

January 2002  
378-1-151

# REPORT ON THE SELF-AUDIT OF FREQUENCY OF CONTACT



**Performance Assurance Sector  
Correctional Service Canada**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	5
General Audit Results:	6
1) Compliance with minimum-required frequency of contacts	
2) Community Contacts	
3) Collateral Contacts	
4) Other Information Collected:	10
a) whether information received from releasing institution prior to offender's arrival in the community	
b) whether initial interviews are being scheduled within twenty-four(24) hours of the offender's arrival in the community	
c) when casework records are being entered into OMS within seven(7) days of the contact being made	
d) whether there is an active quality control function in each parole office	
e) information sharing with the police	
f) case conferences	
5) Overall Comments/Findings	13
Appendix A: Methodology	
Appendix B: Number of cases reviewed from each Parole Office	
Appendix C: Comparison of Results	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The self-assessment (self-evaluation) of the Frequency of Contact (FOC) was conducted as part of the Performance Assurance audit schedule for fiscal year 2000-2001. The management tools were developed in National Headquarters and distributed to all parole offices. In the parole offices, management staff used the tools to review a select number of files to ensure that conditionally released offenders are being supervised in accordance with policies and procedures under Standard Operating Practice (SOP) 700-06.

**Face -to-face contacts only:** The audit scope assessed compliance with the frequency of face-to-face contacts, rather than all contacts with offenders in the community, or with other aspects of community supervision. The location of the contacts, whether they took place in the office or the community was recorded, as well as any collateral contacts with the offenders' family members, employers, program providers, police and others.

While the audit was primarily related to direct face to face contact with conditionally released offenders, the review also collected information to determine whether:

- all pertinent information was received from the institutions before the offender arrived to be supervised;
- initial interviews are scheduled within twenty-four hours of the offender arriving at the release destination;
- case conferences are being conducted by office supervisors;
- all necessary information is forwarded to the appropriate police departments;
- there is a quality control element performed in the office;
- the contacts are input into the Offender Management System within a set timeframe; and
- a good use is made of collateral contacts to monitor offenders' correctional plans.

A total of seven hundred and fifty (750) files were reviewed, with all types of conditional releases selected. As per National Headquarter's request, the majority of cases reviewed were supervised at levels A (4 contacts per month) and B (2 contacts per month).

**Improvement shown:** The improvement in results from the 1999 OMS audit compared to the current self-audit was approximately 20% on a national level, with improvements in all five(5) regions. However, there were seven(7) offices overall that did not demonstrate improvement since the OMS audit was conducted in 1999. The results of this self-audit also indicated six(6) sites with a 100% level of compliance to the frequency of contact, compared to three(3) offices in the 1999 audit.

There was an indication on most of the files reviewed for this audit that collateral contacts are being made, but reviewers did note concerns with the lack of collateral contacts, or under utilization of collateral contacts, in some cases. It is difficult to determine a compliance rate for collateral contacts however, since the standard only states that a network of contacts should be maintained, rather than indicating the number and type of contacts that are required for the proper supervision of cases.

Contacts with offenders in a community setting continue to be maintained at a high level. As in the 1999 audit, this self-audit indicates that more than half of all offenders on conditional release are seen regularly in the community, with a combination of home visits, work and program contacts. The overall compliance rate to Sections 57-64 of the Supervision Standard regarding community contacts during this audit was 83%. This is an improvement of almost 20% over the OMS audit.

**A summary of the findings from the audit include:**

- an increase in compliance with the minimum required Frequency of Contacts, since the completion of the OMS audit in 1999;
- continued maintenance of face-to-face contacts in a community setting above the required 50%;
- an under-utilization of collateral contacts in some cases;
- With few exceptions, initial interviews scheduled, (and conducted), within twenty-four hours of the offenders' arrival in the community;
- Some delays with respect to entering casework record information into OMS;
- A requirement to improve in quality control functions in offices; and
- case conferences are being held in all offices, but the frequency varies from office to office.

## INTRODUCTION

The Frequency of Contact (FOC) audit was part of the Performance Assurance audit calendar for fiscal year 2000-2001. The audit was a self-assessment of the frequency of contacts maintained by parole officers with conditionally released offenders, and involved a compliance oriented management tool forwarded for completion to all parole offices across the Service.

The standards for the supervision of conditionally released offenders, and the frequency of contact with these offenders, are determined by Standard Operating Procedure 700-06. This policy determines the minimum number of face-to-face contacts that are required to appropriately manage the risk that offenders pose while living in the community on conditional release.

The supervision of conditionally released offenders is divided into five(5) possible levels.

Levels of Supervision	Frequency of Contact
Level A	Four(4) face-to-face contacts per month
Level B	Two(2) face-to-face contacts per month
Level C	One(1) face-to-face contact per month
Level D	One(1) contact every two(2) months
Level E	A minimum of one(1) face-to-face contact every three(3) months

Although some cases in all five levels were reviewed, as per the request from National Headquarters, the audit focussed on the two(2) highest levels of supervision.

The information from the audit is based on self-reported information from the responsibility centres. The findings are primarily divided into the principal frequency of contact information, including the overall number of contacts, the number of contacts in the community and the collateral contacts. Information was also accumulated on general procedures such as sharing information with the police, case conference, and quality control and initial interviews.

Each office was requested to review a sample of 10% of offenders under their supervision (minimum of 5 cases). A total of **727** files were reviewed nationally, comparable to the number that was reviewed in the 1999 audit (765). The number of cases reviewed from each individual Parole Office can be found in Appendix B.

## GENERAL AUDIT RESULTS

In 1999, when the availability and accuracy of the information on frequency of contacts with conditionally released offenders was reviewed on Offender Management System (OMS), it was found that the information was not always available, and when it was available, it was not always current or accurate. Since that audit was conducted electronically, it was difficult to determine if the high level of non-compliance that was found by the auditors was the result of the contacts not taking place or the result of the information not being entered into OMS.

In the 2001 self-audit, the self-evaluation took place in the offices. Therefore, office management had the opportunity to determine from the hard copies on the files whether the contacts had actually been made with the offenders, and consequently whether the cases were in compliance with the supervision standards. The review of the hard file copy, along with adjustments made in offices regarding frequency of contacts since the 1999 audit, may account for the increase in the rate of compliance during the conduct of this audit.

### COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF CONTACTS

**Finding #1: All regions reported an increase in compliance with the minimum required Frequency of Contacts, since the completion of the OMS audit in 1999.**

With the exception of seven Parole Offices (Prince George, Peel, Toronto Downtown, Chicoutimi, Rimouski, Bathurst and Charlottetown), the results of the self-audit demonstrate an improvement in (or a maintenance of) the level of compliance in meeting the minimum FOC requirements. Nevertheless, 100% compliance was only reported in six sites (Kelowna, Brandon, Rouyn-Noranda, Hull, Cornerbrook and Sydney).

Appendix C provides information comparing the results of the previous audit (conducted in 1999) and those of the current self-audit for each individual Parole Office. A summary by region is presented below:

Region	# months reviewed	# compliant months	% compliance (2001 self-audit)	% compliance (1999 NHQ audit)
Atlantic	548	515	94%	87%
Quebec	997	944	95%	63%
Ontario	1058.5	946.5	89%	75%

Prairie	1203	1055	88%	68%
Pacific	486	437	90%	66%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4292.5</b>	<b>3897.5</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>71%</b>

In addition, there were a number of cases reviewed which exceeded the minimum required number of contacts over the period examined. While this included many of the fully compliant cases, it also included a small number of the non-compliant cases. For example, a case at the A-4 level may have been seen only three times in one month and six times in the next. While the total number of contacts (9) exceeds the total number required (8) over the two-month period, the first month is still in non-compliance since the offender was not seen four times as required.

Region	# cases reviewed	# cases exceeding the <u>total</u> minimum required contacts
Atlantic	94	71
Quebec	167	121
Ontario	184	91
Prairie	201	126
Pacific	81	47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>456</b>

## **COMMUNITY CONTACTS**

**Finding #2: The requirement for over 50% of face-to-face contacts take place in a community setting, continues to be maintained in all regions.**

SOP 700-06 requires that fifty percent or more of the contacts made with offenders on conditional release should be made in the community, rather than an office setting.

In the 1999 OMS audit, the requirement for 50% of contacts with offenders to be made in the community was calculated two ways: a) 50% of the number of required contacts in the community, and b) 50% of the number of contacts that were made by the parole officers. That audit report found that the requirement for community contacts was

generally being met in most of the cases reviewed, and the overall compliance rate for the Supervision Standard was approximately 65% across the Service.

For this audit, the community contacts were interpreted during the analysis as being in compliance if the number of contacts made by the parole officers was 50% of the overall contacts made with the conditionally released offenders.

The results of the current self-assessment also indicated that the requirement to meet offenders in a community setting, at least 50% of the time is being met in the majority of cases reviewed. Audit results show that the achievement rate has increased almost 20% from the OMS audit in 1999. This indicates that in the majority of cases supervised, the offenders are being seen regularly in a community setting.

The following table indicates the number of community contacts that were made by parole offices and the compliance rate for contacts in the community over the review period:

<b>Region</b>	<b># cases reviewed</b>	<b># cases where &gt;50% community contacts</b>	<b>% compliance</b>
Atlantic	94	90	96%
Quebec	167	153	92%
Ontario	184	133	72%
Prairie	201	160	80%
Pacific	81	64	79%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>83%</b>

### **COLLATERAL CONTACTS**

**Finding #3: Collateral contacts are underutilized in some cases.**

Section 65 of SOP 700-06 states that parole officers should maintain a network of collateral contacts that allow for the verification of the offender's place of residence, program participation, employment and other factors relevant to the CPPR.

But other than the above noted section of SOP 700, there are no actual standards to indicate how many collateral contacts should be made, the type of contacts required, or with whom the contact should take place. It is difficult then, to ascertain during an audit, the number and type of collateral contacts that are required in the files reviewed.

However, as with the Offender Management System audit in 1999, collateral contacts were part of the self-assessment, and the reviewers were requested to record the collateral contacts in each case.

The 1999 audit report on Frequency of Contact noted that many of the cases reviewed identified few or no collateral visits. The quality of the collateral contacts was also in question in some cases. In many instances, the only collateral contacts that took place were in the presence of the offender. It was also noted in that report that in the past members of Boards of Investigation had determined that a lack of collateral contacts or poorly conducted collateral contacts was a concern in sensational incidents involving conditionally released offenders.

The results of the current self-assessment indicates that most of the files reviewed contained collateral contacts that were recorded during the review period, and the analysis of those files also indicate that there was an increase in collateral contacts since the completion of the audit in 1999. However, management personnel completing the self-evaluation tool during this audit generally noted that the use of collateral contacts could be increased in many cases, and concerns were raised by reviewers with respect to a lack of collateral contacts. The concerns varied from collateral contacts missing on some cases, to very little use of collaterals at all in any of the cases reviewed. Offices where concerns were noted included:

- Ontario Region - The Women's Supervision Unit, Peel, Barrie, Sudbury (the reviewed noted that an "increase in the use of collaterals could be made," Toronto East, Thunder Bay deficiencies were noted, such as "progress monitored in the correctional plans in 3 of the 5 cases reviewed, collateral contacts made with friends and neighbours not entered as separate entries in OMS, and for one case, there was only 1 collateral contact made in over a seven month period;")
- Prairie Region - Lethbridge(the reviewer felt that there were four cases where collaterals were seen to be underutilized), Prince Albert, Winnipeg, Edmonton (the reviewer noted that "there needs to be a greater number of collateral contacts made, with more substance pertaining to the offender's correctional plan:
- Pacific Region - Abbotsford(limited in 3 cases reviewed), Prince George (the reviewer noted that collaterals were "not used to the greatest extent possible");
- Quebec Region - Estrie, Laurentides, Lafontaine, Laval;
- Atlantic Region - Halifax, Moncton (it was noted by the reviewed that "the use of collaterals is dependent on the judgement of the Parole Officer and in certain cases the frequency of contact with collaterals might appear insufficient," and in the St. John's audit it was noted that contact with collaterals was "most evident for those cases at a CBRF, use of collaterals for full parole/SR cases are reflective of the risk associated with the case."

**OTHER INFORMATION COLLECTED:**

***a) whether information received from releasing institution prior to offender's arrival in the community***

**Finding #4: In the majority of cases, the pertinent information on newly released offenders is arriving in the parole offices prior to the offenders. If late, it is not seen as significant because of the availability of information on OMS.**

The responses indicate that in the majority of cases, the relevant information is received prior to the offender's arrival, but it was noted that there is often no documentation on file to indicate the date that the files were received by the Parole Office. In the few cases where delays were encountered, it was noted that the offenders were generally released from institutions in another region.

Responses show that the late arrival of the required documentation may be more of a problem in the Ontario region, however if the documentation is received a few days after the offender's arrival, it is not seen as a major concern because of the availability of OMS.

***b) whether initial interviews are being scheduled within 24 hours of the offender's arrival in the community***

**Finding #5: With few exceptions, the responsibility centres reported that initial interviews are being scheduled and conducted within twenty-four hours of the offenders' arrival in the community of release.**

With few exceptions, the results of the self-assessment confirm that offenders are being seen within one(1) working day of their arrival in the community. Initial interview checklists are in use in most Parole Offices to record this interaction, and these checklists are usually signed-off by the offenders and the interviewing parole officer.

The noted exceptions to initial interviews with offenders within a twenty-four hour period after arrival in the community were due to particular circumstances, normally related to geographical limitations (i.e., distance of the offender's residence from the Parole Office). Responses indicated that there was phone contact in most cases where there was a delay in face-to-face contacts.

***c) when casework records are being entered into OMS within 7 days of the contact being made***

**Finding #6: Some delays are being experienced with respect to entering casework record information into the Offender Management System.**

When the tools were being prepared for this self-assessment review, it was decided by the Performance Assurance Sector and agreed to by the Community Section of the Reintegration Sector, that seven(7) days would be used as yardstick to measure the length of time offices use to enter casework records into OMS. This was not an official standard, but in spite of that, it was noted during the review that a large number of offices across the Service are ensuring that all entries into OMS occur within a seven(7) day timeframe.

When the 1999 audit was completed, the audit team found that in many offices, especially in the Quebec region, cases not in compliance with Supervision Standards regarding frequency of contacts with offenders, were due to their casework records not being entered into OMS in a timely manner. In some cases, the entries were made months after contacts with the offenders. In response to the outcome of that audit, several offices set a deadline of seven(7) days to ensure that parole officers enter all information from their contacts with offenders into Offender Management System.

The Supervision Standards states that parole officers must maintain clear, detailed and up-to-date casework records. The Standards do not indicate a timeframe for entry of these casework records into the Offender Management System (OMS). As a consequence, parole officers are often late entering the information from interviews with offenders into OMS.

The majority of offices answered the question pertaining to the seven(7) day timeframe as if it was a standard and indicated in their responses the reasons for any delays past the seven(7) days for the entry of casework records into OMS. Some offices, such as Winnipeg and Regina indicated that they were not aware of the 7-day requirement.

Whether the decision to use a seven day timeframe as an official standard will be made or not, the responses from the self-assessment received did indicate that there are still delays being encountered in some offices with respect to entering casework record information into OMS. Not all offices provided a rationale for the delays, but two significant reasons were noted:

- St. John's / Grand Falls, St. John, and Moncton, - Parole Officers are still dictating casework records for entry by clerks, often resulting in a delay.
- With respect to indirect supervision cases, the offices in Nanaimo, Kamloops, Prince Albert, Red Deer, Edmonton, and Langelier report that casework records

are forwarded on a monthly basis for input into OMS. In Prince George, this information is received twice per month.

***d) whether there is an active quality control function in each Parole Office***

**Finding #7: Quality control functions need to be improved to ensure ongoing monitoring of compliance to Frequency of Contact levels.**

The responses received from the self-assessment indicate that offices do have a quality control function in place to monitor the content of reports, such as Correctional Plans, Progress Reports or Assessments for Decision. However, the responses to the audit did not supply much information on how the quality control function is handled in their particular offices. The majority of responses indicated that the quality control function usually consists of reports being reviewed and co-signed by supervisions or senior parole officers. Some offices also indicated that quality control was achieved through regular case conferences. The Toronto Downtown office indicated that the parole supervisor "conducts regular self audits to ensure compliance."

However in most offices there was no indication of ongoing monitoring of Frequency of Contact levels to ensure compliance. A few offices did respond "yes" to the question on the audit tool regarding the monitoring of frequency of contacts with offenders, but did not provide any further information to indicate how this function is fulfilled.

***e) information sharing with the police***

**Finding #8: The police departments are provided with the necessary information on newly released offenders.**

Most offices indicated that it is general practice to provide information to the police, although this is not always recorded on the file. The information is provided in a number of different ways, automatically by the office clerk when the information is received on released offender, by computer disk, or in Toronto by a parole officer assigned to the Metro Toronto Police to provide all the information that is required.

Offices did note that the police are not provided with a copy of the NPB Decision Sheet, indicating that the Police normally do not want a copy of the Decision Sheet. Sop 700-06.75 indicates that National Parole Board Decision Sheets shall be provided to the police, "if applicable."

**f) case conferences**

**Finding #9: Case conferences are being held in all offices, but the frequency varies from office to office.**

As with the entry of offender contacts into OMS, the Supervision Standards are silent on timeframes for case conferences. The Standards simply indicate that "case conferences should be conducted at a frequency consistent with the offender's overall level of risk."

According to the responses received, case conferences are being held. Although it would appear that the frequency of these case conferences varies significantly from office to office. Ranges for timeframes when case conferences are held extend from every 6 weeks to every 6 months (to coincide with the required 6-month update of the CPPR).

There were some offices that were notable for the frequency of case conferences between supervisors and parole officers:

- Granby noted thirty-eight(38) case conferences over the time period reviewed in the six(6) cases;
- Quebec over seven(7) case conferences were held in each case reviewed for the time period under review; and
- In Longueuil, although regular case conferences were held in only thirteen(13) of the fifteen(15) cases reviewed, there were sixty-one(61) case conferences noted for the fifteen(15) cases.

Some offices, such as those within the Central District of Toronto, have established guidelines for case conferences, i.e. cases at FOC level A and B, have one(1) case conference per month; and for cases with FOC levels C & D there is a case conference every two(2) months. The case conferences can be held at a higher frequency, depending on the circumstances of the cases.

**OVERALL COMMENTS/FINDINGS:**

This audit was a compliance based, self -reporting evaluation of various aspects of community supervision of conditionally released offenders. All offices were requested to primarily report on face-to-face contacts, community contacts, and collateral contacts, with an overview of other areas of the supervision process. While all of the offices that

completed the exercise, completed the required Word Checklist on contacts and the roll-ups, the responses in the roll-up sections were varied across the Service.

Some managers provided in-depth information on the extent of compliance in their offices, using the tools as an opportunity to review the work of their parole officers and the quality of supervision.

All responses were taken into account in the report and the findings. A summary of the findings include:

**Finding #1:** All regions reported an increase in compliance with the minimum required Frequency of Contacts since the completion of the OMS audit in 1999.

**Finding #2:** The requirement for over 50% of face-to-face contacts take place in a community setting continues to be maintained in all regions.

**Finding #3:** Collateral contacts are underutilized in some cases.

**Finding #4:** In the majority of cases, the pertinent information on newly released information is arriving in the offices prior to the offenders. But if late, it is not seen as significant because of the availability of information within OMS.

**Finding #5:** With few exceptions, the responsibility centres reported that initial interviews are being scheduled and conducted, within twenty-four hours of the offenders' arrival in the community after release.

**Finding #6:** Some delays are being experienced with respect to entering casework record information into OMS

**Finding #7:** Quality control functions need to be improved to ensure ongoing monitoring of compliance to Frequency of Contact levels.

**Finding #8:** Case conferences are being held in all offices, but the frequency varies from office to office.

**Finding #9:** The police are provided with the necessary information on newly released offenders.

## APPENDIX A

### METHODOLOGY

The information in the report is based on the self-reported information from the offices across the Service. The objective of the audit was to determine the number of cases in full compliance for a six(6) month review period. Full compliance was achieved when all of the required contacts were satisfactorily completed for each of the six(6) months reviewed. In keeping with the consistency of the previous Frequency of Contact audit completed by National Headquarters in 1999, only face to face contacts were taken into consideration during this review. It was also requested that the majority of files reviewed have a level A or level B intervention level, so that the assessment would cover as much as possible, the high risk, high need offenders.

Since the audit was a self-analysis, the case review tools were distributed to all parole offices across the country. The package consisted of a WORD checklist and an EXCEL section to be used as a rollup. A WORD Checklist was completed on each file selected, with the collected information from the selected files for the appropriate six(6) month period indicating:

- a) the level of intervention, and if the intervention changed during the 6 months being reviewed;
- b) the date of each contact with the offender;
- c) the place where the contact occurred; and
- d) the collateral contact.

In order to achieve a more complete picture of the cases, it was requested that any peculiarities or problems with any case be explained in the comment section.

The EXCEL Section, consisting of twenty-five(25) questions was to be completed after all WORD Checklists were filled in. The pages of this section consisted of a set of policy requirements and acted as a roll-up, or over all snapshot of the review exercise.

The offices were instructed to use the tools to collect information for a six(6) month period, on the Frequency of Contacts for approximately 10% of the offenders under supervision in a particular office. Larger offices were directed to examine about fifteen(15) to twenty(20) files and smaller offices were requested to attempt to examine

at least 10% of their files, with at least five(5) files reviewed. Indirect supervision, as well as direct supervision was evaluated.

The direction for the exercise was to select files at random. Several options were offered to management staff for consideration to aid the offices in selecting the files and completing the review. Files of offenders who had been released to the community for at least six(6) months were to be used, and direction was given to set a definite six(6) month span for the review. An example: to use files of offenders who were released before May 1, 2000 and to set the review time period for May 1/00 to December 1,2000. Reviewers were to distinguish the number of contacts between the office and the community, and record the collateral contacts made in each case.

To ensure compliance, the reviewer had to ensure that if the frequency of contact (FOC) was set at level A (A-4), the casework records indicated the offender was seen at least four(4) times in the month reviewed. There was some minor subjectivity in the analysis, in that there should be a reasonable amount of time between each contact. However, two contacts the first of the month and no contact again until the last week of the month would be seen as a non-compliant case. If there were five(5) weeks in a given month, and four(4) face to face contacts was made, the case could be seen as in full compliance.

Likewise, if the frequency of contact was set at level B (B-2), the casework records were required to indicate that the offender was seen at least two(2) times per month, within a reasonable period of time. The completed overall review was to be signed off as complete by the Area Manager and the District Director, before it was returned for analysis to National Headquarters.

At NHQ, the results were reviewed and calculated by:

- a) the minimum number of contacts required in the period reviewed, the FOC,
- b) the number of face-to-face contacts that took place,
- c) minimum number of community contacts required, i.e. 50% of overall contacts,
- d) number of contacts that took place in the community,
- e) the number of collateral contacts, and
- f) the number of compliant months, out of six.

**APPENDIX B  
NUMBER OF CASES REVIEWED FROM  
EACH INDIVIDUAL PAROLE OFFICE**

AREA OFFICE	# CASES REVIEWED	AREA OFFICE	# CASES REVIEWED
<b>ATLANTIC</b>		<b>QUEBEC</b>	
Kentville	10	Longueuil	15
Halifax	8	Ville Marie	20
Truro	11 <sup>1</sup>	LaFontaine	13 <sup>2</sup>
Sydney	9	Langelier	20
Dartmouth	8	Granby	6
Moncton	12	Etrie	6
Charlottetown	5	Quebec	20
Bathurst	6	Rimouski	6
Saint John <sup>3</sup>	5	Chicoutimi	5
Fredericton	5	Trois Rivieres	9
St. John's <sup>4</sup> & Grand Falls	10	Laval	12
Corner Brook	5	Rouyn-Noranda	5
		Hull	7
<b>Atlantic TOTAL</b>	<b>94</b>	Laurentides	13
		Lanaudiere	10
		<b>Quebec TOTAL</b>	<b>167</b>
<b>PRAIRIES</b>		<b>ONTARIO</b>	
Winnipeg	34	Kingston	11
Saskatoon	9	Peterborough <sup>5</sup>	0

<sup>1</sup> Of the Truro cases, 2 were reviewed for 5 months and 1 for a little over 4 months.

<sup>2</sup> The LaFontaine office reviewed two other cases, however they have not been counted in this exercise. They were both intensive supervision cases requiring 8 contacts per month. One was in compliance but the other had no contacts recorded after mid-March and a call to the office indicated that the data has been lost.

<sup>3</sup> Of the Saint John cases, 4 out of the 5 reviewed were reviewed for 5 months.

<sup>4</sup> Of the 11 cases reviewed by the St. John's office, one was not counted for this exercise because there seemed to have been an exemption give to the supervision of the case, but it was not clear and there were only a few contacts recorded. In addition, 6 of the cases reviewed were reviewed for 5 months or less.

<sup>5</sup> Cases from the Peterborough office have not been included in this exercise because the office only reviewed all of the cases for one month.

AREA OFFICE	# CASES REVIEWED	AREA OFFICE	# CASES REVIEWED
Regina	14 <sup>6</sup>	Ottawa	20
Prince Albert	10	Barrie	5
Calgary	47 <sup>7</sup>	Sudbury	5
Yellowknife	5		
Brandon	6		
Thunder Bay	5		
Thompson	5	Toronto Downtown	17
Edmonton	54 <sup>8</sup>	Toronto East (incl. the NE GTA)	24 (including the NE GTA)
Lethbridge	5	Toronto West	15
Red Deer	7	Peel	18
<b>Prairie TOTAL</b>	<b>201</b>	Hamilton	17
		Women's Supervision Unit	9
<b>PACIFIC</b>		Windsor	6
Kamloops	5	London	10
Kelowna	5	Guelph	10
Vernon	4	Brantford	6
Vancouver	17	St. Catharines	6
Victoria	11 <sup>9</sup>		
Nanaimo	6	Team Supervision Unit	5
Prince George	6	<b>Ontario TOTAL</b>	<b>184</b>
New Westminister	16		
Chilliwack	5		
Abbotsford	6		
<b>Pacific TOTAL</b>	<b>81</b>		

<sup>6</sup> The Regina office actually reviewed 15 cases, but only 14 were counted for this exercise because one case had only 2 months' contacts recorded (the 4 other cases were recorded for 5 - 5.5 months).

<sup>7</sup> The Calgary office actually reviewed 48 cases, but only 47 were counted for this exercise because one case was suspended twice for extensive periods of time, allowing less than 2 months to review.

<sup>8</sup> The Edmonton office actually reviewed 55 cases, but only 54 were counted because in one case, the level of intervention was listed as A-4 but there were only 8 contacts recorded & the roll-up sheet indicated only 6 contacts required, therefore it was felt that the wrong intervention level was indicated. (In 2 cases the roll-up sheet and the spreadsheet were not in agreement regarding the # of contacts that were needed.)

<sup>9</sup> The Victoria office submitted 12 cases, but one was under suspension & no contacts were recorded.

**APPENDIX C**

**COMPARISON OF RESULTS (by months audited)**

**NHQ 1999 AUDIT and CURRENT SELF ASSESSMENT**

1999				2001		
Parole Office	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant
<b>PACIFIC</b>						
New Westminster	126	74	59%	96	85	89%
Vancouver	144	94	65%	102	98	96%
Vernon	24	16	67%	24	22	92%
Kelowna	24	20	83%	30	30	100%
Kamloops	24	14	58%	30	27	90%
Chilliwack	18	10	56%	30	27	90%
Abbotsford	84	57	68%	36	28	78%
Nanaimo	30	12	40%	36	35	97%
Victoria	84	60	71%	66	57	86%
Prince George	66	55	83%	36	28	78%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>PRAIRIES</b>						
Winnipeg	144	63	44%	204	184	90%
Brandon	18	11	61%	36	36	100%
Calgary	150	119	79%	282	258	91%
Saskatoon	66	51	77%	54	51	94%

1999				2001		
Parole Office	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant
Lethbridge	18	13	72%	30	29	97%
NWT (Now Yellowknife)	18	14	78%	30	29	97%
Thunder Bay	18	14	78%	30	29	97%
Red Deer	36	22	61%	42	35	83%
Thompson	12	9	75%	30	23	77%
Medicine Hat	12	10	83%			
Drumheller	12	11	92%			
Regina	84	77	92%	81	79	98%
Prince Albert	96	39	41%	60	46	77%
Edmonton	150	117	78%	324	256	79%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>1203</b>	<b>1055</b>	<b>88%</b>
ONTARIO						
St Catherines	42	40	95%	35	34	97%
Ottawa	132	88	67%	120	106	88%
Peel	90	73	81%	101	73	72%
Sudbury	48	37	77%	30	29	97%
Barrie	36	26	72%	30	27	90%
Nunavut	12	0	0%			
Muskoka	12	12	100%			
Peterborough	54	10	19%			
Toronto East	150	116	77%	140	129	92%

1999				2001		
Parole Office	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant
Sault Ste. Marie	12	8	67%			
Toronto West	150	101	67%	88	86	98%
Kingston	114	91	80%	66	55	83%
Timmins	6	2	33%			
Hamilton	102	99	97%	102	99	97%
Guelph	78	53	68%	60	59	98%
Toronto Downtown	126	117	93%	101	92	91%
Women's Sup. Unit.	60	54	90%	54	50	93%
Brantford	30	21	70%	36	34	94%
Windsor	54	42	78%	35.5	30.5	86%
London	72	48	67%	60	43	72%
<b>TOTAL</b>	1380	1038	75%	1058.5	946.5	89%
<b>QUEBEC</b>						
Lafontaine	114	33	29%	78	72	92%
Etrie	48	32	67%	36	35	97%
Granby	54	38	70%	36	34	94%
Longueuil	126	108	86%	90	82	91%
Ville Marie	150	48	32%	118	114	97%
Québec	126	101	80%	120	116	97%
Trois Rivières	60	44	73%	52	48	92%

1999				2001		
Parole Office	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant
Rouyn-Noranda	24	17	71%	30	30	100%
Hull	48	43	90%	42	42	100%
Lanaudière	66	54	82%	60	59	98%
Laurentian	60	48	80%	78	77	99%
Laval	66	54	82%	71	64	90%
Chicoutimi	30	30	100%	30	28	93%
Rimouski	24	24	100%	36	34	94%
Langelier	150	46	31%	120	109	90%
<b>TOTAL</b>	1146	720	63%	997	944	95%
<b>ATLANTIC</b>						
Grand Falls NB						
Grand Sault NB						
Truro	48	41	85%	62	60	97%
Saint John	60	43	72%	26	25	96%
Kentville	48	45	94%	59	57	97%
Corner Brook	18	16	89%	30	30	100%
Moncton	84	76	90%	72	70	97%
Bathurst	24	23	96%	36	33	92%
Happy Valley	6	1	17%			
Sydney	36	35	97%	54	54	100%
Dartmouth	54	42	78%	48	41	85%
Fredericton	36	34	94%	30	29	97%

1999				2001		
Parole Office	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant	Total # of months audited	Total # of months compliant	% of months compliant
St. John's(for 2001 includes Grand Falls)	54	43	80%	53	45	85%
Charlottetown	54	52	96%	30	28	93%
Halifax	66	57	86%	48	43	90%
<b>TOTAL</b>	618	535	87%	548	515	94%
<b>National Total</b>	<b>4602</b>	<b>3275</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>4292.5</b>	<b>3897.5</b>	<b>91%</b>