients decreased while they are in the program?

(7) Has reoffending for PPOP clients decreased after they are de-selected from the program?

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Retrospective Analysis

The retrospective time series analysis focused on collecting information about the offenders who entered the program prior to November 1, 2012 and subsequently exited the program to determine whether their offending behaviour appeared to be altered by the program. While this design is somewhat limited in internal validity because of its inability to control for history without a control group, it does provide information about how clients’ offending behaviour changed while in the program and after exiting.

The retrospective sample is composed of 56 offenders who had been de-selected from the program as of May 31, 2014. The Institute was provided with the intake form, comprehensive bail package, and de-selection form for each offender. The information contained in these documents was coded and descriptively analyzed to produce a profile of the sample at the time of their entry into the program, as well as a historical profile of their offending patterns. Data on these individuals’ offending patterns while they were in the program and after their de-selection were provided from Alberta Justice and Solicitor General’s Justice On-line Information Network (JOIN).
2.2.2 Longitudinal Analysis

In an attempt to address the limitations of the retrospective sample, a pre-test post-test longitudinal sample was identified. This sample includes all offenders selected into PPOP after November 1, 2012 (n=26). The Institute developed an Offender Entry Data Collection Form (see Appendix A) to be completed by program personnel upon an offender’s selection into the program. This form collects information on: the offenders’ demographic characteristics; reasons for selection into the program; their offending history prior to the program; any substance abuse, mental health, medical or dental issues; employment, education and housing status; and any agencies the offenders are expected to be referred to as part of their case plan.

An Offender Exit Data Collection Form (see Appendix B) was developed to be completed by program personnel upon an offender’s de-selection from PPOP. This form collects data on: any changes in family status since program selection; reason for de-selection from the program; convictions during their time in the program; information on their case plan, including any addictions, mental health, medical or dental treatment they may have received; change in employment, education or housing status while in the program; and whether they accessed the services they were referred to by the program. As of May 31, 2014, only four offenders in the longitudinal sample had been de-selected from the program; thus, due to this small sample, data from the exit data collection form were not analyzed for this report.

The longitudinal design includes the use of a comparison group of offenders who fit the criteria for PPOP, but have not yet entered the program due to space limitations. Data on the offending patterns of individuals in the comparison group are periodically provided to the Institute from JOIN. Due to the small number of individuals in the longitudinal sample who have been de-selected from the program to date, analyses of data from the comparison group is premature at this point and is not included in this report.

2.3 Limitations

Some limitations to the data presented in this report are worthy of note. With regard to program clients in the retrospective sample, although one of the reasons for their de-selection is that they had been incarcerated for a period of one year or longer, and this is accounted for in the data analysis, it is possible that some offenders might have been incarcerated following de-selection and thus would not be in a position to engage in further criminal activity. This could have the effect of artificially lowering the criminal conviction rates following de-selection. However, the consistent findings across program sites with regard to convictions after leaving PPOP suggests that the possibility of subsequent incarceration did not have a substantial effect on the findings.
Further, although the number of offenders in the total sample is relatively large at this time, when broken down by program location, sample sizes are considerably lower. For this reason, comparisons between program locations should be viewed as preliminary at this point. If the evaluation continues, the size of the retrospective sample will increase over time as more clients are de-selected, which will allow for more robust comparisons across program sites.

With regard to the longitudinal analyses, the total number of program clients in the sample is relatively low at this point, as are the number of clients at each program location. As with the retrospective sample, longitudinal analyses presented in this report should be viewed as preliminary; if the evaluation is extended, the longitudinal sample will also continue to grow and improve in reliability. At this point, only four clients in the longitudinal sample have been de-selected from PPOP. For this reason, only data collected from this sample at the point of program entry are presented in this report.
3.0 RETROSPECTIVE SAMPLE

3.1 Introduction

The retrospective sample is composed of 56 offenders who entered the program prior to November 1, 2012 and had been de-selected from the program by May 31, 2014. The substantial majority of the retrospective sample was male (89.3%; n=50) with only six of the offenders being female. Figure 3.1 provides the number of offenders in this sample from each program location. The Edmonton Police Service (EPS) location had the highest number of offenders (n=23), followed by the RCMP-North location (n=16), the Calgary Police Service (CPS) location (n=14), and the RCMP-South location (n=3). Due to the small number of offenders in the RCMP-South program location, analyses by program location combine the two RCMP program sites.

Figure 3.1

Program Location for the Retrospective Sample

The purpose of this chapter is to present a profile of the sample to their de-selection from the program, using available program information: intake referral form and comprehensive bail package, including criminal history, the Comprehensive Offender Management Package (COMP; previously called the Show Cause Report), and conviction synopsis. In addition, data on the offenders’ criminal convictions during the program and after de-selection (to May 31, 2014) were available from JOIN.
3.2 Criminal History Prior to PPOP Selection

Across program sites, offenders in the retrospective sample were an average of 17 years of age when they received their first conviction, ranging from 12 to 42 years. The average age of offenders at first conviction at the CPS program location was higher (18.4 years) than either the EPS location (16.9 years) or the RCMP locations (15.9 years). However, one offender at the CPS location was substantially older at the time of his first conviction (42 years) because he had recently immigrated to Canada. When this individual is removed from the analysis, the average age at first conviction for the CPS offenders was in line with those in the other programs (16.5 years).

Table 3.1 presents the average number of substantive and administrative offence\(^1\) convictions in the five years prior to PPOP selection. Offenders at the EPS program location group had more convictions for substantive offences in the five years prior to PPOP selection (21.4) than either the CPS group (15.9) or the RCMP group (14.3).

Table 3.1

Average Number of Convictions during the Five Years Prior to PPOP Selection, by Program Location and Offence Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>Program Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal driving convictions</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offence convictions</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons offence convictions</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud offence convictions</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offence convictions</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offence convictions</td>
<td>10.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal offence convictions</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Substantive offence convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administrative offence convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total convictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Conviction Count Form
Total N for CPS=14; Total N for EPS=23; Total N for RCMP=19

\(^1\) “Substantive offence” refers to all criminal occurrences other than those related to compliance with court orders such as failures to appear or breaches of bail conditions. “Administrative offence” refers to occurrences related to failures to comply with court orders such as failures to appear or breaches of bail conditions.
For all three program locations, convictions for property offences were the most common of the substantive offences. Criminal driving convictions were more common among the EPS group, as were fraud offences. Violent offences were more common among the RCMP program group (1.9) than either EPS (.91) or CPS (.21); however, weapons offences, drug offences and other convictions were most common in the CPS program location. With regard to administrative offence convictions, the CPS and RCMP program locations were quite similar, with an average of 8.8 and 8.9 convictions, respectively. Offenders at the EPS program location averaged slightly fewer administrative convictions (7.6) in the five years prior to PPOP selection. Overall, offenders at the EPS program location had the highest average number of convictions in the five years prior to PPOP selection (29) followed by CPS (24.7) and RCMP (23.2) offenders.

Table 3.2 presents a summary of the criminal history characteristics for PPOP offenders as provided in the program’s COMP/Show Cause Report, by program location.

Table 3.2
Summary of Offender Criminal History Characteristics, by Program Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Program Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate time in custody since first conviction (months)</td>
<td>53.93</td>
<td>14-158</td>
<td>58.95</td>
<td>2-184</td>
<td>62.71</td>
<td>9-207</td>
<td>58.83</td>
<td>2-207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of life incarcerated since first conviction</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>14-55</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>4-58</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>5-70</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>.4-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total times given a custodial sentence</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>11-78</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>5-189</td>
<td>44.67</td>
<td>10-88</td>
<td>52.65</td>
<td>5-189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total times admitted to custody</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>7-59</td>
<td>36.37</td>
<td>5-179</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>11-28</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>5-179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of criminal convictions committed while subject to bail conditions</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>1-32</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>3-49</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of convictions while subject to sentence for other offences</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>0-98</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>2-58</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>0-98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Show Cause Report/Comprehensive Offender Management Package
Total N for CPS=14; Total N for EPS=23; Total N for RCMP=19
1 Missing cases for EPS=1; RCMP=2
2 Missing cases for EPS=1; RCMP=2
3 Missing cases for EPS=1; RCMP=1
4 Missing cases for EPS=4; RCMP=8
5 Missing cases for EPS=1; RCMP=1
6 Missing cases for EPS=1; RCMP=1
With regard to time in custody since first conviction, the RCMP program group, on average, had spent the greatest amount of time in custody (62.7 months), followed by the EPS group (59 months) and the CPS group (53.9 months). In terms of the percentage of their lives that they had spent in custody since their first conviction, offenders in all three program locations were quite similar, with approximately one-third of their lives spent in custody. Offenders in the EPS program had received a substantially higher average number of custodial sentences (63) than those in the CPS (46.6) and RCMP (44.7) groups. The EPS group were also admitted to custody a substantially higher average number of times (36.4), than those in the CPS (22.8) and RCMP groups (18.2). The difference between the number of custodial sentences received and the number of times admitted to custody is likely due to offenders serving some custodial sentences concurrently.

Table 3.2 also presents the average number of criminal convictions committed while subject to bail conditions, and while subject to sentences for other offences. Regarding convictions while subject to bail conditions, the EPS group had the highest average number (19.2), followed by the RCMP (17.8) and CPS (14.6) groups. With regard to convictions while subject to other sentences, the RCMP (23.6) and EPS (22.7) groups were quite similar, compared to 16.6 for the CPS group.

### 3.3 Selection to PPOP

This section summarizes the program information available regarding offender selection to PPOP, primarily drawn from the intake referral form and the Comprehensive Offender Management Package (COMP), previously called the Show Cause Report. Average age at selection to PPOP was similar for all program sites, with offenders in the Calgary program averaging 33.2 years of age at selection (range = 19 to 62 years), compared to 32.7 years for the EPS group (range = 20 to 48 years) and 31.3 years for the RCMP group (range = 18 to 54 years).

Table 3.3 summarizes the Program Selection Criteria at intake. Mandatory criterion #1 (a history of frequently committing substantive offences) was met for all offenders; however, the other 5 mandatory criteria were met by most but not all offenders. The mandatory criterion that was not met by the most offenders was #4 (intelligence indicates the offender is currently active in committing criminal activity); this criterion was not met by five offenders in the RCMP program, and one offender in the CPS program.

In terms of the discretionary criteria, the most commonly selected were discretionary criterion #1 (offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated with addictions), which over 80% of the offenders in each program location met, and discretionary criterion #3 (offender is unemployed and does not have stable residency), which was met by 89.5% of offenders in the RCMP program, 82.6% in the EPS program and 71.4% in the CPS program.
Table 3.3

Program Selection Criteria at Intake, by Program Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CPS</th>
<th>EPS</th>
<th>RCMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #1: A history of frequently committing substantive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #2: A history of committing substantive offences while on release</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #3: A history of non-compliance with court orders including failing to appear and breach of conditions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #4: Intelligence indicates the offender is currently active in committing criminal activity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #5: Criminal behaviour of the individual has a serious impact on public safety and victimization and/or on public confidence in the justice system</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #6: Offender is considered to be a medium to high risk to reoffend</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary criterion #1: Offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated with addictions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary criterion #2: Offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated to mental illness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary criterion #3: Offender is unemployed and does not have a stable residency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary criterion #4: Offender may be influential with other offenders resulting in criminal behaviour among associates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Intake Referral Form
Total N for CPS=14; Total N for EPS=23; Total N for RCMP=19
1 Missing case for CPS=1

Interestingly, almost all of the individuals at the RCMP program sites (94.7%) met discretionary criterion #4 (offender may be influential with other offenders resulting in criminal behaviour among associates), compared to just over one-half at the
EPS site (52.2%) and only 28.6% in the CPS program. Discretionary criterion #2 (offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated to mental illness) was met by no offenders in either the CPS or RCMP sites and only 17.4% in the EPS site, which suggests that these clients had not undergone mental health assessments prior to entering the program.

Table 3.4 summarizes the offenders’ criminal history at referral to PPOP, as reported by the referring agency. Nearly all of the offenders at all program locations had a history of property offences and non-compliance with court orders. A history of drug offences was somewhat more common among offenders at the CPS (78.6%) and EPS (78.3%) locations than at the RCMP program sites (57.9%). Violent offences were considerably more common at the RCMP (78.9%) and EPS (73.9%) program locations than at the CPS location (42.9%). Weapons offences were more common at the RCMP (68.4%) and EPS (57.1%) sites than at the EPS program (30.4%), and a history of driving offences was considerably more common at the EPS (65.2%) and RCMP (63.2%) sites than at the CPS program (28.6%).

### Table 3.4

**Offender Criminal History at Referral, by Program Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal History</th>
<th>CPS</th>
<th>EPS</th>
<th>RCMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons offences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliance with court orders</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving offences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Intake Referral Form
Total N for CPS=14; Total N for EPS=23; Total N for RCMP=19

### 3.4 Bail Conditions and Grounds for Detention

The COMP/Show Cause Report summarizes offenders’ criminal history, grounds for detention, and the bail conditions recommended by the program based on the offender’s profile and risk factors. Primary grounds for detention are related to circumstances where the detention is necessary to ensure the offender’s attendance in court in order to be dealt with according to law. Convictions on primary grounds include administration of justice crimes such as failure to appear or comply with release or sentencing conditions, escape and obstruction of justice. Primary grounds for detention may also include gang activity, unemployment, or homelessness—circumstances that may contribute to failure to attend court. Secondary grounds for
detention are related to circumstances where detention is necessary for public safety and relate to the likelihood that the offender will commit an offence if released. Charges on secondary grounds include substantive offences such as violent, property and drug offences. Secondary grounds may also include risk to public safety and child welfare involvement. Overall, the PPOP offenders in the sample averaged 23.6 convictions on primary grounds charges and 41.5 convictions on secondary grounds charges (see Figure 3.2).

**Figure 3.2**

*Average Number of Convictions on Primary and Secondary Grounds Charges, by Program Location*

At all program sites, offenders had a higher number of convictions on secondary grounds offences than on primary grounds offences. Offenders in the EPS program had an average of 50.1 convictions on secondary grounds, compared to 36.7 convictions in the CPS program and 34.2 convictions in the RCMP sites. Offenders in the EPS program also had the highest average number of convictions on primary grounds (26.6), compared to the RCMP (23.7) and CPS (18.6) programs.

The program’s COMP/Show Cause Report recommends bail conditions for each offender based on their circumstances and criminal profile. Across all program sites, offenders averaged 12.8 recommended bail conditions in their reports, with the fewest being 8 and the most being 21. The mean number of bail conditions per offender was
similar for all programs, with the RCMP and CPS sites averaging 13.9 conditions each, compared to 11.4 for the EPS site.

3.5 De-selection from PPOP

On average, offenders spent 28.6 months in the program, the least being less than 7 months and the most being 54 months, before being de-selected. Offenders in the EPS program site, on average, spent the least amount of time in the program (25.2 months) while offenders in the CPS and RCMP sites, on average, spent more time in the program (31 and 31.1 months, respectively). Offenders can be de-selected from the program for a number of reasons. Table 3.5 provides a summary of the reasons for de-selection and the proportion of offenders to whom each applies. Note that more than one reason for de-selection can apply to an offender.

Table 3.5

Reasons for De-selection, by Program Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for De-Selection</th>
<th>CPS</th>
<th>EPS</th>
<th>RCMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The subject has not committed substantive offences for a minimum period of six months. This does not include cases where law enforcement officers are involved but charges have not been laid.</td>
<td>6 42.9</td>
<td>6 26.1</td>
<td>7 36.8</td>
<td>19 33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence indicates that the offender is no longer actively engaged in criminal activities that impact public safety.</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2 8.7</td>
<td>4 21.1</td>
<td>6 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The offender demonstrates low risk for re-offending.</td>
<td>1 7.1</td>
<td>3 13.0</td>
<td>2 10.5</td>
<td>6 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence indicates that an offender is deceased has become permanently incapacitated.</td>
<td>1 7.1</td>
<td>1 4.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence indicates that an offender has permanently relocated outside the province.</td>
<td>2 14.3</td>
<td>2 8.7</td>
<td>1 5.3</td>
<td>5 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence indicates that an offender is incarcerated for a period of one year or more.</td>
<td>5 35.7</td>
<td>11 47.8</td>
<td>8 42.1</td>
<td>24 42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The offender is no longer a priority for the referring agency.</td>
<td>2 14.3</td>
<td>3 13.0</td>
<td>7 36.8</td>
<td>12 21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: De-selection Checklist
Multiple Response Data; Total N for CPS=14; Total N for EPS=23; Total N for RCMP=19
Across all program sites, the most common reason for de-selection was that the offender has been incarcerated for a period of one year or longer (42.9% of all offenders). However, one-third of offenders were de-selected because they had ceased to commit substantive offences for a minimum period of six months (33.9%), pointing to the possible success of the program for these offenders. The third most common reason for de-selection was that the offender is no longer a priority for the referring agency, either because they were no longer offending or had relocated outside of the agency’s jurisdiction (21.4%). Approximately one-tenth of the offenders were de-selected because they were no longer engaged in criminal activity that impacts public safety and a similar number were de-selected because they demonstrated a low risk for re-offending or had permanently relocated outside the province. Few offenders were de-selected because they were permanently incapacitated or deceased.

There were some notable differences in reasons for de-selection across program sites. Offenders at the CPS and RCMP sites were considerably more likely to be de-selected because they had ceased to commit substantive offences for at least six months (42.9% and 36.8%, respectively) than were offenders in the EPS program (26.1%). Offenders in the RCMP sites were more likely to be de-selected because they no longer engaged in criminal activities that impact public safety (21.1%) than individuals at the EPS (8.7%) and CPS (0%) sites. Individuals at the EPS program site were more likely to be de-selected because they had been incarcerated for a period of one year or more (47.8%) than offenders at the RCMP (42.1%) or CPS (35.7%) sites. Finally, individuals at the RCMP sites were considerably more likely to be de-selected because they were no longer a priority for the referring agency (36.8%) than offenders at either the CPS (14.3%) or EPS (13%) sites.

### 3.6 Convictions Before, During and After the Program

Data were obtained from Alberta Justice and Solicitor General’s Justice On-line Information Network (JOIN) on the number of substantive and administrative convictions for PPOP clients in the retrospective sample during their time in the program and after de-selection from the program to May 31, 2014 (the data cut-off date for this report).

Across all program locations, an average of 19.4 months had elapsed between offenders’ de-selection from the program and May 31, 2014 (range = 1 to 45 months). By program location, offenders at the EPS site had been out of the program for an average of 22.2 months, CPS offenders had been out of the program for an average of 20.8 months and RCMP offenders had been out of the program for an average of 14.9 months. Since the length of time individuals were in the program and out of the program varied widely, convictions during these periods were converted to an average number of convictions per month to control for these differing time periods. For comparative purposes, the number of convictions in the five years prior to PPOP selection were also converted to an average number of convictions per month.
As possible reasons for de-selection from PPOP include the incarceration, incapacitation, death or relocation of the offender, individuals who were de-selected for these reasons (n=34) were excluded from the analysis of convictions after exiting the program to provide the most conservative estimate of post-program convictions. Table 3.6 presents the average number of convictions per month before, during and after PPOP by program location.

### Table 3.6

Average Number of Convictions/Month Before, During and After PPOP, by Program Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CPS</th>
<th>EPS</th>
<th>RCMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Years Prior to PPOP (Monthly Average)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Convictions</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07-.58</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.10-.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Convictions</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02-.45</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convictions</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.10-.90</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.13-1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During PPOP (Monthly Average)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Convictions</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00-.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Convictions</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00-.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convictions</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00-.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.00-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After PPOP (Monthly Average)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Convictions</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00-.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Convictions</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convictions</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00-1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Conviction Count Form and JOIN
Total N for CPS=14; Total N for EPS=23; Total N for RCMP=19

1 Excludes offenders who are incarcerated, have relocated, are permanently incapacitated or deceased, or are no longer a priority for the referring agency. Total N for CPS=6; Total N for EPS=8; Total N for RCMP=8
At each program location results indicated that both substantive and administrative convictions decreased from before entry to PPOP to during the program and then decreased again from levels during the program to after de-selection. For example, offenders at the CPS program site had an average of .27 substantive convictions per month in the five years prior to PPOP selection; this decreased to .07 convictions per month while in the program and then decreased further to .01 convictions per month after de-selection from PPOP. A comparable pattern was seen at the EPS site, where program clients had an average of .36 substantive convictions in the five years prior to program entry, .18 convictions per month during their time in the program and .13 convictions per month after de-selection. Likewise, offenders in the RCMP program sites had an average of .24 substantive convictions per month prior to entering PPOP, .08 convictions per month during the program and .03 convictions per month following de-selection. Across all programs, a similar pattern was seen with administrative convictions.

In order to maximize the comparability of the before, during and after program data, analyses were conducted on the average number of convictions per month prior to entering the program and during PPOP using the subset of individuals included in the after-program analyses—those who were de-selected because they had not committed offences for at least six months, they were no longer engaged in criminal activity that impacts public safety, or they demonstrated a low risk for re-offending. Due to the small number of program clients at each site included in this analysis, the findings from this analysis should be viewed as preliminary at this point.

Figure 3.3 presents the average number of convictions per month before, during and after the program for offenders at the CPS program location. The findings were quite dramatic and indicate that for substantive, administrative and all convictions combined there was a substantial reduction in average number of convictions per month from the five years prior to PPOP entry to the period that offenders were involved with the program. Total convictions, for example, decreased from an average of .38 per month prior to PPOP to .11 per month during PPOP, and only .02 per month after de-selection. For substantive offences, there was a further decline in the number of convictions per month after de-selection from the program.

Figure 3.4 presents the comparable analysis for the EPS program site. Overall, findings were similar to those obtained at the CPS site, with the exception that there was a slight increase in the average number of monthly substantive convictions after exiting the program compared to during the program. However, average convictions per month were still substantially lower after exiting the program than prior to entry. Total convictions decreased from an average of .49 per month prior to PPOP to .2 per month during PPOP and to .15 after PPOP. Overall, the number of convictions before, during and after the program was higher at the EPS site than at the CPS site.
**Figure 3.3**

**Average Number of Convictions/Month Before, During and After PPOP, for the Calgary Police Service Program Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>5 Years Prior to PPOP</th>
<th>During PPOP</th>
<th>After PPOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Convictions</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Convictions</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convictions</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Conviction Count Form and JOIN
Excludes offenders who are incarcerated, have relocated, are permanently incapacitated or deceased, or are no longer a priority for the referring agency.
Total N for CPS=6

**Figure 3.4**

**Average Number of Convictions/Month Before, During and After PPOP, for the Edmonton Police Service Program Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>5 Years Prior to PPOP</th>
<th>During PPOP</th>
<th>After PPOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Convictions</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Convictions</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convictions</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Conviction Count Form and JOIN
Excludes offenders who are incarcerated, have relocated, are permanently incapacitated or deceased, or are no longer a priority for the referring agency.
Total N for EPS=8
Finally, Figure 3.5 presents this analysis for the RCMP program locations. Once again, the pattern of findings is consistent and indicates a steady decrease in the average number of convictions per month across the three time periods for substantive, administrative and total convictions. Total convictions decreased from an average of .43 per month prior to PPOP to .11 per month during PPOP to .08 after de-selection.

![Graph showing average number of convictions/month before, during, and after PPOP for RCMP program locations.](image)

Source of data: Conviction Count Form and JOIN
Excludes offenders who are incarcerated, have relocated, are permanently incapacitated or deceased, or are no longer a priority for the referring agency.
Total N for RCMP=8

Across all program sites, the findings are very positive and suggest the effectiveness of PPOP in reducing offending behaviour among its clients. While a decrease in convictions when offenders are in the program might be expected simply due to increased surveillance, a further decrease following de-selection strongly suggests that PPOP is effective in reducing offending behaviour even after involvement with the program has ended. Further follow-up of program clients would be very useful to determine if this reduction in offending is sustained over the long term. It would also be very useful to repeat this analysis once the number of clients in the retrospective sample at each program location has increased to determine if the magnitude of the reduction in offending is maintained with a larger sample.
4.0 LONGITUDINAL SAMPLE

4.1 Introduction

On November 1, 2012, PPOP staff implemented an Offender Entry Data Collection form for all new clients accepted into the program (see Appendix A). This form collects information on: the offenders’ demographic characteristics; the reasons for their selection into the program; their offending history prior to the program; the presence of any substance abuse, mental health, medical or dental issues; their employment, education and housing status; and any agencies the offenders will likely be referred to as part of their case plan. Offenders entering the program after this date became part of a longitudinal sample that uses a pre-test post-test design that collects information upon clients’ selection into the program and again following their de-selection using the Offender Exit Data Collection Form (see Appendix B).

A total of 26 offenders entered the program during the period November 1, 2012 to May 31, 2014 and comprise the current longitudinal sample. Only four of these individuals had been de-selected from the program as of May 31, 2014. The small number of de-selected clients precludes analysis of their exit forms for purposes of this report as results could not be reliably extrapolated to the total longitudinal sample. This chapter presents a profile of the clients in the longitudinal sample at the time of their entry into PPOP according to the information provided on their entry forms.

4.2 Background Information

All of the offenders currently in the longitudinal sample are male. Figure 4.1 presents a breakdown of the number of offenders at each program location. The highest number of clients were at the CPS location (n=8), followed by the EPS location (n=7), the RCMP-North location (n=6) and the RCMP-South location (n=5). To enhance comparability of the analyses of this sample with the retrospective sample, the two RCMP locations were combined. The number of program clients at each program location is relatively low at this point; for this reason, the findings discussed should be treated as preliminary and interpreted with caution.

Table 4.1 presents demographic characteristics of the longitudinal sample by program location. Across all locations, offenders were an average of 35.6 years of age when they entered the program. Clients in the EPS program were considerably older at program entry (mean = 46 years) than those in the CPS (mean = 31.9 years) or RCMP (mean = 31.7 years) locations. This difference is largely due to the minimum age of offenders at program entry: the youngest offender to enter the EPS program was 33 years, compared to 18 years for the CPS program and 24 years for the RCMP programs. As well, the maximum age of offenders at program entry was 67 for the EPS program, compared to 50 for the CPS and 49 for the RCMP program sites.
Figure 4.1

Program Location for the Longitudinal Sample

![Program Location Chart]

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N=26

Table 4.1

Demographic Characteristics of the Longitudinal Sample on Program Entry, by Program Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Program Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean     Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean     Range</td>
<td>Mean     Range</td>
<td>Mean     Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at PPOP Entry</td>
<td>31.88    18-50</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>33-67</td>
<td>31.73    24-49</td>
<td>35.62    18-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on Waitlist (Days)¹</td>
<td>23.75    0-77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.50     0-30</td>
<td>9.33     0-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status²</td>
<td>n       %</td>
<td>n    %</td>
<td>n    %</td>
<td>n       %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>7       87.5</td>
<td>4    66.7</td>
<td>6    60.0</td>
<td>17      70.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0       0.0</td>
<td>0    0.0</td>
<td>0    0.00</td>
<td>0       0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>1       12.5</td>
<td>2    33.3</td>
<td>4    40.0</td>
<td>7       29.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>0       0.0</td>
<td>0    0.0</td>
<td>0    0.0</td>
<td>0       0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0       0.0</td>
<td>0    0.0</td>
<td>0    0.0</td>
<td>0       0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0       0.0</td>
<td>0    0.0</td>
<td>0    0.0</td>
<td>0       0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders with Children</td>
<td>2       25.0</td>
<td>1    14.3</td>
<td>4    36.4</td>
<td>7       26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N for CPS=8; Total N for EPS=7; Total N for RCMP=11
¹ Missing cases for CPS=4; EPS=2; RCMP=5
² Missing cases for EPS=1; RCMP=1
Overall, offenders spent an average of 9.3 days on the wait list before entering PPOP. The longest average wait time was for the CPS program location (23.8 days); the wait time for the RCMP locations averaged 7.5 days, while there was no wait time for the offenders at the EPS site.

With regard to marital status, all program clients were either single or cohabiting. Across all program locations, the majority of offenders were single (70.8%), ranging from 60% for the RCMP locations to 87.5% at the CPS location. A total of seven offenders (29.2%) were in a cohabiting relationship. Just over one-quarter of clients had children (26.9%), ranging from 36.4% of RCMP clients to 14.3% of EPS clients. Across program locations, five offenders had children under 17 years of age and four had children who resided with them. Two of the offenders had a history of Child and Family Services involvement.

### 4.3 Criminal History Prior to PPOP Selection

Offenders’ age at the time of their first conviction was available for 21 PPOP clients in the longitudinal sample. Across all program sites, offenders were, on average, 18.1 years of age at their first conviction (range = 12 to 28). Ages were quite similar at all program sites and ranged from 17.7 years at the EPS location to 18.4 years at the CPS program site. Across program sites, offenders had received an average of 56.8 convictions in their lifetime (range = 13 to 142). Offenders in the Edmonton program had the highest number of lifetime convictions (mean = 80.1), followed by the CPS program with an average of 63.1 convictions. Clients in the RCMP program locations had considerably fewer convictions (mean = 37.4).

Data were also available on the length of time offenders had spent in custody since their first conviction for 21 PPOP clients. On average, offenders at all program sites had spent 62.8 months in custody (range = 2 to 253 months). Offenders at the EPS program site had spent the greatest amount of time in custody (mean = 103.9 months). Offenders at the CPS program had spent an average of 68.3 months in custody, while RCMP program clients had spent considerably less time in custody (mean = 16.2 months).

Table 4.2 presents the average number of convictions for individuals in the longitudinal sample in the five years prior to PPOP selection. Across all program locations, offenders averaged 23.4 convictions; substantive offence convictions (15.7) were twice as prevalent as administrative convictions (7.6). Among the substantive convictions, property offences were the most common (mean = 11), followed by convictions for fraud-related offences (mean = 1.5) and drug offences (mean = 1.5). The average number of convictions per offender for other types of substantive offences were all less than 1.
Table 4.2

Average Number of Convictions Five Years Prior to PPOP Selection, by Program Location and Offence Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>CPS</th>
<th>EPS</th>
<th>RCMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal driving convictions</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offence convictions</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons offence convictions</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud offences convictions</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0-13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offence convictions</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offence convictions</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal offence convictions</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Substantive offence convictions</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>9-32</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administrative offence convictions</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>0-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total convictions</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>13-42</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>3-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N for CPS=8; Total N for EPS=7; Total N for RCMP=11

With regard to program location, offenders at the RCMP sites had the highest average number of convictions across all offence types (26) followed by individuals at the CPS (23) and EPS locations (19.6). Offenders at the RCMP (mean = 17.6) and CPS (mean = 17.4) locations had equivalent numbers of substantive convictions, while program clients at the EPS location were somewhat lower (mean = 11). The average number of convictions for administrative offences was higher at the EPS (8.6) and RCMP (8.5) programs than at the CPS site (5.6).

The average number of property offence convictions was higher at the RCMP (12.5) and CPS (12.3) sites than at the EPS location (7.1), while the average number of drug-related offences was highest at the EPS location (2.6), followed by the RCMP (1.5) and CPS (1.3) sites. Fraud-related convictions were highest at the CPS site (2.8) and were somewhat lower at the RCMP (1.3) and EPS (1.6) locations. There were no violent convictions recorded at the EPS site; offenders at the RCMP and CPS sites averaged 1 and .8 violent offences, respectively.
4.4 Selection to PPOP

Program personnel were asked to rate the offenders’ motivation upon entry to PPOP; ratings for the total longitudinal sample and for each program location are provided in Figure 4.2. No program clients were rated as very motivated at any program location. Overall, offenders were more likely to be rated as having low motivation (46.2%) than as being motivated (34.6%). Over one-half of the RCMP clients were rated as motivated (54.5%), while one-quarter of the CPS clients (25%) were rated as motivated and only 14.3% of EPS clients were motivated. EPS program clients were most likely to be rated as having low motivation (57.1%), followed by CPS (50%) and RCMP (36.4%) offenders.

Table 4.3 summarizes the Program Selection Criteria at intake to PPOP. Across all program sites, the mandatory selection criteria were present for most offenders, and ranged from 100% for mandatory criterion #3 (a history of non-compliance with court orders) to 88.5% for mandatory criterion #2 (a history of committing substantive offences while on release) and mandatory criterion #5 (criminal behaviour of the individual has a serious impact on public safety and victimization and/or on public confidence in the justice system).
### Table 4.3

Program Selection Criteria at Intake, by Program Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CPS</th>
<th>EPS</th>
<th>RCMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #1: A history of frequently committing substantive offences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #2: A history of committing substantive offences while on release</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #3: A history of non-compliance with court orders including failing to appear and breach of conditions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #4: Intelligence indicates the offender is currently active in committing criminal activity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #5: Criminal behaviour of the individual has a serious impact on public safety and victimization and/or on public confidence in the justice system</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory criterion #6: Offender is considered to be a medium to high risk to reoffend</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary criterion #1: Offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated with addictions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary criterion #2: Offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated to mental illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary criterion #3: Offender is unemployed and does not have a stable residency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary criterion #4: Offender may be influential with other offenders resulting in criminal behaviour among associates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N for CPS=8; Total N for EPS=7; Total N for RCMP=11

With regard to program location, all clients at the EPS program met all six mandatory criteria; some clients at the CPS and RCMP sites did not meet one or more
mandatory criteria. Less than two-thirds (62.5%) of clients at the CPS location met mandatory criterion #2, and 72.7% of RCMP clients met mandatory criterion #5.

With regard to the discretionary criteria, across program sites, a substantial majority of offenders met discretionary criterion #3 (offender is unemployed and does not have a stable residency) (80.8%) and discretionary criterion #4 (offender may be influential with other offenders resulting in criminal behaviour among associates) (80.8%). Just over one-half of program clients (53.8%) met discretionary criterion #1 (offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated with addictions), while only 15.4% met discretionary criterion #2 (offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated to mental illness).

A substantial difference across programs was observed with regard to discretionary criterion #1, with 71.4% of EPS and 72.7% of RCMP offenders meeting this criterion, compared to only 12.5% of CPS clients. In addition, while almost all offenders in the RCMP locations (90.9%) met discretionary criterion #4, 85.7% of EPS offenders and less than two-thirds (62.5%) of CPS clients met this criterion.

Program personnel were asked to rate the offenders’ level of healthy family and community supports upon entry to the program (Figure 4.3).

Figure 4.3

Offenders’ Level of Family/Community Support upon Program Entry, by Program Location

![Bar Chart]

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N for CPS=8; EPS=7; RCMP=11
Missing cases for EPS=1
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Across all program sites, only 4% of program clients were rated as having a high number of healthy supports; the most common response was that offenders had a low number of healthy supports (48%), followed by a moderate number of healthy supports (24%) and no healthy supports (24%).

Offenders in the RCMP programs were most likely to be rated as having a high number of healthy supports (9.1%); no clients at either the CPS or EPS locations had a high number of supports. Clients at the CPS (37.5%) and EPS (33.3%) locations were most likely to be rated as having no healthy supports, compared to 9.1% of offenders at the RCMP locations.

4.5 Substance Abuse Issues at PPOP Selection

The Offender Entry Data Collection Form includes information on any substance abuse issues being dealt with by the program clients (Table 4.4). Across all program sites, the substantial majority of offenders had either a confirmed addiction (56%) or problems with substance use (24%). At each program site, at least three-quarters of program clients had substance abuse issues, ranging from 75% at the CPS locations to 83.3% at the EPS location. The EPS location also had the highest proportion of offenders with a confirmed addiction (83.3%).

Equal proportions of offenders with substance abuse issues across program sites were rated as having either a moderate (40%) or severe (40%) level of addiction. The largest proportion of offenders with a severe addiction were at the EPS location (60%), compared to 50% at the CPS location and 22.2% at the RCMP sites.

Almost two-thirds (60%) of program clients with substance abuse issues had received addictions treatment in the past; the highest proportion was at the CPS location (83.3%), followed by the EPS (60%) and RCMP (44.4%) sites. The most common types of addictions treatment prior to PPOP entry across all program locations were residential treatment (58.3%), individual counselling (41.7%) and group counselling (33.3%). Individuals at the CPS program site were considerably more likely to have received group counselling (60%) and less likely to have received individual counselling (20%) in the past than clients at the other program sites.

Across program locations, when asked what addictions treatments were going to be provided through PPOP, program workers were most likely to indicate individual counselling (70%), followed by residential treatment (65%) and group counselling (35%). The EPS (80%) and RCMP (77.8%) programs were somewhat more likely to make use of individual counselling than the CPS site (50%). However, the CPS site (50%) was more likely to refer to group counselling than the RCMP (33.3%) or EPS (20%) locations.
Table 4.4

Offenders’ Substance Use Characteristics on Program Entry, by Program Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Program Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>EPS n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>RCMP n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No concerns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender has problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed addiction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Addiction²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Has Received Treatment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Substance Abuse in the Past²</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Treatment Previously Accessed³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counselling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Treatment to be Provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through PPOP²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Counselling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counselling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders’ Level of Motivation to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Substance Use Issues³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very motivated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N for CPS=8; Total N for EPS=7; Total N for RCMP=11
1 Missing cases for EPS=1
2 This analysis was only conducted for offenders who either had problems with substance use or a confirmed addiction (n=20).
3 This analysis was only conducted for offenders who had received substance abuse treatment in the past (n=12). Multiple response question.
4 This analysis was only conducted for offenders who either had problems with substance use or a confirmed addiction (n=20). Multiple response question.
Finally, program personnel were asked to rate the offenders’ motivation to address their substance abuse issues. As shown in Table 4.4, no offender at any program site was rated as very motivated to address their substance abuse issues. Offenders at the RCMP (66.7%) and EPS (60%) sites were more likely to be rated as motivated than at the CPS location (33.3%). At least one-third of offenders at the EPS (40%) and CPS (33.3%) locations were rated as having low motivation, compared to 22.2% of program clients at the RCMP sites.

4.6 Mental Health Issues at PPOP Selection

Program personnel were asked to provide information regarding any mental health issues of PPOP clients at program entry (Table 4.5). Due to the relatively low number of offenders with diagnosed mental health issues, this analysis was not conducted separately by program location. One-half of program clients were rated as having no mental health concerns, while 20% had a suspected mental health disorder and 35% had a confirmed disorder. The most common confirmed or suspected disorder was depression (40%), followed by anti-social personality disorder (30%), and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) (30%).

All offenders with a confirmed or suspected mental health disorder had received treatment for their mental health issues in the past, and 70% required medication for their mental health issues. When asked what mental health treatment was being provided through PPOP, the most common response was a psychiatric consultation (70%), followed by an assessment (50%), medication stabilization (50%), and individual counselling (30%).

No offenders were rated as very motivated to address their mental health issues, while 50% were rated as motivated, 20% were rated as having low motivation, and for 30% their level of motivation was unknown.

4.7 Medical and Dental Issues at PPOP Selection

Program personnel were asked to indicate if the offenders had any medical or dental issues upon selection to PPOP. The substantial majority of program clients were rated as having no medical issues (80.8%). Only two offenders had a medical condition specified; thus, no further analyses were conducted on medical issues.

With regard to dental issues, 88.5% of offenders were rated as having no dental issues at PPOP selection. However, no information on dental issues was provided for the other three offenders and, thus, further examination of these issues was not possible.

---

2 One program participant was rated as having both a suspected and a confirmed mental health disorder.
### Table 4.5
Offenders’ Mental Health Characteristics on Program Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mental health concerns</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender has a suspected mental health disorder(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender has been diagnosed with a mental health disorder(s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Diagnoses&lt;sup&gt;1,2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social Personality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOS (Not Otherwise Specified) Psychosis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipolar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Induced Mood Disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Has Received Treatment for their Mental Health Issues in the Past&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Requires Medication for their Mental Health Issues&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Treatment being Provided Through PPOP&lt;sup&gt;1,2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric consultation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication stabilization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counselling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders’ Level of Motivation to Address Mental Health Issues&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very motivated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N=26; Missing cases=6
<sup>1</sup> Multiple response question.
<sup>2</sup> Based on offenders with mental health diagnoses or suspected mental health disorder(s) (n=10).
4.8 Employment and Education Characteristics at PPOP Selection

The Offender Entry Data Collection Form includes information on PPOP clients’ employment and educational status at program entry (Table 4.6). Across all program locations, the most common source of income for offenders was social assistance (43.5%) followed by no income (34.8%). Less than one-fifth of program clients (17.4%) had employment income at the time of their selection into PPOP. A considerably higher proportion of clients at the EPS program location had no income (66.7%) than at the RCMP (30%) or CPS (14.3%) sites. Offenders at the CPS (28.6%) and RCMP (20%) sites were more likely to have employment income than at the EPS location (0%).

With regard to employment status at PPOP selection, across all program locations almost three-quarters of offenders (73.9%) were unemployed. Only 13% of offenders had full-time employment, while an additional 8.7% had seasonal employment. Clients at the EPS (83.3%) and RCMP (80%) locations were more likely to be unemployed than at the CPS site (57.1%). Conversely, CPS clients were more likely to have full-time or seasonal employment (42.9%) than those at the RCMP (20%) or EPS (0%) sites.

Almost two-thirds of offenders at the RCMP locations (63.6%) had employment goals as part of their PPOP case plan, compared to 37.5% at the CPS site and 28.6% at the EPS location. The lower percentage at the CPS program probably reflects the fact that a higher proportion of CPS clients were already employed; however, unemployment rates were very high at the EPS program, but the proportion of cases with employment goals was the lowest at this location. The most common employment goal (n=4) was to obtain full-time work, followed by obtaining certification in a trade.

With respect to the highest level of education obtained prior to PPOP selection, across all program locations, offenders were most likely to have some high school education (54.2%), followed by training in a trade (16.7%) and high school completion (12.5%). One individual at the CPS program location had some university education and one at the EPS location was a university graduate. For two-thirds of offenders at the EPS (66.7%) and RCMP (63.6%) locations, the highest level of education obtained was some high school, compared to 28.6% at the CPS site. However, CPS clients were more likely to have completed high school (28.6%) than at the RCMP (9.1%) or EPS (0%) locations.

Relatively few offenders had educational goals as part of their PPOP case plan; this ranged from 12.5% at the CPS program to 27.3% at the RCMP locations. Overall, less than one-fifth of offenders (19.2%) had educational goals in their case plan. The most common educational goal was to obtain a GED (n=2). One offender each had the following educational goals: recertify in a trade; complete first aid and safety courses; and complete computer training.
### Table 4.6

**Offenders’ Employment and Education Characteristics, by Program Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Program Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Income at PPOP Selection¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social assistance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment insurance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status at PPOP Selection¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender has Employment Goals as Part of Case Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Education Attained at Selection²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some university</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender has Educational Goals as Part of Case Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N for CPS=8; Total N for EPS=7; Total N for RCMP=11

¹ Missing cases for CPS=1; EPS=1; RCMP=1
² Missing cases for CPS=1; EPS=1
4.9 Housing Characteristics and Other Needs at PPOP Selection

Table 4.7 provides a summary of the items on the Offender Entry Data Collection Form relating to offenders’ housing characteristics and other needs upon selection to PPOP. Across all programs, 44% of offenders were in custody at selection to PPOP and 32% were living with family or friends. Only 12% of offenders either rented or owned their own home. The largest proportion of program clients who were in custody were at the EPS location (83.3%); a considerably smaller proportion of clients at the CPS (37.5%) and RCMP (27.3%) sites were in custody at PPOP selection. One-quarter (25%) of CPS program clients were living in a shelter, while no clients at the EPS or RCMP sites were living in a shelter. RCMP program clients were most likely to be living with family or friends (54.5%), compared to 14.3% at the EPS site and 12.5% at the CPS site.

### Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>EPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s Living Arrangement upon PPOP Entry¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In custody</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation facility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-way house</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-stage housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With family/friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents own home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns own home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender has Housing Goals as Part of Case Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Requires Assistance Obtaining Identification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Requires Assistance Obtaining Basic Necessities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N for CPS=8; Total N for EPS=7; Total N for RCMP=11
¹ Missing cases for EPS=1

Across all program locations, less than one-fifth (19.2%) of offenders had housing goals as part of their PPOP case plan. The most frequently mentioned housing goal was to obtain their own residence (n=2).
With regard to other needs the offenders required assistance with, almost one-quarter (23.1%) needed help with obtaining identification; 62.5% of clients at the CPS program location needed assistance with this, compared to 9.1% at the RCMP locations and no offenders at the EPS site. Just over one-quarter of offenders (26.9%) needed help with obtaining the basic necessities of life; 50% of the CPS clients were rated as having this need, compared to 18.2% at the RCMP and 14.3% at the EPS locations.

4.10 Service Referrals as Part of PPOP Case Plan

Across program locations, just over one-half of offenders (53.8%) received service referrals as part of their case plan. The proportion of program clients with service referrals ranged from 37.5% at the CPS location to 57.1% and 63.6% at the EPS and RCMP sites, respectively. Table 4.8 presents the services that offenders were referred to as part of their PPOP case plan. The most common services referred to were family/children’s services (42.3%) and addictions services (42.3%), followed by employment/education services (23.1%), mental health services (15.4%), and housing services (11.5%). Referrals to family/children’s services were most common at the RCMP (63.6%) and EPS (57.1%) program locations; no offenders at the CPS site received this type of referral. The same pattern was found with referrals to addictions services. RCMP clients were more likely to receive referrals to employment/educational services (36.4%) than either EPS (14.3%) or CPS (12.5%) clients. CPS clients were more likely to receive referrals to mental health services (37.5%), compared to 9.1% of RCMP clients and no EPS clients.

Table 4.8

Service Referrals for Offenders, by Program Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Program Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Children’s Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addictions Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Education Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Transitions Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Offender Entry Data Collection Form
Total N for CPS=8; Total N for EPS=7; Total N for RCMP=11
Multiple Response Question.
5.0 STRATEGY FOR A COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

One of the objectives of this report is to develop a strategy for a cost/benefit analysis of PPOP. A critical factor in conducting an economic analysis of a crime prevention program is the methodological quality of the project-specific research (Hornick, Paetsch & Bertrand, 2000). The stronger the research design of the outcome evaluation, the more confidence can be placed in the findings of the economic analysis. Ideally, the research design should involve the use of a randomized control group, but this is rarely possible when dealing with crime prevention programs. For PPOP, the final year of the research design proposed an examination of a wait-list comparison group, which would greatly enhance the confidence level of a cost/benefit analysis.

A traditional cost/benefit analysis approach involves examining the cost of inputs relative to the financial value of the program’s outputs. Benefit/cost ratios can then be expressed as the value of outcomes divided by the input costs, or a net benefit can be calculated by subtracting the sum of the input costs from the sum of the benefit costs (Hornick et al., 2000). While the calculations of cost/benefit analysis are relatively straightforward, the assumptions upon which the amounts of monetary benefits are based are quite complex.

An approach that has been gaining popularity in Canada is the Social Return on Investment (SROI) methodology (LBG Canada, 2012). An SROI approach builds upon the logic of cost/benefit analysis, but is designed to also inform decision-making managers on the social and environmental impacts of their program.

5.2 Social Return on Investment

SROI analyses are frameworks for measuring and communicating the social, economic or environmental impact of investment in an organization, project or program (The SROI Network, 2012). The development of the methodology began in the mid-1990s in the United States when Roberts Enterprise Development Fund wanted to create a tool to communicate to investors the impact of their own programs (Simpact Strategy Group, 2011). Over time, the methodology has evolved and has become a helpful tool for evaluation, management, and communication for agencies and organizations. In Alberta, the Safe Communities Secretariat, Alberta Justice, integrated the SROI methodology into the evaluation frameworks of 88 crime prevention pilot projects (LBG Canada, 2012).

SROI is a “story about how change is being created by measuring social, environmental and economic outcomes and uses monetary values to represent them” (The SROI Network, 2012, p. 8). The process of creating an SROI builds upon the
existing or developing logic model or outcomes framework of an organization or program by assessing the impact of the outcomes and establishing the possible financial value of this impact. Though the SROI analysis produces a ratio representing the monetary value of the impact of investment in a program, it is not meant to be reduced to a number alone. It is intended to include quantitative, financial and qualitative information to communicate the impact of an organization or program to its external stakeholders, and internally to assess program performance and identify areas for improvement (American Public Human Services Association, 2013).

SROI analyses can be evaluative, using outcomes measurement to determine the value of change caused by a program, or predictive, assessing the value of a program if its outcomes were achieved. Evaluative SROIs require the collection of reliable outcomes data, while predictive SROIs provide a foundation by which outcomes can be measured. Regardless of the approach, SROI is based on seven principles (The SROI Network, 2012, p. 9):

(1) involve stakeholders;
(2) understand what changes;
(3) value the things that matter;
(4) only include what is material;
(5) do not over-claim;
(6) be transparent; and
(7) verify the result.

5.2.1 The SROI Process

There are six stages to conducting an SROI (The SROI Network, 2012). The following sections discuss each of these stages in relation to PPOP.

Establishing Scope and Identifying Key Stakeholders

The first stage of the SROI process involves determining the information available, the stakeholders that should be involved, and the boundaries of the SROI analyses. At this stage, the decision would be made to conduct either an evaluative analysis or a predictive analysis. Given that outcomes data are already being collected for PPOP, an evaluative analysis could be conducted. This step would be completed in consultation with the PPOP management team.

Mapping Outcomes

The second stage of the SROI process involves identifying inputs, valuing inputs, clarifying outputs, and describing outcomes. Since a logic model has already been developed for PPOP, this stage would primarily involve valuing the inputs to the program.
Evidencing Outcomes and Giving Them a Value

The third stage of the SROI development process involves finding data, or evidence, to establish whether the outcomes have occurred. For PPOP, the results of the process and outcomes evaluation would aid in completing this step. The process of valuing outcomes would involve searching for financial proxies both in the literature and the SROI Canada database.

Establishing Impact

The fourth stage of the SROI development process involves factoring in deadweight, displacement, attribution, and drop-off to establish overall impact. These elements are defined as follows (Simpact Strategy Group, 2011):

1. Deadweight: the amount of an outcome that would have happened anyway if the client had not participated in the activity.

2. Displacement: the amount the value created should be reduced due to the program displacing another positive activity as an unintended consequence.

3. Attribution: the proportion of the value created that was caused by the activity or contribution of another organization or person.

4. Drop-off: the deterioration of an outcome over time.

For PPOP, each of these elements would be established using the program information available, stakeholder feedback, and the literature.

Calculating the SROI

The fifth stage of the process involves calculating the SROI values of specific outcomes or benefits, factoring in the inputs, social value creation, impact assessment, and discount rate. In addition, an annual interest rate may be added to the value created.

Reporting, Using, and Embedding

The final stage of the SROI involves sharing the findings with PPOP and responding to their input. Ultimately it is desirable for PPOP to build on the work conducted and measure outcomes in the future.
5.2.2 Issues and Considerations with the SROI Approach

There are several important issues and considerations when using an SROI analysis (American Public Human Services Association, 2013):

**Need for Quality Data:** Access to quality data is essential for a reliable SROI analysis. Agencies also need access to data on costs and other inputs, as well as outputs and outcomes, and outcomes need to be expressed in monetary terms.

**Challenges in Assigning Financial Values to “Softer” Outcomes:** One of the advantages of using an SROI framework is that social outcomes are valued, but some outcomes may be difficult to quantify if there is a lack of evidence to justify a financial proxy. It is expected that as the field of SROI analyses advances, this deficit will be addressed.

**Potential Risks in Using SROI Analyses to Measure Impact:** The SROI Network (2012) cautions organizations against “over claiming” results. Agencies that over claim—claim value that they haven’t created—risk having their SROI analysis dismissed as invalid. Another risk is the finding of a low or negative return, which doesn’t necessarily mean that a program is a poor investment. It may indicate that “more resource-intensive services were provided to individuals with complex needs” and can motivate agencies to consider new strategies or partnerships (American Public Human Services Association, 2013, p. 12).

**The Time Horizon Can Influence Findings:** The impact of a program changes over time, and therefore the SROI ratio after one year of service delivery may be quite different from the return five or ten years later.

**Engaging Stakeholders is Critical:** Involving stakeholders is a core principle of the SROI framework (The SROI Network, 2012). Program staff and external stakeholders need to be involved in the SROI analysis from the beginning to promote shared ownership in the process, which in turn “allows stronger engagement, deeper embedding, and meaningful contributions” (American Public Human Services Association, 2013, p. 12).

5.3 Recommended Strategy

Given that PPOP is currently undergoing an outcome evaluation and has already developed a logic model, the next step is to value those outcomes. The SROI methodology quantifies the impacts of the program using financial proxies. SROI Canada, a member group of practitioners, facilitators and policy representatives, maintains a financial proxy database for members (Robertson, 2012). The database has been developed in cooperation with the City of Calgary, Simpact Strategy Group, the Safe Communities and Strategic Policy Secretariat of Alberta Justice, and various other...
community agencies, and provides proxies that represent the value of achieving social and environmental outcomes.

A survey of community organizations and government sources using the SROI methodology reported the following benefits from collecting social outcomes (Robertson, 2012):

(1) identification of opportunities for program delivery improvement;

(2) increased ability to describe the change that clients experience and to report on results to key stakeholders;

(3) improved communication with key audiences;

(4) increased knowledge of the relative importance of changes experienced by target stakeholders;

(5) improved program delivery;

(6) evidence-based support for continued funding; and

(7) identification of opportunities to increase impact on a policy or issue area.

According to the SROI Network (2012), an evaluative SROI should result in changes to an organization. While the ratio is useful in communicating with stakeholders, it has the most value in portraying the changes in social value creation over time. In addition to informing organizations on whether their programs are improving or not, the SROI analysis provides information on how a program can change its services to maximize the social value created in the future.
6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters presented the findings of the second year of a proposed three-year evaluation of the Priority Prolific Offender Program (PPOP). This report focuses on the outcomes of a group of PPOP clients who had exited the program (the retrospective sample). Preliminary findings of a group of offenders who had entered the program as part of a pre-test post-test design (the longitudinal sample) are also presented. PPOP joins a growing number of programs in Canada designed to address the behaviour of prolific offenders, using a combination of monitoring, enforcement, and rehabilitative services. The objectives of Alberta’s program specifically aim to ensure Crown prosecutors have complete, accurate, and up-to-date information on prolific offenders, rehabilitation is promoted through the provision of appropriate support services, and the consequences of offending and reoffending are meaningful to the offender.

The Canadian Research Institute for Law and the Family was first contracted in 2010 to conduct a process evaluation of the program. The results of this evaluation yielded five recommendations for the program moving forward:

(1) the development of an operations manual;
(2) a review of the comprehensive bail packages;
(3) adequate funding and resources;
(4) education and awareness; and
(5) a process and outcomes evaluation.

Following the final recommendation, PPOP contracted the Institute in 2012 to begin the first year of a three-year process and outcomes evaluation involving multiple components. The report from the first year of the process and outcomes evaluation (MacRae-Krisa & Paetsch, 2013) used program data on offenders who had been de-selected from the program, a survey of PPOP staff and a survey of PPOP stakeholders to re-examine program processes and, in particular, to provide a profile of the offenders in the program as a foundation for examining outcomes in the proposed second and third years of the evaluation.

Following an internal review of the program in 2013, PPOP contracted the Institute to conduct the second year of the evaluation and it was determined that a comparison of clients at the program sites in Calgary, Edmonton and the RCMP locations would be desirable. The current report focuses on updating the profile of individuals in the retrospective sample who had been clients of PPOP and were subsequently de-selected and conducting comparisons across program sites. An additional 22 clients who were de-selected from the program since the last report have
been added to this sample. Further, this report examines these clients’ re-offending behaviour during their time in the program and after leaving it using data obtained from the Justice On-line Information Network (JOIN) to determine the longer term efficacy of PPOP in reducing offending behaviour.

Two new data collection forms were implemented on November 1, 2012. The Offender Entry Data Collection Form provides a detailed profile of clients upon their entry to PPOP while the Offender Exit Data Collection Form collects information on clients’ experiences while in the program. Offenders who entered the program following implementation of these data collection instruments became part of a pre-test post-test longitudinal sample. This report also provides an initial profile of these clients at their time of entry into the program by program location. Since only four of these clients had been de-selected by May 31, 2014, exit data were not presented in this report.

6.2 Summary

The following sections summarize the results of the retrospective and longitudinal data analyses.

6.2.1 Retrospective Analysis

Program Clients

• The retrospective sample was composed of 56 offenders who had entered the program prior to November 1, 2012 and had been de-selected by May 31, 2014.

• A substantial majority of the sample (89.3%) was male.

• The Edmonton Police Service (EPS) program location had the greatest number of offenders (n=23), followed by the RCMP-North (n=16), Calgary Police Service (CPS) (n=14) and RCMP-South (n=3) locations.

Criminal History Prior to PPOP Selection

• On average, offenders in the retrospective sample were 17 years of age when they received their first conviction. Average age at first conviction ranged from 15.9 years at the RCMP sites to 18.4 years at the CPS location.

• Offenders in the EPS program had an average of 21.4 convictions for substantive offences in the five years prior to entering PPOP, compared to 15.9 for the CPS clients and 14.3 for the RCMP.

• At all program locations, property offences were the most common of the substantive offences.
• Offenders at the RCMP program locations had an average of 8.9 administrative convictions in the five years before entering PPOP, compared to 8.8 for the CPS and 7.6 for the EPS sites.

• The RCMP program group, on average, had spent 62.7 months in custody since their first conviction, followed by 59 months for the EPS group and 53.9 months for the CPS offenders.

• Offenders at the EPS program location had received a higher average number of custodial sentences (63) than offenders at the CPS (46.6) and RCMP (44.7) sites.

Selection to PPOP

• Average age at selection to PPOP was 33.2 years at the CPS program, 32.7 years at the EPS site and 31.3 years at the RCMP locations.

• Only mandatory selection criterion #1 (a history of frequently committing substantive offences) was met by all offenders; however, the substantial majority of offenders met each of the other mandatory criteria.

• 85.7% of offenders met the discretionary criterion of their offending being correlated to addiction.

• 82.1% of offenders met the discretionary criterion of being unemployed and without stable residency.

• 60.7% of offenders met the discretionary criterion of being influential with other offenders resulting in criminal behaviour among associates. This criterion was met by a substantially higher proportion of offenders at the RCMP sites (94.7%) than at the EPS (52.2%) or CPS (28.6%) or locations.

• Only 7.1% of offenders met the discretionary criterion of their behaviour being correlated to mental illness. No offenders in either the CPS or RCMP program locations met this criterion.

• Almost all offenders (91.1%) had a history of non-compliance with court orders, while a history of drug offences was more common among individuals at the CPS (78.6%) and EPS (78.3%) programs than at the RCMP (57.9%) sites.

• A history of violent offences was more prevalent among offenders at the RCMP (78.9%) and EPS (73.9%) locations than at the CPS (42.9%) program.
• Primary grounds for detention are based on ensuring offenders will attend court to be dealt with according to the law. Offenders averaged 23.6 convictions on primary grounds, with clients in the EPS program having a higher number of convictions (26.6) than those in the RCMP (23.6) or CPS (18.6) locations.

• Secondary grounds for detention are based on ensuring public safety. Offenders averaged 41.5 convictions on secondary grounds. Offenders in the EPS program averaged 50.1 convictions on secondary grounds, compared to 36.7 for the CPS and 34.2 for the RCMP sites.

• Across all programs, PPOP recommended an average of 12.8 bail conditions for each offender. The number of bail conditions was similar at each program site, with the RCMP and CPS programs recommending an average of 13.9 conditions compared to 11.4 at the EPS site.

De-selection from PPOP

• On average, offenders spent 28.6 months in PPOP, ranging from 25.2 months at the EPS location to 31 months at the CPS and RCMP sites.

• The most common reason for de-selection, given for 42.9% of all program clients, was that the offender was incarcerated for a period of one year or longer. Offenders in the EPS program were more likely to be de-selected for this reason (47.8%) than those in the RCMP (42.1%) or CPS (35.7%) programs.

• One-third (33.9%) of all offenders were de-selected because they had ceased to commit substantive offences for a minimum period of six months. Offenders at the CPS (42.9%) and RCMP (36.8%) sites were more likely to be de-selected for this reason than EPS program clients (26.1%).

Convictions Before, During and After PPOP

• On average, 19.4 months elapsed between offenders’ de-selection from PPOP and May 31, 2014, and ranged from 22.2 months at the EPS program location to 20.8 months at the CPS and 14.9 months at the RCMP sites.

• At all program sites, the average number of substantive and administrative convictions per month decreased from before entry to PPOP to during the program and then decreased again from levels during the program to after de-selection. For the CPS program location, offenders had an average of .27 substantive convictions per month in the five years prior to entering PPOP; this decreased to .07 convictions per month during the program and then decreased further to .01 convictions after exiting the program.
At the EPS site, offenders had an average of .36 substantive convictions per month in the five years prior to PPOP selection, which decreased to .18 convictions per month during the program and .13 convictions per month after de-selection.

At the RCMP locations, offenders averaged .24 substantive convictions per month prior to PPOP, .08 convictions per month during the program and .03 convictions per month after de-selection.

For the CPS program location, clients averaged .12 administrative convictions per month in the five years prior to entering PPOP, which decreased to .01 convictions per month during the program and remained at the same level after exiting the program.

For the EPS site, offenders had an average of .16 administrative convictions per month prior to entering PPOP, .1 convictions per month during the program and a further decrease to .02 convictions per month after de-selection.

For the RCMP locations, clients averaged .49 administrative convictions prior to entering the program, which decreased to .2 convictions per month during the program and further decreased to .15 convictions per month after exiting the program.

6.2.2 Longitudinal Analysis

Program Clients

A total of 26 offenders entered PPOP during the period November 1, 2012 through May 31, 2014 and formed the longitudinal sample analyzed for this report. Four of these offenders had exited the program by May 31, 2014.

All of the offenders in the longitudinal sample were male.

The CPS program location had the greatest number of offenders (n=8), followed by the EPS (n=7), RCMP-North (n=6) and RCMP-South (n=5) locations.

Across program locations, offenders averaged 35.6 years of age at PPOP selection, with EPS clients having a higher average age (46 years) than those at the CPS (31.9 years) or RCMP locations (31.7 years).

Overall, program clients spent an average of 9.3 days on the wait list before entering PPOP. The longest average wait time was 23.8 days at the CPS program; average wait time was 7.5 days at the RCMP sites and 0 days at the EPS location.
• Across program locations, offenders were either single (70.8%) or cohabiting (29.2%) at the time of PPOP entry.

• One-quarter of program clients (26.9%) had children; five offenders had children under 17 years of age and four had children living with them. Two offenders had a history of Child and Family Services involvement.

Criminal History Prior to PPOP Selection

• On average, offenders were 18.1 years of age at the time of their first conviction; age at first conviction ranged from 17.7 years at the EPS location to 18.4 years at the CPS program.

• Program clients averaged 56.8 convictions in their lifetime. EPS program clients had the highest average number of lifetime convictions (80.1), followed by the CPS program (63.1) and the RCMP sites (37.4).

• Offenders had spent an average of 62.8 months in custody since their first conviction. Average time in custody was highest at the EPS program site (103.9 months); CPS program clients had spent an average of 68.3 months in custody, while RCMP program clients had spent an average of 16.2 months in custody.

• In the five years prior to entering PPOP, offenders averaged 23.4 convictions; convictions for substantive offences were twice as common (15.7) as administrative convictions (7.6). Offenders at the RCMP program sites had the highest average number of overall convictions (26) followed by individuals at the CPS (23) and EPS (19.6) locations.

• Among convictions for substantive offences, property offences were the most common (11), followed by fraud-related offences (1.5) and drug offences (1.5).

Selection to PPOP

• Across program locations, offenders were more likely to be rated by program personnel as having low motivation (46.2%) than as being motivated (34.6%) at program entry. Over one-half of RCMP clients were rated as motivated (54.5%), compared to one-quarter of CPS clients (25%) and only 14.3% of EPS clients.

• With regard to the selection criteria for PPOP, across program sites, the mandatory selection criteria were present for most offenders. All six criteria were present for all offenders at the EPS program site. However, criterion #2 (a history of committing substantive offences while on release) was only present for 62.5% of CPS clients and criterion #5 (criminal behaviour has a serious impact on public
safety and/or public confidence in the justice system) was only present for 72.7\% of RCMP clients.

- Differences across program sites were found with regard to the presence of the discretionary criteria for PPOP entry. For example, with regard to discretionary criterion #1 (the offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated with addictions) almost three-quarters of clients in the EPS (71.4\%) and RCMP (72.7\%) locations met this criterion, compared to only 12.5\% at the CPS location.

- Offenders at all program sites were most likely to be rated as having a low number of healthy family and community supports at their entry to PPOP (48\%). RCMP clients were less likely to be rated as having no healthy supports (9.1\%) than those at the CPS (37.5\%) or EPS (33.3\%) locations.

Substance Abuse Issues at PPOP Selection

- Across program sites, the substantial majority of offenders had either a confirmed addiction (56\%) or problems with substance use (24\%). The EPS location had the greatest proportion of clients (83.3\%) with a confirmed addiction.

- Almost two-thirds of offenders with substance abuse issues had received treatment in the past (60\%), the highest proportion being at the CPS location (83.3\%) and the lowest at the RCMP sites (44.4\%).

- Ratings of offenders’ motivation to address their substance abuse issues indicated that clients at the RCMP (66.7\%) and EPS (60\%) sites were more likely to be rated as motivated than CPS clients (33.3\%).

Mental Health Issues at PPOP Selection

- One-half of clients across program sites (50\%) had a confirmed or suspected mental health disorder at PPOP selection. The most common disorders were depression, anti-social personality disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder.

- All offenders with a confirmed or suspected mental health disorder had received treatment in the past.

Employment and Education Characteristics at PPOP Selection

- Across program sites, the most common source of offenders’ income was social assistance (43.5\%) followed by no income (34.8\%). Only 17.4\% had employment
income at PPOP selection. Clients at the CPS (28.6%) and RCMP (20%) sites were more likely to have employment income than at the EPS site (0%)

• CPS clients were more likely to have full-time or seasonal employment (42.9%) than those at the RCMP (20%) or EPS (0%) sites.

• Across program locations, offenders were most likely to have some high school education (54.2%), followed by training in a trade (16.7%) and high school completion (12.5%). Clients at the CPS site were more likely to have completed high school (28.6%) than those at the RCMP (9.1%) or EPS (0%) locations.

### Housing Characteristics and Other Needs at PPOP Selection

• Among all offenders, 44% were incarcerated at selection to PPOP and 32% were living with family or friends. Only 12% either rented or owned their own home.

• The EPS site had the highest proportion of offenders in custody (83.3%), compared to 37.5% at the CPS and 27.3% at the RCMP locations.

• Almost one-quarter of program clients (23.1%) needed assistance with obtaining identification and 26.9% needed help obtaining the basic necessities of life. The highest proportion of clients who required assistance with both of these needs was at the CPS program location.

### Service Referrals as Part of PPOP Case Plan

• The most common services that PPOP referred clients to as part of their case plan were family/children’s services (42.3%), addictions services (42.3%) and employment/education services (23.1%).

• The most common service referrals used at the EPS and RCMP program sites were family/children’s services and addictions services, while the most common referrals at the CPS location were to mental health services.

### 6.3 Conclusions

Findings from the second year of the PPOP program evaluation yielded many interesting results and highlighted differences across program sites, both in terms of their offender populations and their internal processes and procedures. The results also strongly suggest that PPOP has been successful in reducing its clients’ offending behaviour, not only during their time in the program but after exiting it as well.

As noted in a recent study by Rezansoff, Moniruzzaman & Somers (2012) previous evaluations of prolific offender programs have been criticized for the use of
small sample sizes, insufficient comparison groups and a lack of cost-effectiveness analyses. The evaluation of PPOP has addressed these criticisms by expanding the size of both the retrospective and longitudinal samples as more clients enter the program. While the number of clients who have been de-selected from the longitudinal sample is low at the present time, if the evaluation continues, this number should increase to the point where detailed analyses can be conducted. Further, if the PPOP evaluation continues, a strategy has been devised that will enable analyses of a comparison group that is composed of individuals who are on the wait list for the program. Finally, this report presents a strategy for a value creation analysis of PPOP using a Social Return on Investment methodology that could be conducted in the last year of the evaluation when more outcome data would be available.

It was recommended in the Year 1 evaluation report (MacRae-Krisa & Paetsch, 2013) that the name of the comprehensive bail packages be reviewed to emphasize that the detailed information contained in them can be used for purposes other than bail hearings such as at trial and sentencing. This recommendation was adopted and the name has been changed from the Show Cause Report to the Comprehensive Offender Management Package (COMP). Information contained in the COMP has allowed the program to be specific about individual offender’s needs which facilitates development of a detailed case plan. Following the examination of program data used in this report, it is apparent that there are slightly different versions of this document currently in use. These versions should be examined and, to the extent possible, a single version of the COMP should be used across all PPOP sites to facilitate collection of consistent program information.

The Year 1 evaluation report also suggested that communication between PPOP and Crown prosecutors could be improved with regard to the COMP and each offender. Further, the importance of continued education and advocacy for the program among the Crown and judges was noted. According to the program, efforts to improve engagement with stakeholders have been ongoing, but have been challenging. Over the course of the program, many attempts to enhance awareness of PPOP among its stakeholders have taken place, several of which have occurred since the Year 1 evaluation report was completed. These efforts have included:

- two presentations to federal Crown prosecutors and four presentations to provincial Crown prosecutors. Presentations are designed to provide education on the history of PPOP, what the program does and how it can have an impact in the courts when dealing with prolific offenders;

- two additional presentations to the Crown in Calgary and one presentation to the Crown in Red Deer at their annual conference;

- one presentation at an annual judges’ conference as well as meetings with individual judges;
• a one-page educational handout regarding the program has been prepared and will be rolled out following the annual judges’ conference later this year; and

• several meetings with individual Crown prosecutors to educate them on the program.

A future stakeholder survey should be conducted to assess whether these further efforts have been successful in enhancing knowledge and understanding of the work of PPOP.

The analyses conducted for the current report indicated that the ratings of the motivation of clients in the longitudinal sample upon entering PPOP were overall quite low. As the number of clients de-selected from this sample increases, it will be important to examine the effects of their motivation level on their program outcomes. It is perhaps not surprising that these clients would have low motivation upon entering the program, and one of the challenges of the program is to increase offenders’ motivation to change their behaviour. The exit survey used with the longitudinal sample collects information on clients’ motivation levels upon leaving the program. As more clients in this sample exit the program, future analyses will be able to examine changes in their motivation after participating in PPOP.

Given that almost three-quarters of offenders in the longitudinal sample were unemployed at PPOP entry, it is somewhat surprising that less than one-half of program clients had employment goals as part of their case plan. Similarly, even though over one-half of clients had not completed high school, only one-fifth of offenders had educational goals as part of their case plans. Also, a very small number of clients had their own residence, but only one-fifth were reported as having housing goals. There are relatively high levels of substance abuse issues among program clients, particularly at the EPS site. It may be that setting goals in tangible areas such as employment, education and housing is delayed until after the substance abuse issues are dealt with. The process for goal setting for PPOP offenders should be reviewed, since clearly articulated goals can help to ensure that referrals to appropriate services are made.

Findings from the longitudinal sample in the present report indicated that the services clients were referred to differed across program locations. For example, while over one-half of clients at the EPS and RCMP locations received referrals to family/children’s services and addictions services, no clients at the CPS site received referrals to these services. Similarly, while over one-third of CPS clients were referred to mental health services, only one RCMP client and no EPS clients received this type of referral. It is not clear whether these variations in practice reflect differences in need across program locations or differences in the availability of services at the various program sites. The Year 1 evaluation report noted that treatment and support services were not sufficient to meet the needs of PPOP clients and this is likely still the case. It
would be useful to repeat the staff and stakeholder surveys to determine if the availability of services and the needs of clients have changed over the past two years.

There were substantial differences in the length of time offenders in the longitudinal sample spent on the wait list prior to entering PPOP. While EPS clients all entered the program immediately with no wait time, RCMP clients spent an average of 9 days on the wait list while CPS clients were on the wait list for an average of 24 days. It is unclear whether this is related to differences in program capacity at the various locations. There is evidence in the present report that clients in the EPS program represent a group of more serious prolific offenders; thus, it may be that enrolling them in the program is viewed as more urgent than at the other program sites.

Findings from the retrospective sample indicated that offenders at the EPS program location had a greater number of convictions in the five years prior to entering PPOP than clients at either the CPS or RCMP sites. EPS clients also had received a considerably higher average number of custodial sentences in their lifetime and had spent the greatest amount of time in custody since their first conviction. Clients’ ages at the EPS program site were comparable to those at the other programs, so these differences are not attributable to the EPS offenders representing an older cohort of PPOP clients. Thus, it appears that clients at the EPS program location represent a qualitatively different sample of offenders who were more criminally active prior to entering the program and accordingly had greater involvement with the correctional system.

This conclusion is also supported to some extent in findings from the longitudinal sample.Clients at the EPS program location had the highest number of lifetime convictions, had spent the greatest amount of time in custody by a considerable margin and were more likely to be rated as having low motivation upon their entry to PPOP. However, in this sample, EPS clients were substantially older than CPS and RCMP clients, which could account, at least in part, for their higher number of convictions and longer periods in custody. Once there are a greater number of clients in the sample at each location, it will be possible to control for these age differences in subsequent analyses.

Interestingly, even though EPS offenders had more lifetime convictions and had spent more time in custody than offenders at the other program sites, their number of substantive convictions in the five years before PPOP selection was lower than clients at either of the other program locations. This could indicate that EPS clients had spent more time in custody during the five years before entering the program and thus were not in a position to be committing crime. However, it could also indicate that EPS clients were committing more serious crimes and receiving longer custodial sentences. Adding support to the hypothesis that these offenders were committing more serious offences is the fact that EPS clients in the retrospective sample had a higher number of convictions on secondary grounds charges, which include substantive offences where
detention is necessary to ensure public safety. This also suggests that EPS clients may have a history of committing more serious offences.

There was a substantial difference in the average length of time RCMP program clients had spent in custody since their first conviction for the retrospective (63 months) and the longitudinal (16 months) samples. It is unclear what accounts for this difference. Given the small sample size for the longitudinal sample at this point, this may simply reflect a random fluctuation rather than a systematic difference between the two samples. A further data collection period would increase the sample size and allow this difference to be examined further.

There were also some differences across program locations in terms of the use of selection criteria for PPOP. Almost all offenders at the EPS location met all six mandatory selection criteria; however, one-quarter of RCMP program clients in the retrospective sample did not meet the mandatory criterion of being currently active in committing criminal activity. Further, one-quarter of clients in the longitudinal sample at the CPS program did not meet the mandatory criterion of being considered a high risk to re-offend, and over one-third did not meet the criterion of committing substantive offences while on release. This indicates that some clients who meet most, but not all, mandatory criteria are being selected into PPOP. To avoid confusion regarding the use of these criteria, the program should consider changing the names from “Mandatory” and “Discretionary” criteria to “Primary” and “Secondary” criteria.

With regard to the discretionary criteria, across program locations, few offenders in either sample were rated as meeting the criterion that their criminal behaviour is correlated with mental illness. Since one-half of the clients in the longitudinal sample were rated as having a confirmed or suspected mental health issue (comparable data were not available for the retrospective sample), it may be that these mental health issues were not viewed as contributing to clients’ criminal behaviour. Alternatively, it is possible that the referring agency was not aware of a mental health diagnosis or that the offenders had not received a complete mental health assessment prior to entering PPOP. While conducting mental health assessments is not within the purview of PPOP, given the prevalence of mental health issues among the longitudinal sample, it is important that the program has the resources in place to provide adequate support to these clients.

EPS clients in the retrospective sample were most likely to be de-selected from PPOP because they had been incarcerated for a period of one year or more and were least likely to be de-selected because they had ceased committing substantive offences for a period of six months or more. EPS offenders in the longitudinal sample were also considerably more likely to be incarcerated upon entering PPOP and, consequently, to be unemployed and have no income. These findings also suggest that the EPS offenders are qualitatively different than those at the other program locations and may represent a group with a more entrenched and serious pattern of criminal behaviour.
The results obtained when examining offending behaviour before, during and after the program for clients in the retrospective sample are extremely positive and strongly suggestive of the efficacy of PPOP in having a positive effect on individuals not only during their time in the program, but after de-selection as well. Across all program locations, and for both substantive and administrative offences, the number of convictions during the program was substantially lower than in the five years prior to PPOP and, with the exception of substantive offences among EPS program clients, decreased even further or remained the same following de-selection. These findings are in line with a recent preliminary study on recidivism among offenders in the British Columbia Prolific and Priority Offender Management program (Rezansoff et al., 2012). This study found a substantial decline in all types of convictions from the period prior to program enrolment to a post de-selection period of at least one year. This study also found a reduction in the number of negative police contacts.

The positive findings with regard to decreased offending observed in the present analysis argue strongly for continuing the evaluation of PPOP for at least an additional year as originally envisioned. A further year of data collection will expand the sizes of both the retrospective and longitudinal samples, which will enable more robust comparisons across program sites. Further, the additional data collection period will allow for more offenders in the longitudinal sample to be de-selected from the program, which will afford the opportunity for detailed pre-test post-test program analyses, provide a larger pool of de-selected clients who could be interviewed about their experiences with the program, and allow comparative analyses between individuals who have been in PPOP and those in the comparison group. Once more outcome data are available, a solid foundation for an SROI analysis will be laid. Most importantly, further data collection will provide the opportunity to determine if the effects of PPOP in decreasing recidivism are maintained in the long term.

6.4 Recommendations

The findings from the Year 2 evaluation of PPOP yielded the following recommendations:

(1) **Comprehensive Offender Management Package (COMP):** Slightly different versions of the COMP are currently in use. The COMP should be reviewed to ensure that, to the extent possible, a standard version is used across program locations.

(2) **PPOP Selection Criteria:** While the mandatory selection criteria for PPOP are being met for the majority of offenders at each program location, there were some important systematic differences across locations. Given that some clients who have met most, but not all, mandatory criteria are being selected into PPOP,
the program should consider changing the names from “Mandatory” and “Discretionary” criteria to “Primary” and “Secondary” criteria.

(3) Mental Health and Substance Use Services: Given the substantial number of program clients with mental health and substance use issues, the program should review its capacity for providing appropriate service referrals in these areas.

(4) Offenders’ Motivation Levels: Given the substantial number of PPOP clients with low motivation upon entering the program, as more clients are de-selected from the longitudinal sample, the program should more closely examine their levels of motivation to address their criminal behaviour, substance use and mental health issues in relation to program outcomes.

(5) Goal Setting: Given the low numbers of goals documented for the longitudinal sample, it is recommended that the program review the procedures used for setting goals in the case plans. Clearly defined goals will help to ensure that appropriate service referrals are made.

(6) Service Referrals: Given the differences in service referrals across program sites, the program should review the services available at the various locations and determine if they are sufficient to meet the clients’ needs.

(7) Data Collection Forms: If the evaluation is not continued beyond the current year, it is recommended that the program continue to use the Offender Entry Data Collection Form and the Offender Exit Data Collection Form to allow for continued internal monitoring of clients’ progress.

(8) Staff and Stakeholder Surveys: Another wave of staff and stakeholder surveys should be conducted to determine if communication between Crown prosecutors and PPOP has improved with regard to the COMP and each offender and whether attempts at continued education and advocacy for PPOP among prosecutors and the judiciary has resulted in enhanced knowledge of the program. These surveys would also determine if client needs and the availability of services have changed in the last two years.

(9) Continuation of the Evaluation: Given the extremely positive preliminary findings regarding decreases in recidivism among PPOP clients both during their time in the program and after de-selection, it is recommended that the evaluation be continued for another year as originally envisioned. This will allow for a determination of whether the positive results reported in the current analysis are sustained over a longer term with a greater number of PPOP clients. Another round of staff and stakeholder surveys, as well as interviews with de-selected
clients in the longitudinal sample could be incorporated into a final evaluation year.

(10) **SROI Analysis**: Given the positive findings contained in this report, an analysis of the social value created by PPOP should be conducted once additional outcome data are available. A strategy for this analysis is outlined in this report, which could be carried out as part of a final evaluation year.
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GLOSSARY

ACOM: Alberta Community Offender Management System

Administrative Offence: Administrative offence refers to occurrences related to failures to comply with court orders such as failures to appear or breaches of bail conditions.

COMP: PPOP’s Comprehensive Offender Management Package (previously called the Show Cause Report). It summarizes the offender’s criminal history, grounds for detention, and the bail conditions recommended by the program based on the offender’s profile and risk factors.

Cost-Benefit Analysis: A systematic process that examines inputs in terms of costs relative to outcomes in terms of what is achieved by the intervention in monetary terms.

CPIC: The Canadian Police Information Centre, which maintains a national database containing information on individuals’ conviction records, warrant status and other matters relating to criminal involvement.

CPS: The Calgary Police Service

EPROS: Edmonton Police Reporting and Occurrence System

EPS: The Edmonton Police Service

Internal Validity: Refers to the extent that the observed changes can be attributed to the program or intervention and not to other possible causes such as history, maturation of participants, or selection bias.

JOIN: Justice Online Information Network, an Alberta provincial database containing information on individuals’ conviction and sentence records.

Logic Model: Framework used when evaluating a program that articulates the objectives, inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes of the program.

Longitudinal Sample/Analysis: In this study, offenders entering the program after November 1, 2012 became part of a longitudinal sample that uses a pre-test post-test design and collects information upon clients’ selection into the program and again following their de-selection.
**Mean:** The mean is the average response to a question. It is calculated by adding up all of the responses received and then dividing the resulting sum by the total number of responses.

**Missing Cases:** The number of responses on individual questions that are not available. The most common reason for missing cases in survey or interview data is that the respondent chose not to answer a particular question. In file review data, missing cases are usually the result of the relevant information not being included in the file.

**Multiple Response Data:** Multiple response data refers to questions in which respondents are allowed to choose more than one answer. In tables where multiple response data are presented, the percentages presented for individual items will total more than 100.

**N and n:** N refers to the total number of respondents to a survey or interview or the total number of files that were available for review while n refers to a subset of the total responses that may be selected for specific data analyses. For example, if 100 people respond to a survey, N = 100. If 30 of those respondents identify as female, then n = 30 females and n = 70 males.

**Outcome Analysis:** Evaluation methodology designed to measure short- and long-term outcomes to determine whether the program is having the intended effect in achieving specific program objectives.

**PIMS:** Police Information Management System for the Calgary Police Service

**PPOP:** The Priority Prolific Offender Program

**Pre-test/Post-test Design:** A research methodology that collects data on program participants before they enter a program and again after they exit it to determine what effects the program had.

**Process Analysis:** Evaluation methodology designed to examine how a program is actually implemented and answers the question of whether the program has been carried out as it was intended.

**Range:** The lowest and highest responses from the range of responses received to a question.

**Retrospective Sample/Analysis:** In this study, the retrospective time series analysis is designed to focus on collecting information about the offenders who entered the program prior to November 1, 2012 and who have subsequently exited the
program to determine whether their offending behaviour appeared to be altered by the program.

**Substantive Offence:** Substantive offence refers to all criminal occurrences other than those related to compliance with court orders such as failures to appear or breaches of bail conditions.

**SROI:** Social Return on Investment is a framework for measuring and communicating the social, economic or environmental impact of investment in an organization, project or program.

**YCJA:** The federal *Youth Criminal Justice Act*
APPENDIX A

Offender Entry Data Collection Form
INSTRUCTIONS: This form should be completed for all offenders who enter the program. The form should be completed once a Case Plan and Comprehensive Bail Package have been developed. If an offender is de-selected from the program before a Case Plan or Comprehensive Bail Package is developed, please complete the information to the best of your knowledge.

“Program entry” is defined as the point at which PPOP engages with the offender.

Upon completing this form, please save it using the FPS number as the file name.

FPS #: Date of Birth: mm/dd/yy

Referring Agency:

Length of time on waitlist (days): Date of program entry: mm/dd/yy

Program Location: □ Calgary (CPS) □ Calgary (RCMP)
□ Edmonton (EPS) □ Edmonton (RCMP)

PPOP Police Officer (name): PPOP Probation Officer (name):

Gender: □ Male □ Female Ethnicity:

Relationship status:
□ Single □ Married □ Cohabiting □ Dating □ Divorced □ Widowed

□ Offender has children → # of children: # children living with offender:
# of children under the age of 17:

Child and Family Services are involved with the family

How would you rate the offender’s motivation on entry to PPOP?
□ Very motivated □ Motivated □ Low motivation □ Unknown

Selection Criteria

Mandatory Criteria
□ A history of committing substantive offences (5 charges with 3 convictions in at least 5 years)
□ A history of committing substantive offences while on release
□ A history of non-compliance with Court orders including failing to appear and breach of conditions
□ Intelligence indicates the offender is currently active in committing criminal activity

Discretionary Criteria
□ The offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated with addictions
□ The offender’s criminal behaviour is correlated to mental illness
□ The offender is unemployed and does not have stable residency
□ The offender may be influential with other offenders resulting in criminal behaviour among associates
The criminal behaviour of the individual has a serious impact on public safety and victimization and/or on public confidence in the justice system.

The offender is considered to be a medium to high risk to reoffend.

Criminal History (to PPOP program entry date)

Date of first conviction: mm/dd/yy  Date of last conviction: mm/dd/yy

Total criminal convictions: Approximate time in custody since first conviction (days):

Convictions in the five years prior to PPOP entry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive Convictions</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Administrative Convictions</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal driving offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to appear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Escape lawful custody/unlawfully at large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with release conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with a sentence/probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceit offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with court order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obstruction of justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obstruct a police officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perjury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal flight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal hit and run</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Convictions from age 18 to five years prior to PPOP entry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive Convictions</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Administrative Convictions</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal driving offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to appear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Escape lawful custody/unlawfully at large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with release conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with a sentence/probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceit offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with court order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obstruction of justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obstruct a police officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perjury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal flight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal hit and run</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youth convictions (age <18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive Convictions</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Administrative Convictions</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal driving offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to appear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Escape lawful custody/unlawfully at large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with release conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with a sentence/probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceit offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with court order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drug offences
Other criminal offences

Obstruction of justice
Obstruct a police officer
Perjury
Criminal flight
Criminal hit and run
YCJA offences

Case Plan

How often will the offender report to PPOP?

Family/Community Support

How would you rate the offender’s general support system on selection to PPOP?
☐ No healthy supports
☐ Low number of healthy supports
☐ Moderate number of healthy supports
☐ High number of healthy supports

Substance Use

☐ No substance abuse concerns (continue to “Mental Health” section)
☐ Offender has a confirmed addiction
☐ Offender has problems with substance use

How would you rate the offender’s level of addiction?
☐ Mild  ☐ Moderate  ☐ Severe  ☐ Unknown

☐ The offender received treatment for substance use in the past
  Type of treatment previously accessed:  ☐ Detox  ☐ Residential  ☐ Individual counselling  ☐ AA/NA
  ☐ Group counselling  ☐ Other:

What addiction services are going to be provided to the offender through PPOP (check all that apply)?
☐ Detox  ☐ Individual counselling  ☐ Group counseling  ☐ Residential treatment  ☐ AA/NA
☐ Other:

How would you rate the offender's motivation to address his/her substance use issues?
☐ Very motivated  ☐ Motivated  ☐ Low motivation  ☐ Unknown

Mental Health

☐ No mental health concerns (continue to “Medical” Section)
☐ Offender has been diagnosed with a mental health disorder(s)
  Specify mental health diagnoses:
☐ Offender has a suspected mental health disorder(s)
  Specify mental health concerns:

☐ The offender received treatment for their mental health issues in the past

☐ The offender requires medication for his/her mental health issues

What mental health treatment is being provided to the offender through PPOP (check all that apply)?
☐ Assessment  ☐ Medication stabilization  ☐ Individual counselling  ☐ Group counselling
☐ Psychiatric consultation  ☐ Other:
How would you rate the offender’s motivation to address his/her mental health issues?
- [ ] Very motivated
- [ ] Motivated
- [ ] Low motivation
- [ ] Unknown

Medical
- [ ] No medical issues (continue to “Dental” Section)
- [ ] Offender has a medical condition
  Specify medical diagnoses/concerns:
- [ ] Offender requires treatment for this medical condition
  What medical services will the offender be referred to through PPOP?:

Dental
- [ ] No dental issues (continue to “Employment/Education” Section)
- [ ] Offender requires dental services
  What dental services will the offender be referred to through PPOP?:

Employment/Education
Source of income at PPOP selection (select all that apply):
- [ ] No income
- [ ] Social assistance
- [ ] Employment insurance
- [ ] Employment
- [ ] Other:

Employment status at PPOP selection:
- [ ] Unemployed
- [ ] Part-time employment
- [ ] Full-time employment
- [ ] Seasonal Employment
- [ ] Other:
  - [ ] Offender has employment goals as part of his/her case plan
  Specify employment goals:

Highest level of education attained at PPOP de-selection:
- [ ] No education
- [ ] Elementary
- [ ] Junior high school
- [ ] Some high school
- [ ] High school graduate
- [ ] Trade
- [ ] Some university
- [ ] University graduate
- [ ] Other:

- [ ] The offender can read
- [ ] The offender can write

- [ ] Offender has educational goals as part of his/her case plan
  Specify educational goals:

Housing
Offender’s living arrangement upon PPOP entry:
- [ ] In custody
- [ ] Shelter
- [ ] Rehabilitation facility
- [ ] Half-way house
- [ ] Second-stage housing
- [ ] With family/friends
- [ ] Rents own home
- [ ] Owns own home
- [ ] Other:

- [ ] Offender has housing goals as part of his/her case plan
  Specify housing goals:

Other
- [ ] Offender requires assistance obtaining identification
- [ ] Offender requires assistance obtaining basic necessities
Stakeholder Involvement

What agencies will the offender be referred to as part of his/her case plan (please list)?

Conditions

List the release conditions recommended for the offender:
APPENDIX B

Offender Exit Data Collection Form
PPOP Evaluation
Offender Exit Data Collection Form

INSTRUCTIONS: This form should be completed for all offenders for whom a data entry form has been completed upon their de-selection from the program.

Upon completing this form, please save it using the FPS number as the file name.

FPS #:

Date of de-selection: mm/dd/yy

Program Location at de-selection:  
- Calgary (CPS)  
- Calgary (RCMP)  
- Edmonton (EPS)  
- Edmonton (RCMP)

PPOP Police Officer (name):  
PPOP Probation Officer (name):

Relationship status:  
- Same as on selection to PPOP  
- Changed to:  
  - Single  
  - Married  
  - Cohabiting  
  - Dating  
  - Divorced  
  - Widowed

Children:  
- Same as on selection to PPOP  
- Changed to:  
  - # of children:  
  - # children living with offender:  
  - # of children under the age of 17:

If Child and Family Services was involved on entry to PPOP, did that involvement change by the time the offender exited from PPOP?  
- Yes  
- No  
- Not applicable

How did Child and Family Services involvement change?

Reason for De-selection

- Offender has been stable and crime free in the community for at least six months and his/her risk to reoffend has dropped significantly
- Law enforcement agencies advise PPOP that the offender is no longer a priority in their jurisdiction
- They have died, become permanently incapacitated or relocated permanently
- They have been incarcerated for a significant period of time (>1 year)

Criminal History (from program entry date to de-selection date)

Date of first conviction after entry to PPOP: mm/dd/yy  
- Not applicable

Total criminal convictions since PPOP selection:  
Approximate time in custody since PPOP entry (days):

Conussions in the period from PPOP selection to de-selection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive Convictions</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Administrative Convictions</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal driving offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to appear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Escape lawful custody/unlawfully at large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with release conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with a sentence/probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceit offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to comply with court order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obstruction of justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criminal offences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obstruct a police officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Plan

How would you rate the offender’s motivation on de-selection from PPOP?
☐ Very motivated ☐ Motivated ☐ Low motivation ☐ Unknown

Family/Community Support
How would you rate the offender’s general support system on de-selection from PPOP?
☐ No healthy supports
☐ Low number of healthy supports
☐ Moderate number of healthy supports
☐ High number of healthy supports

Did the offender make progress on developing social supports during his/her time with PPOP?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the offender have a significant negative life experience while they were with PPOP? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Do you think this event affected their progress? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Substance Use
☐ No substance abuse concerns *(continue to “Mental Health” section)*
☐ Offender had a confirmed addiction upon selection to PPOP
☐ Offender had problems with substance use upon selection to PPOP

What substance abuse services did the offender access during his/her time with PPOP?
☐ Detox ☐ Individual counselling ☐ Group counseling ☐ Residential treatment ☐ AA/NA
☐ Other:

How would you rate the offender’s participation in substance abuse programming?
☐ Low ☐ Moderate ☐ High

Did the offender make progress in addressing their substance abuse issues? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, indicate general type of progress:
☐ Abstinence ☐ Reduced use ☐ Use of less severe substance
☐ Other:

Did the offender suffer any relapses while with PPOP? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Did the offender recover from this/these relapse(s) while with PPOP? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Was the offender connected with substance abuse aftercare upon de-selection from PPOP?
☐ Detox ☐ Individual counselling ☐ Group counseling ☐ Residential treatment ☐ AA/NA
☐ Other:

What was the offender’s attitude toward substance abuse services upon de-selection from PPOP?
☐ Negative ☐ Positive ☐ Excellent

Mental Health
☐ No mental health concerns *(continue to “Medical” Section)*
☐ Offender had a mental health diagnosis upon entering PPOP
☐ Offender was diagnosed with a mental health condition during his/her time at PPOP
Specify mental health diagnosis:
☐ Offender has a suspected mental health condition upon de-selection from PPOP
Specify suspected mental health condition:
What mental health treatment was provided to the offender through PPOP (check all that apply)?
☐ Assessment ☐ Medication stabilization ☐ Individual counselling ☐ Group counselling
☐ Psychiatric consultation ☐ Other:

How would you rate the offender’s motivation to address his/her mental health issues?
☐ Very motivated ☐ Motivated ☐ Low motivation ☐ Unknown

Did the offender make progress in addressing his/her mental health condition? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, indicate general type of progress:
☐ Stable lifestyle ☐ Medication compliance ☐ Regular participation in mental health supports
☐ Other:

Was the offender connected with mental health aftercare upon de-selection from PPOP?
If yes, indicate the type of aftercare:
☐ Individual counselling ☐ Psychiatric consultations ☐ Residential treatment
☐ Other:

What was the offender’s attitude toward mental health services upon de-selection from PPOP?
☐ Negative ☐ Positive ☐ Excellent

Medical
☐ No medical concerns (proceed to “Dental” Section)
☐ Offender had a diagnosed medical condition upon entering PPOP
☐ Offender was diagnosed with a medical condition during his/her time at PPOP
Specify medical diagnosis:

What medical treatment was provided to the offender through PPOP?

How would you rate the offender’s motivation to address his/her medical issues?
☐ Very motivated ☐ Motivated ☐ Low motivation ☐ Unknown

Did the offender make progress in addressing his/her medical condition? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, indicate general type of progress:

Was the offender connected with medical aftercare upon de-selection from PPOP? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, indicate the type of aftercare:

What was the offender’s attitude toward medical services upon de-selection from PPOP?
☐ Negative ☐ Positive ☐ Excellent

Dental
☐ No dental concerns (proceed to “Employment/Education” Section)
☐ Offender had known dental issues upon entering PPOP
☐ Offender was assessed as having dental issues during his/her time at PPOP
What dental services were provided to the offender through PPOP?

How would you rate the offender’s motivation to address his/her dental issues?
☐ Very motivated ☐ Motivated ☐ Low motivation ☐ Unknown

Did the offender make progress in addressing his/her dental issues? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, indicate general type of progress:

Was the offender connected with dental aftercare upon de-selection from PPOP? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, indicate the type of aftercare:
What was the offender’s attitude toward dental services upon de-selection from PPOP?  
☐ Negative  ☐ Positive  ☐ Excellent

Employment/Education
Source of income at PPOP de-selection (select all that apply):
☐ No income  ☐ Social assistance  ☐ Employment insurance  ☐ Employment  
☐ Other:

Employment status at PPOP de-selection:
☐ Unemployed  ☐ Part-time employment  ☐ Full-time employment  ☐ Seasonal Employment  
☐ Other:

If employment goals were part of the case plan, did the offender reach these all of these goals?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If no, which goals were not met?

Highest level of education attained at PPOP de-selection:
☐ No education  ☐ Elementary  ☐ Junior high school  ☐ Some high school  
☐ High school graduate  ☐ Trade  ☐ Some university  ☐ University graduate  
☐ Other:

☐ The offender can read  ☐ The offender can write

If educational goals were part of the case plan, did the offender reach these all of these goals?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If no, which goals were not met?

Housing
Did offender make any housing changes while in PPOP?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  
Did the offender’s housing situation improve?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Offender’s living arrangement upon entry de-selection from PPOP:
☐ In custody  ☐ Shelter  ☐ Rehabilitation facility  ☐ Half-way house  ☐ Second-stage housing  
☐ With family/friends  ☐ Rents own home  ☐ Owns own home  ☐ Other:

If housing goals were part of the case plan, did the offender reach these all of these goals?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If no, which goals were not met?

Other
☑ Offender obtained identification during time with PPOP  
☐ Offender obtained the necessities of life during time with PPOP

Stakeholder Involvement
What agencies was the offender referred to during his/her time with PPOP (please list)?

Agency
Did the offender access this service?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unknown
Conditions

List the release conditions that the offender received while with PPOP: