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ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

This Evaluation of Correctional Service of Canada’s Employment Strategy was conducted between April 2007 and June 2008, and coincides with the Evaluation of Correctional Programs. Both evaluations are large in scope and correspond with two significant departmental reviews: an independent panel review, a strategic review. The evaluations also coincide with an audit being conducted by the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) Canada.

Results of the first review were published in December 2007, “A Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety”. The report was prepared by an independent Review Panel established by the Minister of Public Safety, the Honourable Stockwell Day. The review focussed on the operations, policies and plans of CSC in order to strengthen its contribution to public safety. Briefly, the report sets out a vision for transforming the federal corrections system based on an increased emphasis on offender responsibility and accountability, the elimination of drugs from prisons, the provision of more employment and employability skills for offenders, and the modernization of physical infrastructure.

The second review, as part of the renewal of Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat’s (TBS) Expenditure Management System (EMS), is being led by the TBS and is a review of departments’ program spending over a 4-year cycle. This review will assess whether departments are achieving intended results, managing programs efficiently, and aligning programs with the government’s priorities. The strategic review of CSC’s program spending began in the fall of 2007 and will examine program effectiveness and opportunities for savings or reallocation.

Finally, in June 2007 the Office of the Auditor General of Canada began an audit of the efficiency and economy of CSC services. The audit proposed to examine the cost of various services, how they are i) structured (national, regional, institutional, community), ii) developed, iii) delivered, iv) evaluated, and v) paid (FTEs, contract, contribution, etc.). Differences will be disaggregated in the audit across regions and federal institutions, as well as offender groups. The services which are expected to be a focus of the audit are health services (meeting offenders physical and mental health needs), institutional services (meals, clean working and living environments, necessary supplies and clothing, options to purchase personal items), accommodation services (suitable accommodation and living conditions), security of offenders (security needs of offenders are identified, addressed within human rights context), program development and delivery, case management, and CORCAN, as well as other relevant services.
READING THIS REPORT

This document begins with an executive summary which summarizes all areas of the report as well as the key findings and recommendations resulting from this evaluation. Following the executive summary is the body of the document which includes: 1) a brief introduction to Employment and Employability Programs (EEP); 2) information pertaining to the evaluation strategy; 3) participant profiles; 4) key findings; 5) concluding remarks; and 6) appendices. The key findings section of this document is structured according to the standard evaluation objectives; continued relevance, success, cost-effectiveness and unintended findings.

In order to facilitate the reading of this report, the key findings section has been presented in a particular format. Specifically, the beginning of each section commences with a broader based “Summary Finding”, followed by the supporting “Findings” which are more specific in nature. Subsequently, the qualitative and quantitative analyses that were conducted to arrive at each “Finding” are presented. Importantly, only “Summary Findings” appear in the Executive Summary. Headers are provided in the upper right corner of each page in order to assist the reader in finding areas of particular interest.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Within CSC, CORCAN\(^1\) is the organization responsible for the management of offender employment. As such, CORCAN plays a key role in CSC’s mandate to enhance public safety by providing offenders with the employment experience and skills they need to become productive citizens upon their return to the community. Recently, a report from an external review panel\(^2\) indicated that employment initiatives for offenders have been eclipsed over the past decades with the advent and wide development and distribution of programs designed to address other core need areas (e.g., substance abuse and violence). This evaluation contributes to knowledge concerning the current state of Employment and Employability Programs (EEP) as evidenced by the relevancy, success, and cost-effectiveness of related employment initiatives.

The evaluation, led by the Evaluation Branch, was conducted in collaboration with the Research Branch. This approach facilitated not only the exchange of ideas and expertise, but ensured the efficient completion of various project components. The purpose of the current evaluation was to examine two major components of EEP\(^3\), more specifically, the intake assessment and assignment process and the institutional intervention process, as they relate to employment initiatives and resulting correctional outcomes. The goal of this evaluation was to provide a comprehensive analysis of EEP, considering both process and outcome issues as they relate to offender, staff, and community partner perspectives and results.

Numerous consultations were completed throughout the duration of this project. In the beginning stages of the evaluation, a consultative group was formed in order to provide feedback regarding approach and methodology, as well as reviewing the Terms of Reference, the Results Based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF), and the final report. The consultative group included representation from CORCAN, the Comptroller’s Branch, and Correctional Operations and Programs. In order to ensure that the evaluation was as comprehensive and representative as possible, additional consultations were conducted with the Regional Administrators, Correctional Programs, the Assistant Wardens, Intervention, the Women Offender Sector, and Aboriginal Initiatives.

Evaluation Strategy

The current evaluation utilized a multi-method approach, thereby ensuring the triangulation of data and the receipt of appropriate feedback from key stakeholders. Qualitative and quantitative methodologies were utilized to conduct the evaluation. Information was collected through:

- A review of relevant documentation, including employment literature, employment related policies and procedures, and CORCAN materials;

\(^1\) For more information regarding CORCAN, please consult their website: http://infonet/corcan/home_e.shtml


\(^3\) Importantly, these two components represent only part of the EEP continuum. The community focused initiatives resulting from EEP are scheduled to be examined in the 2008 / 2009 fiscal year by the Evaluation Branch.
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- Automated data collection, including information from the Community Employment Centres and queries of CSC’s Offender Management System (OMS);
- CORCAN financial and annual reports, Integrated Financial & Material Management System (IFMMS), Corporate Reporting System, and the Cost of Maintaining Offenders (COMO) database; and,
- Surveys with staff and community partners; and
- Interviews with inmates.

In all, three samples were utilized to contribute to various aspects of this evaluation: 1) Institutional Sample: drawn from the OMS; 2) Community Employment Centre Sub-sample: a sub-sample of the institutional sample, drawn from the Community Employment Centres (CEC); and 3) Qualitative Sample: resulting from the offender interviews and staff / community partner surveys that were conducted.

Summary Findings

Objective 1: Continued Relevancy:

Summary Finding 1 (Relevance of EEP): Employment and Employability Programs (EEP) continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities and address the employment needs of offenders. Furthermore, inmate pay and incentive pay policy is relevant, as evidenced by similar practices in diverse jurisdictions. However, employment opportunities within the institutions do not necessarily respond efficiently to labour market needs and there is an insufficient number of both meaningful employment activities and work release opportunities. Finally, although viewed as useful when incorporating EEP into an offender’s correctional plan, vocational assessments are not viewed, by staff, as relevant given the employment opportunities available in the institution and in the community.

Objective 2: Success:

Efficiency:

Summary Finding 2 (Vocational Assessments): Vocational assessments are viewed as both accurate and useful by offenders; however, in considering the large number of offenders identified at intake with employment needs, a relatively low number of offenders are being provided with the opportunity to complete vocational assessments.

Summary Finding 3 (Assignment of Employment Interventions): Assignment to employment interventions is not based solely on identified employment need and staff indicated that the greatest roadblocks to the effective incorporation of EEP into an offender’s correctional plan include: lack of available job placements and vocational programs, competing priorities in terms of offenders’ other programming needs, and offenders’ refusal to participate.

Summary Finding 4 (Vocational Congruence): In considering the level of vocational congruence provided by employment interventions, relatively high rates of vocational congruence are being achieved. Offenders and staff indicated that employment interventions are congruent with
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offenders’ interests and effectively use offenders’ skills and abilities. This finding is particularly true for CORCAN employment positions and work releases.

Summary Finding 5 (Productivity / Institutional Incidents): Employment and vocational programs improved the overall functioning of the institution and time in employment programming was predictive of a decreased involvement in institutional incidents. Furthermore, as compared to offenders in CSC employment and the comparison group, offenders in ‘core employment programs’ were involved in significantly fewer institutional incidents. Finally, offenders stated that they were making a productive contribution and reported their jobs and work releases as a good use of their time. Importantly, these findings vary slightly for Aboriginal and women offenders

Effectiveness:

Summary Finding 6 (Reintegration / Job Readiness): In considering job readiness, reductions in employment need, and reintegration, in comparison to institutional employment opportunities, it appears that vocational programs, CORCAN employment and work releases were viewed as being particularly effective. Furthermore, offenders expressed motivation to become involved in third party certification programming, both within and outside of the institution, but did not associate involvement in employment interventions with the likelihood of gaining conditional release. Importantly, community partners indicated that offenders were NOT job ready upon release.

Summary Finding 7 (Job Attainment): Proportion of time in employment programming was predictive of job attainment in the community. Furthermore, CORCAN employment, vocational programs and work release opportunities were viewed by staff as facilitating the attainment of community employment upon release; however, this was not the case for institutional employment. Although offenders indicated that they were not encouraged to seek out resources in the community, community partners suggested the opposite; that is, offenders were encouraged to seek out community resources. Low employment skills, holding a criminal record and low education and / or certification were identified as the greatest roadblocks to accessing employment in the community.

Summary Finding 8 (Job Retention): Staff indicated that participating in CORCAN employment, vocational programs, and work release opportunities increase the likelihood that offenders will retain their employment in the community. However, involvement in EEP did not emerge as a significant predictor of job retention.

Summary Finding 9 (Recidivism): The proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being readmitted to federal custody, being reconvicted for a new offence, and being reconvicted for a new violent offence. However, as compared to offenders who are employed in the community, offenders who are unemployed are significantly more likely to recidivate. Finally, vocational congruence may prove relevant in the examination of recidivism given that, as compared to unemployed offenders and offenders in community employment that is low in terms of vocational congruence, offenders in community
employment that is highly congruent with their vocational interests remaining in the community longer.

**Objective 3: Cost-Effectiveness:**

Summary Finding 10 (Cost-Effectiveness): On a per inmate basis, Employment and Employability Programs (EEP) are offered in a cost-efficient manner, and economical in comparison to other interventions. Furthermore, high participation and successful completion rates in EEP are associated with lower unit costs and EEP are cost-effective in increasing participants’ likelihood of obtaining early institutional release. In addition, employment programs are cost-effective in increasing offenders’ ability to obtain employment in the community. Finally, staff viewed CORCAN’s role of maintaining self-sufficiency as taking precedence over the role of contributing to successful offender reintegration.

Summary Finding 11 (Incentive Pay): Incentive pay is viewed as being a positive motivator and contributing to a sense of independence and self-sufficiency as well as productivity. Jobs offering incentive pay are also viewed as more appealing by offenders. However, the fair distribution of incentive pay job opportunities is viewed differently by both staff and offenders and staff indicated that incentive pay causes conflict among offenders.

**Objective 4: Unintended Outcomes:**

Summary Finding 12 (Unintended Outcomes): There is a shortage of vocational programs, work release options and job opportunities. However, according to offenders, existing EEP assisted them in “staying out of trouble”, keeping occupied, increasing positive work habits, learning new skills and knowledge, and gaining confidence with job skills. Furthermore, numerous EEP best practices are actively being undertaken by a variety of institutions across the country.

**Recommendations:**

**RECOMMENDATION A (1):** CSC should determine what is necessary to ensure that those offenders identified as eligible to complete a vocational assessment, receive a vocational assessment. Furthermore, although critical in the assessment of employment needs (as they permit the determination of vocational congruence), given the feedback from staff, the relevance and applicability of vocational assessments should be further considered in light of the available institutional and community employment opportunities. Finally, staff training / information sessions concerning the relevance, applicability, value, and validity of vocational assessments should be conducted.

**RECOMMENDATION B (3):** There is a need to: i) examine the utility and efficiency of the employment assessment (i.e., Form 1253); ii) ensure the implementation and utilization of a nationally standardized vocational assessment tool that is appropriate for men and women offenders, as well as Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders (e.g., meets language and educational realities); and iii) develop appropriate procedures for those assessments that are postponed for educational or operational reasons. Furthermore, automated data from both employment and vocational assessments should be readily accessible on OMS. Notably, in
implementing a nationally standardized vocational assessment tool, it will be critical to consider both the cultural differentiation and varying spiritual perspectives of the offender population.

RECOMMENDATION C (4): CSC needs to ensure that those offenders identified with employment needs are receiving adequate employment intervention and support throughout their period of incarceration. In doing so, consideration should be given to the most advantageous “blend / ratio” of both skilled and unskilled program / work participants, thereby ensuring optimal productivity, teaching, and learning environments. Resulting outcomes should then be directly reflected in policy documents.

RECOMMENDATION D (5): CSC should ensure that generic work descriptions, along with the true skill level required for a given employment position, are carefully considered throughout the offender’s period of incarceration, thereby leading to more effective employment assignments and concrete vocational outcomes that will add value to employment interventions and lead to more successful employment outcomes.

RECOMMENDATION E (10): CSC should further consider the relevance of security environment (i.e., minimum vs. medium vs. maximum security) and its impact on the delivery of employment interventions. The environment should be capable of providing an intervention that is most reflective of the community work environment (i.e., more closely resemble a typical “real world” work week).

RECOMMENDATION F (2): CSC’s EEP would benefit by ensuring the continued monitoring and analysis of labour market needs, direction, and trends. CSC should ensure the alignment of EEP with labour market demand. It will be equally critical that monitoring and analyses are both region and site specific. Meeting labour market need may be achieved in part by ensuring that all offenders develop appropriate employability skills, as identified by the Conference Board of Canada. Importantly, although not isolated within this evaluation, the National Employability Skills Program (NESP) delivers these employability skills.

RECOMMENDATION G (6): CSC should examine current certification processes in order to determine how: 1) increased opportunities for vocational training lead to third party certification; and 2) related partnerships can be achieved. Increased third party certifications may contribute to the maintenance of high enrolment and completion rates, thereby maintaining cost-efficiency. Furthermore, the vocational description tables identifying details surrounding third party certification should be continuously monitored and updated.

RECOMMENDATION H (7): CSC should continue efforts to advance an approach that will lead to increased job retention rates for offenders. This may be facilitated by a continuity of data collection and management, in which relevant employment information, for a given offender, is adequately gathered and recorded at intake assessment, applied through the employment intervention process, and maintained through release into the community (i.e., job attainment and retention). This approach should ensure the collection of automated data which reflect the organization’s ability to maintain continuity for the offender as these relate to their employment needs, intervention efforts, and vocational aspirations.
RECOMMENDATION I (8): CSC should more closely analyze the relationships between job attainment, job retention, and recidivism. This analysis would be facilitated by improved data integrity (as discussed in Recommendation 7).

RECOMMENDATION J (9): CSC should implement a national communications strategy in relation to ongoing employment initiatives, best practices, outcomes, challenges, lessons learned, and successes.

RECOMMENDATION K (11): CSC should continue efforts to ensure that an automated offender schedule that accommodates attendance and pay is developed and implemented.

Conclusions

This evaluation contributes to our knowledge on Employment and Employability Programs within the Correctional Service of Canada. Results indicate a number of positive outcomes, yet limitations still exist. Importantly, in considering the facilitation of EEP across security levels and regions, differences have been highlighted. More specifically, lower levels of security (i.e., minimum and medium) are often viewed as being more efficient and effective at delivering employment and employability interventions. Furthermore, regionally, it appears that different strengths and weaknesses emerge from various areas of the country. This highlights the necessity for ongoing communication in terms of best practices, “what works”, and what has yet to be mastered. Furthermore, it seems evident that all parties involved in this evaluation see benefits of EEP; however, gaps exist in terms of availability of job placements and vocational programs. Finally, the true meaningfulness of current intervention opportunities is arguably lacking.

Following the release of this evaluation report, a Management Action Plan (MAP) will be developed based on the findings and recommendations outlined above. Accordingly, the Office of Primary Interest (OPI) will take on the responsibility for implementing this MAP. In all likelihood, within five years, another evaluation of EEP within CSC will be conducted and at that time, it is hoped that outcomes for staff, offenders and community partners will reflect continued growth and improvement in the area of employment and employability interventions and their ability to contribute to: 1) public safety; 2) the operations, and safety and security, of institutions; and 3) the well-being of staff and offenders.
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRSDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFMMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAACJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIASEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHMIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In Canadian federal institutions, approximately 65% of male offenders (77% for those under 25 years of age at time of admission)\textsuperscript{4}, and almost two-thirds of women\textsuperscript{5} are unemployed at the time of their arrest. Furthermore, more than half of newly admitted men and women have been identified as having needs in the area of employment\textsuperscript{6}. This is important given that offenders with unstable employment patterns have been found to be at a much greater risk of re-offending than offenders with a stable employment history. In fact, results of several meta-analyses have indicated that employment history and employment needs at time of release are predictive of criminal recidivism\textsuperscript{7}. In addition, employment has been found to be a significant contributor to successful offender reintegration in the community\textsuperscript{8}.

Given the link between employment and criminality, correctional organizations recognize the need for correctional interventions in the form of employment programming. Prison employment programs have been found to offer a number of benefits to inmates\textsuperscript{9}, including work experience and a positive impact on behaviour. Research indicates that prison industries and vocational programs contribute to the safe and orderly operation of institutions\textsuperscript{10}. In turn, employment programs assist in reducing prison misconduct and improving inmate institutional adjustment.


Institutional employment and post-release programs also have the potential to assist offenders in developing the skills and competencies necessary to secure and maintain employment within their communities, thereby further contributing to their successful reintegration into society. For instance, a study in Canadian federal institutions demonstrated that participation in prison work programs had a positive impact on post-release recidivism\(^{11}\). Furthermore, participation in post-release programs appears to enhance offenders’ ability to find work\(^ {12}\), as well as positively influencing their release outcomes\(^ {13}\).

1.2 CSC’s Employment Strategy

Within CSC, CORCAN\(^ {14}\) is the organization responsible for the management of offender employment. Designated a Special Operating Agency (SOA) by the Treasury Board in 1992, CORCAN’s mandate is:

To aid in the safe reintegration of offenders into Canadian society by providing employment and employability skills training to offenders incarcerated in federal penitentiaries and, for brief periods of time, after they are released into the community.

CORCAN plays a key role in CSC’s mandate to enhance public safety by providing offenders with the employment experience and skills they need to become productive citizens upon their return to the community. Moreover, CORCAN’s mandate is consistent with CSC’s strategic priority to contribute to the safe transition of offenders into the community. Further, given that institutional employment provides opportunities for offenders to contribute to the operation and maintenance of Canada’s institutions, these initiatives may assist in reducing the costs of incarceration and rehabilitation\(^ {15}\).

\(^{14}\) For more information regarding CORCAN, please consult their website: http://infonet/corcan/home_e.shtml
\(^{15}\) As cited on CORCAN’s webpage.
The Employment and Employability Program (EEP) provides a strategic approach to the attainment of CORCAN’s mandate. The goals of the EEP include enhancing inmates’ chances of finding and keeping employment upon release, providing inmates with a sense of purpose, and helping them to develop and maintain those generic competencies required to be employable in today’s market. In order to reach these goals, CORCAN has established an employment continuum (Appendix 1), ranging from offender intake assessment, through program assignment, job readiness programs, and skills building in the institution to employment services in the community.

1.2.1 Objectives
The ultimate goal of the EEP is to provide offenders with as many vocational and employment opportunities as possible, in the institution and in the community, thereby contributing to positive and productive engagement upon their release into the community. This is accomplished by improving the offenders’ capacity to obtain and maintain employment once they are released into the community, thus positively influencing safe reintegration. The purpose of the EEP is therefore to enhance the job readiness of every offender.

As outlined in the EEP Governing Principles, the objectives of the EEP can be summarized as follows:

- Enhance the employability of offenders;
- Develop the employability skills of offenders through institutional work experience and basic employability skill courses;
- Provide a sense of purpose to inmates and contribute to a safe institutional environment;
- Link employment-related activities / interventions that span from intake to community release so that offenders remain employable during incarceration and within the community; and
- Assist with institutional self-sufficiency, thereby lowering the cost of incarceration.

---

16 For more information regarding the EEP, including governing principles and program collaboration, please consult the following website: http://infonet/corcan/eep_e.shtml#2
17 Case Management Bulletin: Employment and Employability Program (EEP).
18 Please consult the following website: http://infornet/corcan/documents/eepgp_e.doc
The objectives of the EEP are clearly linked with CSC’s Program Activity Architecture (PAA), as captured in the Strategic Outcome stating: “offenders are safely and effectively accommodated and reintegrated into Canadian communities with due regard for public safety”. Three program activities support this Strategic Outcome: Care and Custody, Rehabilitation and Case Management, and CORCAN. These activities include, but are not limited to, ongoing case management efforts, and the provision of employment and employability skills through program development and delivery, which incorporates inmate pay. Case management and inmate pay will be discussed briefly below.

1.2.2 Assessment & Assignment Process: Case Management

The Dynamic Factor Identification Analysis (DFIA) is utilized by CSC as part of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process which includes an employment and education domain. If offenders are assessed as exhibiting employment or education needs, they are then further assessed to determine if they are eligible to complete a vocational assessment. CSC’s vocational assessment package includes the Career and Occupational Preference System (COPS, interests), and the Career Ability Placement Survey (CAPS, abilities). This package is designed to assist individuals in the career decision-making process, through an assessment of their interests and abilities. The purpose of this type of assessment is to determine an inmate’s aptitude or ability to function in a particular assignment / program, in hopes of ensuring ideal intervention processes, thereby achieving higher rates of successful reintegration.

In considering the significance of such an assessment package, it is important to recognize that researchers suggest that more attention needs to be focused on the employment needs of offenders and related skill acquisition. Furthermore, research suggests that employment-related variables, different from those traditionally examined, need to be studied for their

---

20 All regions use this package, with the exception of Quebec which uses a vocational instrument called “D’aptitudes Informatisé”. In the Pacific Region, the Vocational Preference Inventory (Holland, J.L. (1977). Vocational Preference Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.; Holland, J. L. (1985). Vocational Preference Inventory manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.) is used as a reliability check for the COPS. Finally, the Prairies Region is currently piloting an instrument called “ESPORT”.
potential impact on correctional outcomes\textsuperscript{22}. Finally, others point to an absence of theoretical clarification of the connection between work programs and the post-release offending behaviour of inmates\textsuperscript{23}. They argue that empirical evaluations of the effects of programs resolve questions of effectiveness but “fail to illuminate the mechanics of why and how programs work” (p. 348). Accordingly, more attention needs to be focused on how and why employment programming and intervention efforts are, or are not, successful.

A more in-depth analysis of the vocational assessment and assignment process may provide us with additional information regarding the “why and how” of program effectiveness. More specifically, if employment intervention assignments are based on the vocational assessment outcomes, that is, if interventions correspond to the offenders’ interests and abilities, perhaps those offenders placed in “congruent” employment interventions are more successful than those placed in “incongruent” interventions. There is evidence to suggest that vocational congruence (i.e., agreement between vocational interests and vocational opportunities) is critical to vocational satisfaction, stability and success\textsuperscript{24}. For this reason, interventions providing increased vocational congruence may increase the likelihood of offenders successfully participating in, and eventually appropriately applying the skills and work principles gained through employment interventions.

1.2.3 Enrolment: Inmate Pay / Incentive Pay

Part of the success of institutional employment and employability programs is encouraging, motivating, and providing offenders with the necessary skills to become meaningfully and lawfully employed. One possible motivational tool is incentive pay. The concept behind this is to establish a contract prior to a performance that promises a financial reward for a specific action. In doing so, it is thought to drive performance intrinsically (personal satisfaction) or


extrinsically (tangible reward)\textsuperscript{25}. Therefore, when properly designed and implemented, incentive pay plans may be effective motivational tools, especially for the offender population. CORCAN operates the incentive pay program for inmates within CSC institutions. Incentive pay is offered to inmates as: 1) *group incentive*, where all workers benefit when certain productivity levels are reached; 2) *piece work* (based on individual productivity); or 3) at an hourly rate (based on productive hours worked). Incentive pay is only awarded for quality production, and not for rework or repair activities. More specifically, the incentive plan is applied in CORCAN operations where there will be a: 1) net increase in revenue or a decrease in costs after payment of the incentive; 2) regular inmate pay and incentive pay, combined, do not exceed the federal minimum wage rate in the case of inmates working on federal penitentiary reserves, or the prevailing minimum provincial wage in the case of inmates working at locations other than federal penitentiary reserves; and 3) inmates who receive pay are subject to deductions, such as room and board, in accordance with a schedule established in CSC policy Commissioner’s Directive (CD) # 730.

Within CSC, offenders are paid on a per day work basis according to four levels: level A ($6.90), level B ($6.35), level C ($5.80) and level D ($5.25). Offenders are able to progress through the pay levels based on performance standards in relation to all program assignments in their correctional plan for a given period of time. With regard to inmate payment, within CSC, incentive pay is currently limited to $13.80 a day per inmate, and will not exceed $138 in any given pay period (i.e., bi-weekly)\textsuperscript{26}. Furthermore, the maximum that an inmate can now be paid per pay period is $207 (including base pay, overtime, and incentive pay)\textsuperscript{27}. CSC pays for all base pay in institutions, while CORCAN pays for incentive pay only. CORCAN spends approximately $1.6 to 1.8 million per year on incentive pay\textsuperscript{28}.


\textsuperscript{26} It was previously a “true” incentive, but was “capped” in the year 2000; Personal Communication with Jeff Stapledon, September 18, 2006.

\textsuperscript{27} CORCAN Governing Principles Manual, GP 3.1-05.

\textsuperscript{28} Personal communication with Jeff Stapledon, September 18, 2006.
2.0 EVALUATION STRATEGY

2.1 Logic Model

The evaluation strategy, including the evaluation questions and outcomes of interest, was formulated based on the activities, outputs, and outcomes outlined in the EEP Logic Model (see Appendix 2). Activities of the EEP are the processes or actions of the program that are intended to produce specific outputs which are described as the direct products or services stemming from these activities. They are the primary link in the chain through which outcomes are achieved.

The activities and corresponding outputs of the EEP are as follows:

1. Assessing employment needs / abilities / interests at intake
2. Program board assignment
3. Employment skills building within the institution
4. Promote transition to employment in the community
5. Provide employment services in the community

There were seven immediate outcomes, four intermediate outcomes, and two long-term outcomes identified for EEP. The immediate outcomes were:

1. Identification of employment programs for inclusion in correctional plans
2. Effective / appropriate program assignment
3. Provision of a sense of purpose
4. Financial benefit for offenders
5. Develop / maintain employability skills and competencies
6. Enhance job readiness / employability
7. Enhance the ability of offenders to obtain employment in the community

The intermediate outcomes were:

1. Appropriate institutional / employment interventions
2. Positive institutional adjustment
3. Institutional self-sufficiency
4. Job retention

The ultimate long-term outcome resulting from the services provided through the EEP is CSC’s ability to lower the cost of incarceration and successfully reintegrate offenders into Canadian society. By appropriately and effectively addressing the employment needs of offenders, CSC will be better able to contribute to the safe release of offenders from federal institutions into the community.
2.2 Evaluation Plan
The evaluation was conducted by the Evaluation Branch, in consultation and collaboration with the Research Branch. The purpose of the current evaluation was to examine two major components of the EEP, specifically, 1) the intake assessment and assignment process; and 2) the institutional intervention process, as they relate to employment initiatives\(^{29}\). The goal of this evaluation was to provide a comprehensive analysis of the EEP, concerning both process and outcome issues as they relate to offender, staff, and community partner perspectives and results. The evaluation objectives will focus on continued relevance, success, cost-effectiveness, and implementation issues, and any unintended effects associated with the EEP.

2.3 Measures and Procedure
The current evaluation utilized a multi-method approach, thereby ensuring the triangulation of data and the receipt of appropriate feedback from key stakeholders. Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were utilized in the analyses of data. Information was collected through a review of relevant documentation, automated data, surveys with staff and community partners, and interviews with inmates (see Appendix 3 for survey and interview protocols). The automated data resulted in a sample size of 20,067. CSC staff and community partners were given the opportunity to complete a survey in January and February, 2008. A total of 860 staff completed the survey and a total of 21 participants from five community stakeholder organizations were involved in the completion of surveys. A total of 302 offender interviews were conducted by three members of the evaluation team, in person, during the months of November and December 2007 and January 2008.

In all, three samples were utilized to contribute to various aspects of this evaluation:

1) Institutional Sample: drawn from the OMS;
2) Community Employment Centre Sub-sample: a sub-sample of the institutional sample, drawn from the Community Employment Centres (CEC); and
3) Qualitative Sample: resulting from the interviews and surveys that were conducted.

\(^{29}\) The community focused initiatives resulting from EEP are scheduled to be examined in the 2008 / 2009 fiscal year by the Evaluation Branch.
Participant Profiles

Various resources and financial documents / databases were also reviewed, including information from CORCAN financial and annual reports, the Corporate Reporting System, the Integrated Financial & Material Management System (IFMMS), and the Cost of Maintaining Offenders (COMO) database. Note that detailed information regarding specific data collection sources / methods and analytical techniques is provided in Appendix 4.

Data from OMS, the qualitative interviews and surveys, and financial databases (e.g., IFMMS, COMO) are presented below in the sections on participant profiles and key findings. Results of interview and survey questions are presented in the key findings section where they relate to the appropriate evaluation objectives (relevancy, success, cost-effectiveness, implementation issues and unintended effects). Note that statistics from inferential analyses and descriptive analyses are presented where appropriate. In addition, means, and where required, frequencies and percentages, obtained from “closed” interview questions (e.g., dichotomous / 5-point-scale responses) are reported in the text of the key findings sections. General themes obtained from the thematic analysis of the responses to the “open-ended” interview questions are also presented in the text of the key findings sections, and additional information resulting from the thematic analysis of the open-ended interview questions is presented in appendices to follow.

Finally, an examination of critical aspects related to inmate pay and incentive pay was undertaken through the completion of a number of project components. First, a jurisdictional review of inmate pay and incentive pay was completed; second, qualitative interviews and surveys included questions on this subject matter; and finally, the cost-effectiveness analysis included a segment concerning inmate pay / incentive pay.

2.4 Limitations

The accessibility of accurate job retention information posed limitations within this evaluation, given that this type of information is not readily extractable from OMS. In order to proceed with this data collection, despite the limitations, job retention data were accessed from the CEC and where necessary, text files from OMS were coded. This in turn resulted in a relatively small sample size, thereby limiting the robustness of the findings. Furthermore, specific community job titles are not routinely recorded, thereby making any type of follow-up regarding the types of
jobs offenders are getting upon release quite difficult. Once again, text files from OMS were coded and where necessary, community employment coordinators were contacted directly, via telephone, to gather required information.

Another limitation of this evaluation is related to the ability to access and efficiently evaluate data in relation to the vocational assessments (e.g., CAPS / COPS, Essential Skills Portfolio (ESPORT), Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI), etc.). There is no national standard in terms of the assessments being delivered and the data from these assessments are not easily accessed. In turn, in order to conduct analyses relating to vocational congruence, information was manually extracted and coded, from OMS. Furthermore, where necessary the vocational assessments were converted in order to represent proxy measures of the vocational interests under review.

Furthermore, with respect to data emerging from the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) and corresponding follow-up data from the Community Intervention Scale (CIS), the quality of these data was limited, with large quantities of data missing from the CIS assessments, thereby precluding the possibility of certain pre- and post-test outcomes (i.e., employment need as assessed at intake and upon release). In addition, similar to findings described in the original evaluation of EEP, there are difficulties in tracking the length of time offenders actually participate in employment programs. This resulted in the necessity to create a “proportion of time in employment programming” variable. This independent variable poses potential limitations in terms of validity. Nevertheless, “proportion of time in employment programming” is still more meaningful than a variable that merely identifies if there was involvement in employment programming – yes / no”.

Unfortunately, the insights offered by community partners are limited with respect to the sample size attained. In total, only 60 surveys were distributed to 12 community partner organizations, with a response rate of 35%. As a result, although reported throughout the document, and often corresponding to the views of staff and offenders, the generalizability of these perspectives is uncertain.
Finally, this evaluation is limited in the degree of precision regarding financial comparisons. For example, it is difficult to determine precise costs of individual vocational programs, as the costing centres reflect a broader range of spending patterns. Furthermore, given the massive continuum of Employment and Employability Programs, spanning from intake, through incarceration and following-up in the community, costing the entire continuum was met with great difficulty. Despite this limitation, every attempt was made to provide the most accurate and comprehensive costing information.

3.0 PARTICIPANT PROFILES

3.1 Institutional Sample
This sample included all federal offenders incarcerated between April 1, 2003 and March 31, 2005, who had an admission date of 1997 or later. The follow-up period extended from offenders’ release dates to August 31, 2007. From the total sample of 20,067 federal offenders who met the criteria for inclusion in this investigation, three study groups were created:

1. The first group included offenders who participated in one or more core employment programs during their current sentence \((n = 8,429)\), recognizing that these individuals may have also participated in CSC work assignments. Core employment programs included CORCAN employment, vocational training, and employability skills programs.

2. The second group consisted of offenders who participated in CSC work assignments and no core employment programs \((n = 7,560)\). These work assignments consist of general institutional services duties (e.g., cleaning) and were classified as all non-CORCAN work.

3. The final group was the comparison group \((n = 4,078)\), which consisted of all offenders who did not take part in any core employment programs or CSC work assignments during their present sentence.

A specific profile of this sample is presented in Section 3.4.

3.2 Community Employment Centres (CEC) Sub-sample
In addition to the original institutional sample introduced above, a sub-sample drawn from offenders who had used the CEC (i.e., Community Employment Centres Sub-sample) was
utilized in this evaluation. This sample was used to conduct a more in-depth examination of the employment assessment and assignment process, data pertaining to the types of jobs obtained in the community, and the retention of those jobs. Detailed information regarding the types of jobs accessed in the community, as well as the retention of the jobs, was not readily available for all offenders in the institutional sample. Given that this sub-sample utilized the CEC, detailed information regarding community employment was readily accessible.

This sub-sample was selected from offenders who were on some form of conditional release and had used the Community Employment Centres (CEC) for employment services or job placements between April 1, 2006 and March 31, 2007. This approach allowed for the ascertainment of specific job titles of offenders who had obtained employment in the community and permitted the collection of post-release follow-up data (3 and 6 month follow-up for job placement after release). After receiving the Finger Print Serial Numbers (FPSs) of offenders who had utilized the CEC between the above mentioned dates \( n = 2885 \) and determining how many of these offenders had completed, first an employment assessment, and then a vocational assessment (necessary for the in-depth examination of the vocational assessment process), 304 federally sentenced offenders from four of the five regions across Canada (Atlantic, Ontario, Prairies and Pacific) formed this CEC sub-sample. Outside of the job placement and follow-up information, all additional data for these offenders were then accessed from the Offender Management System (OMS). These data represented information from the offender’s respective periods of incarceration. A brief profile of this sample is presented in Section 3.5. Notably, this significantly smaller sub-sample also permitted the replication of all statistical analyses performed on the institutional sample, thereby providing additional support for the robustness of the findings outlined in this report. Without exception, all analyses performed on this sub-sample successfully replicated the findings from the institutional sample.

---

30 Community job titles and 3 and 6 month follow-ups with offenders were not being routinely gathered or tracked by any other methods implemented by CSC.
31 The Quebec region was excluded from this sample as the vocational assessment being utilized in this region was not recognized as a tool that could act as a proxy measure required for the in-depth examination of the vocational assessment process.
32 As such, a separate comparison group was created for inclusion in relevant analyses.
3.3 Qualitative Sample

Finally, a third and final sample resulted from interviews and surveys conducted with offenders, staff, and community partners. Profiles of these groups will be presented in Section 3.6; however, a brief description regarding the methodological approach follows. CSC staff members were asked about their views on employment, employment assessments, vocational training, and work release through a staff survey (see Appendix 3). For a three-week period in January and February 2008, staff could access an online survey regarding the employment and employability evaluation through a link received through e-mail and posted on the front page of the CSC InfoNet. The survey was open to all staff with access to the InfoNet, and was available 24-hours a day for approximately three weeks. The survey was available in both English and French.

Offender interviews (see Appendix 3) also asked offenders about their experiences with employment, employment assessments, vocational training, and work release. Interviews were conducted with a random sample of offenders between November 2007 and January 2008. Each site provided a comprehensive list of offenders who were either currently employed in the institution or currently participating in vocational programming. A random sample of offenders was selected from each list and arrangements for interviews were made with these inmates.

A survey concerning similar themes to those addressed with staff and offenders was also distributed to community partners (see Appendix 3). The distribution of this survey was coordinated through the Director of Stakeholder Relations, Communications and Citizen Engagement. This individual championed the initiative by personally supporting, and distributing, the survey to community partners falling under the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice (NAACJ) umbrella. More specifically, in January 2008, the surveys were distributed to the following eleven organizations:

1. Association des Services de Réhabilitation Sociale du Québec (ASRSQ)
2. Canadian Association for Community Living (CACL)
3. Canadian Associations of Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS)
4. Canadian Training Institute (CTI)
5. The John Howard Society of Canada (JHSC)
6. National Association of Friendship Centres (NAFC)
7. Native Counselling Services of Alberta (NCSA)
8. The Salvation Army (SA)
9. St. Leonard’s Society of Canada (SLSC)
10. Seventh Step Society of Canada
11. Youth Canada Association (YOU CAN)

In addition to the above noted organizations, OPEX, from the Quebec Region (which does not fall under the NAACJ umbrella) also received copies of the survey for completion. The organizations were provided with self-addressed (CSC, National Headquarters), pre-postage paid envelopes and given approximately five weeks to complete and return the surveys. The next section of the report will provide a detailed profile for the three samples introduced above: 1) institutional sample; 2) CEC sub-sample; 3) qualitative staff, offender, and community partner samples.

3.4 Profile of Participants from Institutional Sample

Offenders in each of the three study groups within the institutional sample were compared across several background, sentencing, offence-related, and risk / need variables. This illuminated a clear profile of offenders in CSC’s core employment programs. In terms of background characteristics, there were significant differences between the groups on age, \( F(2, 20,064) = 94.80, p < .001 \). Post-hoc multiple comparisons revealed that offenders in the core employment group were significantly younger (\( M = 32.08 \) years) than CSC work assignment participants (\( M = 33.88 \) years) who, in turn, were significantly younger than the comparison group (\( M = 34.54 \) years). Though each of the three study groups included predominantly male, non-Aboriginal offenders, there was a significant association between group membership and both gender, \( \chi^2 (2, N = 20,067) = 13.88, p < .001 \), and ethnicity, \( \chi^2 (2, n = 19,959) = 7.39, p < .05 \). The comparison group had slightly more women offenders (5%) than both of the employment groups (each 4%). The two employment groups, on the other hand, had more Aboriginal offenders (each 19%) than the comparison group (17%).

3.4.1 Education and Employment Indicators

As summarized in Table 1, low levels of educational and vocational attainment were prominent across each of the study groups. However, in most cases, the significant differences between the

---

groups indicated that offenders in the comparison group tended to have achieved the lowest levels of education\textsuperscript{34}, and to have the greatest deficits across employment indicators\textsuperscript{35}.

### Table 1. Profiles of Educational and Vocational Attainment: Institutional Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core Employment</th>
<th>CSC Work Assignments Only</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Test Statistic ($\chi^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Grade 8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Grade 10</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No High School Diploma</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>31.91***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Skill Area / Trade / Profession</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>35.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed at Arrest</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>9.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable Job History</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>27.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Employment History</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22.62***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** $**p < .01. ***$ $p < .001.$

#### 3.4.2 Sentencing Information

An examination of the sentencing information revealed that there was a significant association between group membership and sentence type, $\chi^2 (2, n = 20067) = 517.97, p < .001$. More offenders in the comparison group were serving indeterminate sentences (8%) compared to offenders in core employment programs (7%) and CSC work assignments (5%). Of the offenders serving determinate sentences, there was also a significant difference between the

\textsuperscript{34} Importantly, this evaluation did not include an examination of education interventions as an Evaluation of Education Service Delivery Models was conducted by the Evaluation Branch in 2006. Nonetheless, it is recognized that education plays a critical role in the employment assessment process and the development of the correctional plan; both of which impact directly upon the ability to assign and effectively deliver employment interventions.

\textsuperscript{35} Notably, during subsequent quantitative analyses, these emergent differences between groups were controlled for statistically.
groups on average sentence length, $F(2, 18,793) = 148.02, p < .001$. Post-hoc comparisons indicated that the average sentence length was significantly longer for offenders in core employment programs ($M = 4.32$ years) relative to offenders in the comparison group ($M = 3.67$ years) and those in CSC work assignments ($M = 3.61$ years). The latter two groups did not differ significantly.

There were significant differences between the groups on the average number of current offence convictions, $F(2, 18,313) = 57.05, p < .001$, with offenders in core employment programs incarcerated for significantly more offences ($M = 7.84$) than both CSC work assignment participants ($M = 6.34$) and offenders in the comparison group ($M = 6.24$). There was not a significant difference between the CSC work assignment and comparison groups.

3.4.3 Assessment at Intake

The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process collects extensive information on each offender’s criminal history record (youth and adult court involvement), violent offence history, and criminogenic needs. In considering levels of risk and need at intake, there was a significant association between group membership and overall risk level, $\chi^2(4, n = 19,954) = 101.42, p < .001$, as well as between study group and overall need level, $\chi^2(4, n = 19,954) = 84.63, p < .001$. Offenders in core employment programs were more likely to be concentrated in the moderate to high risk and need categories than offenders in the CSC work assignment and comparison groups (see Table 2).
Table 2. Risk / Need Ratings at Intake: Institutional Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core Employment</th>
<th>CSC Work Assignments</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken together, these findings indicate that core employment program participants tend to be younger than non-participants. The vast majority of offenders in these programs are non-Aboriginal, male offenders with high risk and need levels. The substantial proportions of offenders with deficits in the employment domain across the study groups provide a clear rationale for the provision of employment programs during offenders’ periods of incarceration.

3.5 Profile of Participants from CEC Sub-sample

The CEC sub-sample ($n = 304$) had an average age of 31 ranging from 18 to 66 years of age. Roughly half (47%) of the sample was less than 30 years of age. The majority of this sample was male (93.4%) and Non-Aboriginal (80.6%), with 6.6% of the sample being female and 19.4% self-identifying as Aboriginal. These representations are commensurate with that of the prison population as a whole. The majority of offenders (98.4%) identified English as their first language while the remaining identified French or Portuguese as their mother tongue. In considering marital status, 56.3% were single, 28.9% common law, 5.9% married, 4.3% separated, 3.3% divorced, and the remaining (1.3%) self-identified as widowed or ‘not determined’.
3.5.1 Education and Employment Indicators
In examining the indicators associated specifically with the employment / education domain, the data indicated that 65% \((n = 199)\) of the sample had no high school education, 61% had no skill area, trade or profession, and 69% was unemployed at the time of arrest. Furthermore, the data indicated that this sample of offenders had a minimum overall grade level of five and a maximum of thirteen, with an average overall grade level of 10.48 \((SD = 1.66)\).

3.5.2 Sentencing Information
This sample has an average sentence length of 1198 days \((SD = 708)\) with a range of 703 days to 6006 days as their designated sentence length; however, the time actually spent in an institution (i.e., time at risk in the institution) was substantially lower than this. Specifically, the actual ‘length of stay’ in the institution ranged from 117 days to 5728 days with an average stay of 615 days \((SD = 552)\).

3.5.3 Assessment at Intake
Ratings of risk, need, level of motivation, and reintegration potential, as identified during the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process, are provided in Table 3.
### Table 3. Risk / Need / Motivation / Reintegration Potential Ratings at Intake: CEC Sub-sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CEC Sub-sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reintegration Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $n = 304$; An assessment of reintegration potential was missing for 2% of the sub-sample.

Specifics concerning the seven areas of criminogenic need are outlined in Table 4.
Table 4. Criminogenic Need Domains: CEC Sub-sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminogenic Need Domain*</th>
<th>Factor Seen as an Asset</th>
<th>No Need for Improvement</th>
<th>Some Need for Improvement</th>
<th>Considerable Need for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment / Education</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Functioning</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal / Emotional</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 300

3.6 Profile of Qualitative Sample

3.6.1 Staff Survey: Participant Profile

In total, 859 staff members responded to the Employment and Employability survey. Of those, 128 (14.9%) responded to the French language survey, and 731 (85.1%) responded in English. Table 5 outlines the number of staff respondents in each region, by regional location (institution, community, Regional Headquarters (RHQ) or National Headquarters (NHQ)).
### Table 5. Number of Staff Respondents in Each Region, by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Prairies</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
<th>Quebec</th>
<th>Atlantic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHQ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across regions, the majority of institutional staff who responded to the survey and disclosed their institution’s security level (n = 612) were from medium security institutions (n = 306, 50%). Table 6 displays the distribution of respondents by institutional security level and region. The majority of respondents were from the Pacific Region (26%), followed by the Prairies (24%), Ontario (21%), Quebec (16%), and Atlantic Regions (13%). In addition, the majority of respondents were from medium security institutions (50%), followed by multi-level (18%), and minimum and maximum institutions (16%).
Staff respondents had been in their current position anywhere from 1 month to 38 years at the time of the interview, with the average length of time at their current position being 6.8 years ($SD = 7.1$). Respondents represented a broad range of CSC employee classifications, including Welfare Program staff (WP’s; 30% of respondents, $n = 245$), Correctional Officers (CX’s; 22%, $n = 177$), and Administrative Services (AS’s; 9%, $n = 74$). A summary of all other employee classifications represented by the staff respondents is presented in Appendix 5.

### 3.6.2 Offender Interviews: Participant Profile

In total, 302 offenders from across the country were interviewed. Table 7 outlines the number of offenders interviewed in each region, by institutional security level. The majority of offenders were male (80%, $n = 242$) and non-Aboriginal (80%, $n = 241$). Excluding those offenders serving life sentences ($n = 106$), sentence length for those interviewed ranged from 2 to 30 years, with an average sentence length of 5.49 years$^{36}$. Two-way contingency table analysis examining differences in demographic variables (gender, race, or sentence length) across regions or security levels found no significant differences.

---

$^{36}$ Seven responses were omitted from average sentence calculation due to the offender answering the question erroneously.
Table 7. Number of Offenders Interviewed in Each Region, by Security Level of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Level</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Prairies</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
<th>Quebec</th>
<th>Atlantic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the random sample was meant to represent only those offenders who were involved in employment or vocational training, due to changing offender or institutional needs, offenders were not always involved in employment or vocational programming at the time of their interview. In total, 18 offenders (6% of the sample) were neither employed nor in vocational training at the time of their interview; however, all of these offenders had been either employed or in vocational programming in the recent past.

Of those who were employed at the time of the interviews ($n = 281$), 35% ($n = 99$) were employed in a CORCAN employment position, 64% ($n = 180$) were employed in an institutional employment position, and 1% ($n = 2$) were employed in both a CORCAN and institutional employment position at the time of their interview. Only 4% ($n = 12$) of those interviewed were participating in a vocational training program at the time of their interview.

Two-way contingency table analysis examining differences in employment type (CORCAN or institutional) across regions, security levels, and race found no significant differences. However, examination of employment type across gender (men or women) found that women were significantly less likely than expected by chance to be employed in a CORCAN employment position, $\chi^2 (1, n = 279) = 4.86, p < .05$. Two-way contingency table analysis examining differences in vocational training participation (currently participating vs. not currently
participating) could not be reliably conducted due to the small number of offenders enrolled in these programs at the time of the interviews.

In an effort to learn more about the employment, vocational programming, and work release positions in which the sample of offenders was placed, offenders were asked to detail their current or most recent job in the institution, the types of vocational training in which they had participated while incarcerated, and the details of any work release in which they had participated. Results from these lines of questioning follow.

**Offender Involvement in Employment**

Offenders were asked to detail their current or most recent employment position in the institution, and how long they had been at that position\(^{37}\). A summary of the most common employment positions is presented in Table 8. For a comprehensive list of all employment positions represented by the sample, please see Table 46, Appendix 6.

\(^{37}\) If an offender held more than one employment position at the time of the interview, they were asked to detail the position in which they spent more working hours.
Table 8. Summary of Offender Employment Positions by Employment Type (CORCAN or Institutional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Type</th>
<th>CORCAN</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>CORCAN &amp; Institutional</th>
<th>Total n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Textiles</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Labourer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Agribusiness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Repair (HLVW)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Canteen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Worker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The positions listed make up 71% (199 of the 281) employment positions represented by the sample of offenders.

At the time of the interviews, the offenders had been at their current or most recent positions anywhere from 1 week to 19 months, with an average length of 13.26 months, or just over one year, at their current positions (n = 280). Independent sample t-tests and ANOVAs were conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean length of employment among the categories of the demographic variables (race, region, security level, and gender) and among employment type (CORCAN and institutional). No significant mean differences were found for any of the demographic variables, and there was no significant difference in mean length of employment according to employment type (CORCAN or institutional).

Offender Involvement in Vocational Programming

Offenders were asked whether or not they had participated in any vocational programming while incarcerated. Overall, 61% (n = 184) of offenders had participated in vocational programming,
while 39% \((n = 118)\) had not. Of those who gave reasons for not participating \((n = 91)\), 35% mentioned that the training in which they were interested was not offered. Not taking training due to personal choice or due to operational constraints in the institution was mentioned equally (by 15% of respondents each), and 11% indicated that they already had obtained their vocational certificates prior to incarceration.

Those offenders who did take vocational programming were asked to list all of the training in which they had participated. Overall, 182 offenders indicated their involvement in 37 vocational training courses. Table 9 summarizes the most common vocational training programs mentioned. For a comprehensive list of all training noted, please see Table 47, Appendix 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Vocational Training Participants n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHIMIS</td>
<td>139 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>45 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>39 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Operator</td>
<td>31 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td>28 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Arts</td>
<td>18 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESP</td>
<td>16 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction / Workplace Safety</td>
<td>16 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding / Metalwork / Pipefitting</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Percent (%) represents the proportion of participants who participated in the given vocational program. The total will be greater than 100% as offenders could indicated participating in multiple vocational programs.

Not only was participation in vocational programming of interest, but offenders were also asked if they had actually completed the vocational programming in which they participated. Of the 147 participants who responded, 83% \((n = 122)\) had completed all of their programming. Of the 22 offenders who indicated reasons for not completing their programming, 36% \((n = 8)\) were still participating in their program at the time of interview (the training course was still ongoing).
Other reasons for not completing vocational programming included being transferred to another institution (14%, \(n = 3\)), not liking the training program (14%, \(n = 3\)), and the training program being cancelled (9%, \(n = 2\))\(^{38}\).

**Offender Involvement in Work Release**

Finally, offenders were asked to indicate whether or not they had participated in a work release during their time at the institution. Only 14% of offenders \((n = 42)\) had participated in a work release. Table 10 outlines the types of work release placements mentioned by those offenders who specified their work release position \((n = 39)\).

**Table 10. Work Release Placements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Position</th>
<th>Work Release Participants (n) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charitable / Spiritual / Religious Work</td>
<td>17 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry / Construction</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Maintenance</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranching / Farming</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding / Metalwork</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry / Lumber</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse / Manufacturing</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundromat</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offenders’ time on work release ranged from 2 to 36 months, with the average work release spanning 9.16 months \((n = 38)\). Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to determine if any differences existed in median length of work release among the categories of the demographic variables (race, region, security level, and gender) and among employment type (CORCAN and institutional). No significant median differences were found for any of the

\(^{38}\) Proportions for some qualitative items may not sum to 100% in instances where a few outstanding responses could not be classified into a response category or where there were limited responses in a response category.
demographic variables, and there was no significant difference in median length of work release according to employment type (CORCAN or institutional).

3.6.3 Community Survey: Participant Profile
The community partner sample \( n = 21 \) included representation from five of the twelve organizations that were asked to participate in the survey. The five organizations include: Salvation Army, OPEX, St. Leonard’s Society, Elizabeth Fry, and a Community Residential Centre. All five regions were represented; however, the majority of responses came from the Ontario Region (43%, \( n = 9 \)), followed by Quebec (29%, \( n = 6 \)), Pacific (14%, \( n = 3 \)), the Prairies (9%, \( n = 2 \)), and Atlantic (5%, \( n = 1 \)). A variety of positions were represented among these respondents, including: program facilitator, program coordinator, director / assistant director / associate director, employment counselor, prison – community liaison officer, office manager, and manager of community corrections. Respondents had worked in their positions for between 29 and 300 months, with an average of 106 months (\( SD = 74 \)).

4.0 KEY FINDINGS

The following section of this document will report key findings as they relate to outcomes that emerged from the quantitative and qualitative analyses. In general, the primary finding is presented, followed by the quantitative data supporting this finding (when available) and the qualitative data supporting this finding. Quantitative data are always broken down by gender, non-Aboriginal / Aboriginal status, and where appropriate, by study group (i.e., core employment group, CSC employment group, and the comparison group). Qualitative data are presented in terms of staff, offender and community perceptions. Where appropriate, these perceptions are presented together (i.e., when all three groups were asked identical questions). Furthermore, qualitative findings are broken down by region, security level, and study group / interest\(^{39}\). Differences between offender and staff perceptions are also highlighted where appropriate.

\(^{39}\) For example, where appropriate, comparisons between CORCAN, CSC, vocational, and work release interventions are discussed.
4.1 Evaluation Objective 1: Continued Relevancy

The extent to which a policy, program or initiative remains consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities, and realistically addresses an actual need.

In considering the overall relevance of EEP and its components, the evaluation team examined four different areas: 1) levels of employment need being exhibited by offenders; 2) the perceived relevancy of vocational assessments; 3) relevancy of inmate pay and incentive pay, as compared within other jurisdictions; and 4) a labour market analysis that examined the relevancy of current employment interventions as compared to labour market needs.

Summary Finding 1 (Relevance of EEP): Employment and Employability Programs (EEP) continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities and address the employment needs of offenders. Furthermore, inmate pay and incentive pay policy is relevant, as evidenced by similar practices in diverse jurisdictions. However, employment opportunities within the institutions do not necessarily respond efficiently to labour market needs and there is an insufficient number of both meaningful employment activities and work release opportunities. Finally, although viewed as useful when incorporating EEP into an offender’s correctional plan, vocational assessments are not viewed, by staff, as relevant given the employment opportunities available in the institution and in the community.

4.1.1 Levels of Employment Need Being Exhibited by Offenders

Finding 1: Employment and Employability Programs (EEP) continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities, and address employment needs as exhibited by offenders during the Offender Intake Assessment process.

CSC’s Corporate Risk Profile, 2007 / 2008, identified limited program / employment capacity for offenders in the community, as a risk factor for violent re-offending. This immediately denotes the significance of EEP and related initiatives. Furthermore, the Office of the Correctional Investigator (OCI) argued that there is a lack of employment and skills development opportunities within and outside of correctional institutions\(^{40}\); consequently underlining the need
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for continued efforts in this area. Finally, a recent report\textsuperscript{41} maintained that “…employment, as a priority program, has been eclipsed over the past decades with the advent and wide development and distribution of programs designed to address other core need areas (e.g., substance abuse and violence)”. The panel further stated that the message they received from key informants was in reference to a need to “…enhance both the quantity and quality of work opportunities available in penitentiaries, there is a need to move from employing large numbers of offenders in general maintenance jobs to providing more meaningful skills development to prepare the offender for employment upon release”.

The quantitative data provided support for the proclamation that offering employment programs to incarcerated offenders continues to be relevant, as evidenced in the fact that more than one-half of offenders from the institutional sample (i.e., 52%; 9,985 offenders) were identified as exhibiting some or considerable needs in the employment domain at intake.

4.1.2 The Perceived Relevancy of Vocational Assessments

Finding 2: Limited numbers of staff indicated that vocational assessments are relevant given the employment opportunities available in the institution and in the community. Furthermore, results suggest that the true usefulness of information provided by the vocational assessments, when incorporating employment and employability programs into an offender’s correctional plan, has yet to be determined.

As part of the foundation of an offender’s employment future in the institution, it is important that the vocational assessments that are administered continue to be relevant, both in terms of institutional and community job opportunities. To help gauge this relevance, staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that the information provided by vocational assessments is relevant, given the employment opportunities available in the institution. Of those who responded to the question ($n = 635$), almost half (45%, $n = 284$) either disagreed or strongly disagreed that vocational assessments were relevant, while 22% ($n = 141$) either agreed or strongly agreed that vocational assessments were relevant ($M = 2.67, SD = 1.13$).

Staff members were also asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that the information provided by vocational assessments is relevant, given the employment opportunities available in the community. Of those who responded to the question ($n = 541$), just under half (40%, $n = 214$) disagreed or strongly disagreed that vocational assessments were relevant, while 26% ($n = 141$) agreed or strongly agreed ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.15$).

An examination of regional differences revealed that as compared to the Prairies and Ontario Regions, the Quebec Region is more likely to indicate that vocational assessments are relevant given employment opportunities in the institution. Specifically, ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant differences between regions or security levels in mean ratings of agreement for each of the ratings of relevance found that there were significant mean differences between regions regarding the relevance of vocational assessments given employment opportunities in the institution ($F(5,614) = 3.2, p < .01$). On average, respondents from the Quebec Region rated their agreement significantly higher than those from both the Prairies (Mean difference = .53, $p < .01$) and Ontario Regions (Mean difference = .47, $p < .05$)\textsuperscript{42}.

The applicability of vocational assessments was likewise assessed through the staff survey. Staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that the information provided by vocational assessments is useful when incorporating employment and employability programs into an offender’s correctional plan. Of the 645 staff who responded, the majority were neutral in their agreement (43%; $n = 276$), whereas 32% ($n = 204$) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the assessments are useful, and 26% of staff ($n = 165$) agreed or strongly agreed that the assessments are useful ($M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.03$)\textsuperscript{43}.

\textsuperscript{42} There were no regional differences regarding the relevance of vocational assessments given community employment opportunities, and there were no significant mean differences between security levels for either institutional or community employment opportunities.

\textsuperscript{43} ANOVAs conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean ratings of usefulness among the security levels and regions found no significant differences between regions or security levels.
RECOMMENDATION 1: CSC should determine what is necessary to ensure that those offenders identified as eligible to complete a vocational assessment, receive a vocational assessment. Furthermore, although critical in the assessment of employment needs (as they permit the determination of vocational congruence), given the feedback from staff, the relevance and applicability of vocational assessments should be further considered in light of the available institutional and community employment opportunities. Finally, staff training/information sessions concerning the relevance, applicability, value, and validity of vocational assessments should be conducted.

4.1.3 Jurisdictional Comparison of Inmate Pay and Incentive Pay

Finding 3: Policy is relevant, as evidenced by similar practices in other jurisdictions. CSC’s policies on inmate pay and incentive pay are comparable to those of other jurisdictions. The policies also have the potential to contribute to an offender’s level of motivation and willingness to engage in their correctional plan.

In order to contribute to discussions on the continued relevancy of inmate pay and incentive pay, a jurisdictional review was conducted. This review compared inmate policies of CSC with those from other jurisdictions. In all, seven jurisdictions were included: United States, England & Wales, Finland, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Queensland & Tasmania, Australia. Although an in-depth comparison of each jurisdiction was beyond the scope of this evaluation project, the jurisdictional review demonstrates that, with only one exception, Tasmania, Australia, all of these jurisdictions offer some form of inmate and/or incentive pay (see Appendix 7 for a comprehensive review of each jurisdiction). Assessment criteria and general philosophy differ from one jurisdiction to the next, and the terminology varies; however, this jurisdictional review supports the continued relevancy of inmate pay and incentive pay in that it agrees with internationally accepted practices and procedures44. Furthermore, as evidenced in the literature referenced below, this practice has the potential to contribute to an offender’s level of motivation and willingness to engage in their correctional plan.

44 Notably, in 2008, the International Roundtable for Correctional Excellence released a document entitled “The Place of Prison Industries and Employment Training Programmes in the Prison and Probation Services of the International Roundtable”. This document features comments from Roundtable countries on matters such as legal obligations, scope, and management of employment programs in prison. It further highlights issues concerning the purchase of raw materials, customers of prison produced goods, income/revenue for sale of goods, issue of and use of profit, prisoner’s wages, and staffing. Of direct relevance to this report is the information pertaining to prisoner’s wages. Similarly to the jurisdictional review conducted for this report, the findings suggest that although the countries may vary in their approach, policy, and designated rates of pay, their methods are similar to those of Canada, thereby providing additional evidence for the continued relevancy of inmate pay and incentive pay.
Importantly, several studies have supported the argument for the effectiveness of incentive pay (e.g., higher levels of productivity and performance)\textsuperscript{45}; whereas others suggest that paying for performance is ineffective\textsuperscript{46}. One of the main concerns in the incentive pay debate appears to be whether the offer of an incentive is likely to replace intrinsic motivation with extrinsic motivation. The research regarding this highlights the importance of examination of individual differences associated with job participants’ reactions to extrinsic incentives\textsuperscript{47}. Furthermore, it has been noted that pay can significantly increase performance, yet pay is not the only, nor necessarily the best, means of reinforcement for performance improvement\textsuperscript{48}.

### 4.1.4 Labour Market Analysis (LMA)

**Finding 4:** Recognizing that CSC’s ability to consider and adapt to labour market demands is limited in part by the nature of the population under its care, employment opportunities provided within institutions do not necessarily respond efficiently to the labour market needs. Nevertheless, evidence suggests that there will be increasing needs in areas in which CSC could ensure the provision of appropriate skills. Overall, the LMA provides evidence for the continued relevancy of EEP in successfully contributing to CSC priorities and objectives.

An in-depth Labour Market Analysis (LMA; Appendix 8) indicated a growing need to replace retiring workers in many occupations, including occupations that may be readily filled by offenders. More specifically, oil and gas well drillers, service persons, and related workers were highlighted as jobs that will experience a shortage of workers over the next decade.


Furthermore, there will be a continued need for strength in non-residential construction (e.g., 2010 Olympics in British Columbia) and in renovation. Both residential home builders and renovators will benefit. Though the majority of employment opportunities are in the skilled labour market, there is still a need to fill support positions (e.g., residential home builders and renovators; contractors and related trades workers, such as in pipefitting trades and carpentry trades).

The complete LMA is presented in Appendix 8. Given CORCAN’s mandate to provide employment and employability training and skills to offenders, it is not unusual that cost of production is high due to its function as a training service. As such, the costs of production are higher due to higher losses as a result of the training process. However, the LMA indicated that CORCAN could maximize its positive margin by concentrating on industries where production costs are decreasing, return on investment is increasing, or where the production learning curve is shortest. This evaluation indicated that the majority of inmates are working as cleaners and food preparation workers, jobs which do not efficiently respond to labour market demand.

Furthermore, the average number of hours worked per week is roughly 13 hours (minimum hours per week = 2.37, maximum hours per hours week = 30\(^49\)), which is not comparable to the usual 40-hour work week considered as full-time employment in the community.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: CSC’s EEP would benefit by ensuring the continued monitoring and analysis of labour market needs, direction, and trends. CSC should ensure the alignment of EEP with labour market demand. It will be equally critical that monitoring and analyses are both region and site specific. Meeting labour market need, may be achieved in part by ensuring that all offenders develop appropriate employability skills, as identified by the Conference Board of Canada. Importantly, although not isolated within this evaluation, the National Employability Skills Program (NESP) delivers these employability skills.**

4.1.5 The Meaningfulness of Employment Interventions

In considering the relevance of EEP, some may argue that if employment interventions are not viewed as meaningful, they also lose their relevance. As outlined in the report from the external review, “…there is a need to move from employing large numbers of offenders in general maintenance jobs to providing more meaningful skills development to prepare the offender for

employment upon release” (p. 8). With this in mind, staff and community partners were asked to comment on the meaningfulness of employment interventions.

**Finding 5:** The majority of staff indicated that there was not a sufficient number of meaningful employment activities or work release opportunities for offenders exhibiting employment needs. Community partners provided perspectives similar to those of staff.

The goal of productive and meaningful engagement through employment and vocational opportunities was assessed using the staff survey. First, in order to determine what the general outlook was among staff regarding the amount of meaningful employment opportunities, staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that there is a sufficient number of meaningful employment activities for offenders with employment needs. Of the 795 staff who responded, 530 (67%) strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement, while 108 (14%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement ($M = 2.18$, $SD = 1.21$). Similarly, staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that there is a sufficient number of meaningful work release opportunities for offenders with employment needs. Of the 486 staff who responded, 301 (62%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, while 67 (14%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement ($M = 2.23$, $SD = 1.12$).

Examinations of mean differences in ratings of agreement between regions and institutional security levels (using ANOVA) found no significant regional differences in mean responses when asked whether there are sufficient meaningful employment opportunities. However, there were significant differences between staff from various security levels ($F(3,653) = 4.6, p < .005$). Tukey’s post hoc comparisons showed that staff from minimum security level institutions rated their agreement significantly higher than those from both medium (Mean difference = .32, $p = .05$) and multi-level security facilities (Mean difference = .55, $p < .005$). When asked whether there are sufficient meaningful work release opportunities, the same pattern was found. Specifically, there were no significant differences between regions, but staff from minimum security facilities rated their agreement significantly higher than those from both medium (Mean difference = .43, $p < .01$) and multi-level security institutions (Mean difference = .52, $p < .01$).
Finally, to measure the extent to which community partners agree that there are a sufficient number of meaningful employment activity opportunities in the institutions, they were asked to rate their opinion on a scale of one to five, with one being “strongly disagree” and five being “strongly agree”. The majority of community partners (65%, \( n = 13 \) of 20) strongly disagreed or disagree that there is a sufficient amount of meaningful employment for offenders, with 15% (\( n = 3 \)) being neutral and 20% (\( n = 4 \)) agreeing with this statement (\( M = 2.30, SD = 1.08 \)).
4.2 Evaluation Objective 2: Success -- Efficiency

The extent to which a policy, program, or initiative is producing its planned outputs as a result of the initiative and in relation to resources used.

4.2.1 Vocational Assessment Process

Summary Finding 2 (Vocational Assessments): Vocational assessments are viewed as both accurate and useful by offenders; however, in considering the large number of offenders identified at intake with employment needs, a relatively low number of offenders are being provided with the opportunity to complete vocational assessments.

Finding 6: The number of offenders receiving employment and / or vocational assessments is low relative to the number of offenders identified with employment needs. Low rates of vocational assessment completion are attributed, primarily, to stringent educational requirements that are part of the employment assessment screening process.

Of the original sample of offenders drawn from the CEC \( n = 2885 \), 24\% \( n = 690 \) had completed an employment assessment (i.e., determines if an offender requires and is eligible for a more in-depth vocational assessment\(^{50}\)) and 44\% \( n = 304 \) of those who had employment assessments had then completed a vocational assessment (this represents only 11\% of the originally identified sample \( 304 / 2885 \)). This resulted in the previously mentioned sub-sample of 304 offenders from four of the five regions across Canada (Atlantic, Ontario, Prairies, and Pacific)\(^{51}\).

These findings suggest that less than one quarter of offenders completed an employment assessment and less than half of those who completed an employment assessment went on to complete a vocational assessment. Given the high percentages of offenders who are identified with employment needs at intake (i.e., 52\% of the institutional sample and 77\% of the CEC sub-

\(^{50}\) In order to determine if vocational assessments were completed, it was necessary to first determine if employment assessments were completed. If an employment assessment was on file, the files were then further analyzed to determine if a vocational assessment had been completed. Offenders must have a minimum of a grade 8 education to be eligible for a vocational assessment.

\(^{51}\) The Quebec Region was excluded from this aspect of the evaluation as the vocational assessment being utilized in this region was not recognized as a tool that could act as a proxy measure in the determination of levels of vocational congruence.
sample), the number of offenders completing employment and vocational assessments can be considered low. However, approximately 42% of the offenders who were interviewed indicated that they had completed a vocational assessment. This number is higher than that reflected in the results reported above (i.e., quantitative data from the sub-sample), potentially highlighting the limitations of existing knowledge management in this area. However, given that the offenders who participated in the surveys were all employed or in training programs, it is also conceivable that those offenders who were more employable / trainable were also more likely to meet the qualifications required to complete a vocational assessment. Without more accurate tracking of vocational assessment completion, these types of questions are yet to be clarified.

After coding OMS files to determine the reasons for which the vocational assessments were not being completed, the evaluation team was able to find reasons for non-completion for approximately 86% of missing cases. Five central explanations emerged. These explanations, along with the percentages of each, are presented below:

1. The offender failed to meet the screening requirements, as per Employment Assessment at Intake Form #1253 (80%)
   a. Academic requirements (72%)
   b. No need in the employment domain (13%)
   c. Offender did not have employment prospects in area where he / she was previously employed (9%)
   d. Offender not eligible for some form of release within 5 years (<1%)
   e. Offender not motivated to participate in employment assessment & training (5%)
2. Operational constraints (e.g., time, lack of staff resources) (5%)
3. Offender failed to show up for and / or keep their appointment for the completion of the vocational assessment (1%)
4. Offender chose to take assessment at later date. It was not followed-up on. (<1%)
5. Did not complete due to language requirements (<1%)\(^{52}\)

\(^{52}\) Outside of these 5 central explanations, the evaluation team was unable to determine an explanation for the remaining 14% of the non-completions. For this 14%, most often, the documentation within OMS indicated that the offender met the screening criteria and / or they should be referred to assessment at their receiving institution, thereby implying that the assessment should have been completed. It is probable that after being referred for an assessment at a later date, operational constraints are the source of additional incomplete assessments or, alternatively, there is not an appropriate follow-up system in place for such cases.
In examining these findings, a few issues warrant further discussion. First, it is interesting to note that a large percentage of offenders (72% of those not meeting screening requirements) did not meet the appropriate academic requirements for completion of the vocational assessment. This suggests that the vocational assessments being utilized have more advanced cognitive requirements than the cognitive levels being exhibited by the offender population. Furthermore, 13% of those offenders not meeting the screening requirements were also identified as not exhibiting an employment need. In turn, the rationale for the completion of this employment assessment (i.e., Form #1253), with this group of offenders is unclear. Accordingly, this item could be removed from Form 1253. Finally, 9% of those offenders not meeting the screening requirements were identified as not having employment prospects in the area in which he / she was previously employed. This would seemingly increase the need for the completion of a vocational assessment in order to assist with future employment prospects appropriate for that offender. These findings call into question the content of the form as well as the assessment policies surrounding Form 1253.

During the interview process, offenders were asked to recall whether or not they had completed a vocational assessment as part of their intake process. Overall, 48% (n = 144) of offenders indicated that they did not complete a vocational assessment, while 42% (n = 126) indicated that they had completed an assessment. The remaining 10% (n = 32) could not recall whether or not they had completed a vocational assessment as part of their intake process.

Two-way contingency table analysis examining differences in vocational assessment (completed or not completed) across gender, security level, and race found no significant differences. However, significant differences were found when examining differences in vocational assessment (completed or not completed) across regions, $\chi^2 (4, n = 270) = 23.54, p < .001$. Examination of the standardized residuals found that offenders in the Pacific Region were significantly more likely than expected by chance to have completed a vocational assessment ($SR = 2.1$), while offenders in the Quebec Region were significantly less likely than expected by chance to have completed a vocational assessment ($SR = 2.1$).
Offenders who did not complete a vocational assessment at intake were asked to explain why they had not done so. For those who provided a reason \( (n = 62) \), the majority \( (40\%, n = 25) \) stated that they did not have an employment need upon incarceration. One-fifth of respondents \( (21\%, n = 13) \) indicated that a vocational assessment was not offered to them, while 16\% \( (n = 10) \) indicated that they did not meet the educational requirements needed in order to take the vocational assessment.

Offenders who did complete a vocational assessment at intake were asked to specify, if they could, which assessment they completed. In all, 42 of the 126 offenders who indicated that they had completed a vocational assessment were able to name the specific assessment \( (33\%) \). Almost all of those \( (86\%, n = 36) \) named the CAPS / COPS assessment as being the one in which they participated, with D’aptitudes Informatisé \( (n = 2) \), ESPORT \( (n = 1) \), VPI \( (n = 1) \), Career Choices \( (n = 1) \), and Program Maintien Travail \( (n = 1) \) also mentioned.

Importantly, accessing data for this component of the evaluation via OMS posed many challenges as a result of the existing information gathering procedures. First, there are different vocational assessments being used across the country due to the lack of an accepted and appropriate national standard. Second, there is no consistent tracking of the offenders who have and have not completed vocational assessments. Third, raw data for these assessments are not accessible, unless requested through the original administrator of the assessment. As a reminder, in-depth results relating to the vocational assessment and assignment process emerge from analyses conducted with the CEC sub-sample. This sampling process could have in turn had an impact on the representation of this sample; however, in comparing this sub-sample with the institutional sample, few significant differences emerged.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** There is a need to: i) examine the utility and efficiency of the employment assessment (i.e., Form 1253); ii) ensure the implementation and utilization of a nationally standardized vocational assessment tool that is appropriate for men and women offenders, as well as Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders (e.g., meets language and educational realities); and iii) develop appropriate procedures for those assessments that are postponed for educational or operational reasons. Furthermore, automated data from both employment and vocational assessments should be readily accessible on OMS. Notably, in
implementing a nationally standardized vocational assessment tool, it will be critical to consider both the cultural differentiation and varying spiritual perspectives of the offender population.

4.2.2 Offender Perspectives on Vocational Assessment

Finding 7: The majority of offenders indicated that vocational assessments are an accurate reflection of their skills, abilities, and interests. They further indicated that vocational assessments would be useful for guiding them in looking for future employment.

The vocational assessment is often the initial contact an offender will have with the employment and employability process at CSC. As such, it was important to ask offenders about their experiences with vocational assessment, and how useful and applicable the assessment was for them.

Offenders were asked about the applicability of the vocational assessments. They were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that the information provided by the vocational assessments was an accurate reflection of their skills, abilities, and interests. The majority of offenders (71%, \( n = 66 \)) agreed (or strongly agreed) that the assessments were accurate, while 15% of offenders (\( n = 14 \)) disagreed (or strongly disagreed) that the assessments were accurate (\( M = 3.84, SD = 1.18 \))\(^{53}\).

The applicability of the vocational assessments was further investigated by asking offenders to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that the information provided by the vocational assessments would be useful in guiding them in looking for employment in the future. Just over half of those who answered (54%, \( n = 51 \)) agreed (or strongly agreed) that the assessments would be helpful in guiding their future job searches, while 32% of offenders (\( n = 30 \)) disagreed (or

\(^{53}\) Independent sample t-tests conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean ratings of accuracy among gender (men and women offenders), employment type (CORCAN or institutional), and security levels found no significant differences. Examination of median differences (using the Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests) between Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal offenders (race) found no significant differences, however a significant omnibus difference was found when looking at median differences across regions (\( \chi^2(4, n = 93) = 11.20, p < .05 \)).
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strongly disagreed) that the assessments would be helpful ($M = 3.29, SD = 1.49$). Once again, independent samples t-tests, ANOVAs, Mann-Whitney, and Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted to determine if any differences existed in ratings of usefulness found no significant differences among genders, regions, or race. Significant differences were found among employee types, with CORCAN employees rating their vocational assessments as being more useful than did institutional employees ($M = 3.86$ vs. $M = 3.14$, $t(83) = 2.01, p < .05$). Significant omnibus differences were also found among security levels ($F(3,91) = 3.01, p < .05$), with post-hoc regional comparisons indicating that offenders at maximum security institutions ($M = 2.71$) were less likely than minimum ($M = 3.69$) and medium security institutions ($M = 3.69$) to rate the vocational assessments as being useful. However these pairwise regional comparisons were not significant when the Bonferroni correction was applied.

4.2.3 Appropriate Integration of Employment and Vocational Assessment into Correctional Plan

Summary Finding 3 (Assignment of Employment Interventions): Assignment to employment interventions is not based solely on identified employment need and staff indicated that the greatest roadblocks to the effective incorporation of EEP into an offender’s correctional plan include: lack of available job placements and vocational programs, competing priorities in terms of offenders’ other programming needs, and offenders’ refusal to participate.

Finding 8: Offenders are not consistently assigned to employment programs based on identified employment need as assessed at intake. Furthermore, staff members were more likely to suggest that work releases were effectively incorporated into offenders' correctional plans than employment and vocational programs.

A key component of evaluating the efficiency of employment programs was whether offenders with identified employment needs were receiving programs to address these needs while incarcerated. From our institutional sample ($N = 20,067$), among offenders with identified employment needs ($n = 10,412, 52\%$), 78% participated in some type of employment-related activities while incarcerated (39% in core employment programs and 39% in CSC work assignments). However, it should be noted that 81% of those who were not identified as having an employment need also participated in some type of employment-related activities (45% in core employment programs and 36% in CSC work assignments). Of these offenders (i.e., those in employment related activities but not identified as exhibiting an employment need), 39% had
participated in one or more core employment program and an additional 39% had taken part in CSC work assignments only.

**RECOMMENDATION 4: CSC needs to ensure that those offenders identified with employment needs are receiving adequate employment intervention and support throughout their period of incarceration. In doing so, consideration should be given to the most advantageous “blend / ratio” of both skilled and unskilled program / work participants, thereby ensuring optimal productivity, teaching, and learning environments. Resulting outcomes should then be directly reflected in policy documents.**

Staff members were asked a number of questions to determine if employment activities, vocational programming, and work releases were being appropriately incorporated into offenders’ correctional plans, and what the “roadblocks” were to their effective incorporation. First, staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that employment activities, vocational programs, and work release opportunities are being appropriately incorporated into offenders’ correctional plans. Results of these items were categorized into three main levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 11.

**Table 11. Ratings of Staff Agreement Regarding Effective Incorporation of Employment, Vocational Training, and Work Release Opportunities into Offender Correctional Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of EEP</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral % (n)</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>32 (383)</td>
<td>27 (216)</td>
<td>25 (198)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational programming</td>
<td>32 (382)</td>
<td>25 (196)</td>
<td>27 (213)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work release</td>
<td>23 (180)</td>
<td>30 (143)</td>
<td>32 (150)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54 A one-way within-subjects ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between employment, vocational programming, and work release found no significant differences between average levels of agreement ($F(1.42, 649.47) = .7, ns.$).
ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement for each of the elements of the EEP found no significant regional differences. However, respondents at different security level institutions differed with regard to their opinions concerning how appropriately employability and vocational programs \( (F(3,648) = 4.4, p < .01) \), and work releases \( (F(3,385) = 4.2, p < .01) \) are incorporated into offenders’ correctional plans. With regard to employability and vocational programs, Bonferroni-adjusted post-hoc analyses revealed that staff from minimum security institutions rated their agreement higher than those from both medium (Mean difference = .45, \( p < .01 \)) and multi-level security facilities (Mean difference = .44, \( p < .05 \)). Analyses also showed that minimum security staff rated their agreement higher than medium security staff when asked whether work releases are effectively incorporated into offenders’ correctional plans (Mean difference = .50, \( p < .005 \)).

Finding 9: Staff indicated that the greatest roadblocks to the effective incorporation of EEP into an offender’s correctional plan include: lack of availability of job placements and vocational programs, competing priorities in terms of offenders’ other programming needs, and offenders’ refusal to participate.

Staff members were asked to indicate what they perceive to be the greatest “roadblock” to the effective incorporation of employment activities and vocational programs into an offender’s correctional plan. With regard to employment activities, 245 (31%) of the 783 staff who responded to the question mentioned the availability of job placements at the institution as the biggest “roadblock”. Other important impediments included the availability of vocational programs (26%, \( n = 204 \)), offenders’ other programming needs (19%, \( n = 147 \)), and offenders’ refusal to participate in employment activities (14%, \( n = 109 \)). A detailed list of all “roadblocks” mentioned by staff is displayed in Table 56 (Appendix 9).

In terms of the effective incorporation of vocational programming, 290 (38%) of the 760 staff who responded noted the availability of vocational programs as the biggest “roadblock”, with another 19% each indicating the availability of job placements at the institution (\( n = 144 \)) and offenders’ other programming needs (\( n = 141 \)) as being the largest obstacle to effective
incorporation of vocational programming. A comprehensive list of all “roadblocks” listed by staff is presented in Table 57 (Appendix 9).

The integration of assessment outcomes and appropriate placement in employment and vocational activities are paramount in addressing offenders’ employment needs. In order to understand how this element of the EEP is functioning, staff members were asked a series of questions regarding the integration of assessments and placements in an offender’s correctional plan. First, it was important to understand how staff viewed the placement process. Staff members were asked to list what factors they believed determined which offender would be placed in a particular employment activity. For the 823 staff who responded to the question, the most frequently cited determining factors included the availability of the job placement (62%, \( n = 510 \)), offenders’ skills / abilities (46%, \( n = 375 \)), offenders’ interests (40%, \( n = 332 \)), offenders’ employment needs (30%, \( n = 249 \)), and CORCAN business needs (29%, \( n = 242 \)). A comprehensive list of responses is presented in Table 58 in Appendix 9.

Similarly, when asked to list what factors they believed determined which offender would be placed in a particular vocational program, of the 515 staff who responded, 306 (59%) listed the availability of the vocational program, offender’s interests (57%, \( n = 295 \)), offender’s skills / abilities (56%, \( n = 290 \)), offender’s employment needs (49%, \( n = 254 \)), and CORCAN business needs (26%, \( n = 136 \)) as the most frequent determining factors. A comprehensive list of factors listed by staff is displayed in Table 59 (Appendix 9).

Staff members were also asked to provide feedback on whether or not those offenders with the greatest employment needs were being placed in the appropriate employment opportunities. Specifically, staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that employment (institutional and CORCAN) and vocational training opportunities were being given to those with greater employment needs. Results of these items were categorized into three main
levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 12\textsuperscript{55}.

Table 12. Ratings of Staff Agreement Regarding Employment Opportunities Being Distributed to Offenders with the Greatest Employment Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of EEP</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral % (n)</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Employment</td>
<td>50 (379)</td>
<td>33 (254)</td>
<td>17 (128)</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Employment</td>
<td>47 (344)</td>
<td>32 (229)</td>
<td>21 (152)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Programs</td>
<td>48 (362)</td>
<td>33 (248)</td>
<td>18 (140)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA\textemdash conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement for each of the elements of the EEP\textemdash found that mean responses did not significantly differ between regions. However, there was a significant main effect of security level regarding respondents’ agreement as to whether employability and vocational programs are assigned to offenders with greater employment needs ($F(3,617) = 3.61$, $p < .05$). Bonferroni-adjusted post-hoc comparisons showed that, on average, minimum security level staff rated their agreement higher than medium security staff (Mean difference = .37, $p < .05$).

4.2.4 Ability to Intervene According to Offenders Interests and Abilities.

Summary Finding 4 (Vocational Congruence): In considering the level of vocational congruence provided by employment interventions, relatively high rates of vocational congruence are being achieved. Offenders and staff indicated that employment

\textsuperscript{55} A one-way within-subjects ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between employment, vocational programming, and work release indicated no significant differences ($F(1.98, 1395.24) = 2.7$, $ns$; $\omega^2 = .99$).
interventions are congruent with offenders’ interests and effectively use offenders’ skills and abilities. This finding is particularly true for CORCAN employment positions and work releases.

Finding 10: Overall, employment interventions are congruent with offenders’ vocational interests as measured by the vocational assessment at intake. Offenders agreed that employment interventions are congruent with their interests and indicated that they effectively use their skills and abilities. Offenders further indicated that this is particularly true for vocational programs and work release initiatives. Interestingly, staff agreed that CORCAN employment and work releases are congruent with offender interests and abilities but indicated that this is not the case with institutional employment and vocational programs. Overall, as compared to staff, offenders were significantly more likely to indicate that EEP initiatives meet their interests and abilities.

Vocational assessments, along with a series of other tools, are used to place offenders in employment opportunities and vocational programming that are compatible with their skills, abilities, and interests as well as meeting their employment needs. The in-depth examination of the vocational assessment and assignment process (i.e., CEC sub-sample) permitted the evaluation team to examine the level of congruence between the originally assessed vocational interests and the employment intervention placements. This is another method of determining the appropriateness of employment intervention placements. In examining levels of vocational congruence, it appears that, in comparison to levels of vocational congruence achieved by non-offenders in the community, offenders within institutions experience comparable and perhaps higher levels of vocational congruence.

Offenders were asked a series of questions to determine if their employment position, vocational training, and work release (if applicable) were appropriate for them in that they corresponded with their abilities and interests. Specifically, offenders were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that their job, their vocational training, and their work release was something that they

---


57 As discussed in Taylor, 2008.

58 Notably, the impact of vocational congruence was examined in relation to other correctional outcomes identified as relevant for the current evaluation. In the majority of these analyses (i.e., the impact of vocational congruence on time in employment programming, involvement in institutional incidents, changes in levels of security, job attainment, and job retention), offenders, in general, placed in congruent, or incongruent interventions, did not differ significantly; however, in some instances, differences emerged with respect to gender, race and age and interesting findings emerged in relation to time to recidivism. These findings will be addressed in the appropriate sections to follow.
were interested in. Offenders were also asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that their job and work release utilized skills and abilities that they had prior to incarceration. Results of these items were categorized into three main levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 13.
Table 13. Offenders’ Ratings of Agreement that Employment, Vocational Programming, and Work Release Corresponded with Interests and Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral % (n)</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is something that I am interested in</td>
<td>23 (68)</td>
<td>18 (52)</td>
<td>59 (174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job uses skills / abilities that I had prior to incarceration</td>
<td>37 (109)</td>
<td>9 (27)</td>
<td>54 (156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My vocational programs match my interests</td>
<td>16 (30)</td>
<td>12 (21)</td>
<td>72 (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work release is something that I am interested in</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td>10 (4)</td>
<td>82 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work release uses skills / abilities that I had prior to incarceration</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td>74 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To complement the offender questionnaire, staff members were also asked a series of questions to determine if the offenders’ employment positions, vocational training, and work releases corresponded with offenders’ abilities and interests. Specifically, staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that employment opportunities (institutional and CORCAN), vocational training, and work releases were meeting offenders abilities and interests. Results of these items were categorized into three main levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 14.
In general, staff members were more likely to disagree that the employment and vocational programs were corresponding with the abilities of offenders, and were more likely to agree that CORCAN employment and work releases meet the abilities of offenders. A one-way within-subjects ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between employment (Institutional and CORCAN), vocational programming, and work release found significant differences in the average level of agreement across EEP components \( F(2.75, 1156.20) = 32.9, p < .0001; \omega^2 = .88 \). Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons indicated that average ratings of agreement for institutional employment were significantly lower than those for CORCAN employment (Mean difference = -.49, \( p < .0001 \)) and work release programs (Mean difference = -.46, \( p < .0001 \)), but did not differ from the average agreement for vocational programs (Mean difference = -.07, ns.). Additionally, average agreement regarding whether CORCAN employment meets the abilities of offenders was significantly higher than that for
vocational programs (Mean difference = .42, \( p < .0001 \)), but did not differ from the average rating for work release programs (Mean difference = .06, \( ns \)). Finally, the average level of agreement as to whether vocational programs meet the abilities of offenders was significantly lower in comparison to work release programs (Mean difference = -.34, \( p < .0001 \)).

A one-way within-subjects ANOVA was also conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between whether employment (Institutional and CORCAN), vocational programming, and work release found meets the interests of offenders. Results indicated a significant difference in average agreement ratings between EEP components \( (F(2.79, 1159.38) = 36.14, p < .0001; \omega^2 = .90) \). Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons further indicate that the average rating as to whether institutional employment meets the interests of offenders was significantly lower than that for CORCAN employment (Mean difference = -.55, \( p < .0001 \)), vocational programs (Mean difference = -.17, \( p < .0001 \)), and work release programs (Mean difference = -.60, \( p < .0001 \)). Additionally, average agreement regarding the ability of CORCAN employment to meet the interests of offenders was significantly higher than that of vocational programs (Mean difference = .37, \( p < .0001 \)), but did not differ from that of work release programs (Mean difference = .00, \( ns \)). Finally, agreement as to whether vocational programs meet the interests of offenders was significantly lower in comparison to work release programs (Mean difference = -.33, \( p < .0001 \)).

In addition, ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement as to whether each of the elements of the EEP meet offenders’ abilities found significant mean differences between regions as to whether institutional employment \( (F(5,765) = 3.6, p < .005) \) and vocational programs \( (F(5,756) = 6.7, p < .0001) \) meet the abilities of offenders. Bonferroni-adjusted post-hoc analyses revealed that, on average, staff from the Quebec Region rated their agreement higher than staff from Ontario when asked whether institutional employment meets the abilities of offenders (Mean difference = .43, \( p < .01 \)). Quebec Region staff also scored their agreement significantly higher than staff from the Prairies (Mean difference = .60, \( p < .0001 \)), Ontario (Mean difference = .59, \( p < .0001 \)), and Atlantic (Mean difference = .49, \( p < .05 \)) Regions when asked whether vocational programs correspond with the abilities of offenders. Staff from NHQ scored their agreement significantly
higher than those from the Prairies (Mean difference = .69, \( p < .05 \)) and Ontario Regions (Mean difference = .68, \( p = .05 \)).

There were also significant differences between staff from various security levels when asked whether institutional employment (\( F(3,656) = 3.4, p < .05 \)), vocational programs (\( F(3,639) = 3.4, p < .05 \)), and work release programs (\( F(3,374) = 7.9, p < .0001 \)) correspond with the abilities of offenders. There were no differences between security levels regarding whether CORCAN employment meets the abilities of offenders. For institutional employment, respondents from minimum security institutions rated their agreement significantly higher than those from multi-level institutions (Mean difference = .41, \( p < .05 \)). For vocational programs, staff from minimum security institutions also rated their agreement significantly higher than those from both medium (Mean difference = .35, \( p < .05 \)) and multi-level security institutions (Mean difference = .43, \( p < .05 \)). Regarding work release programs, staff from minimum security institutions once again rated their agreement significantly higher than those from medium security institutions (Mean difference = .97, \( p < .0001 \)).

ANOVA\s conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement as to whether each of the elements of the EEP meet offenders’ interests found significant regional differences for all components of EEP, with the exception of work release programs. With regard to institutional employment opportunities (\( F(5,764) = 7.4, p < .0001 \)), Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc analyses revealed that staff from the Quebec Region rated their agreement significantly higher than staff from all other regions, excluding NHQ (Mean differences ranged from .35 to .60). The same pattern was found for employability programs (\( F(5,751) = 10.4, p < .0001 \); Mean differences ranged from .55 to .83); additionally, staff from NHQ rated their agreement significantly higher than those from the Prairies (Mean difference = .74, \( p < .05 \)) and Ontario Regions (Mean difference = .81, \( p < .01 \)).

As to whether CORCAN opportunities meet the interests of offenders (\( F(5,719) = 2.4, p < .05 \)), staff from the Ontario Region rated their agreement significantly higher than those from the Prairies Region (Mean difference = .40, \( p < .05 \)).
In addition, analyses revealed significant differences between institutional security levels regarding the ability of CORCAN employment \( (F(3,604) = 2.7, p < .05) \), vocational programs \( (F(3,635) = 6.2, p < .0001) \), and work release programs \( (F(3,373) = 3.9, p < .01) \) to meet the interests of offenders. Regarding CORCAN employment, Bonferroni-adjusted post-hoc comparisons revealed that staff from minimum security institutions scored their agreement significantly higher than those from multi-level institutions (Mean difference = .45, \( p < .05 \)). For vocational programs, staff from minimum security facilities scored their agreement higher than those from all other security levels (Mean differences ranged from .43 to .58). Lastly, staff from minimum security institutions scored their agreement higher than those from medium security institutions when asked about the ability of work release programs to address the interests of offenders (Mean difference = .48, \( p < .01 \)).

It was also of interest to determine the level of correspondence between the views of staff members and offenders when it came to whether or not they agreed that employment, vocational programs, and work releases were meeting the abilities and interests of offenders. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess if any mean differences existed between the two groups (offenders and staff) in ratings of agreement with the statements. Results indicated that offenders rated their agreement significantly higher than staff members when asked whether institutional employment, CORCAN employment, and work release programs meet their abilities and interests. Means and mean differences are presented in Table 15. Due to the different ways in which vocational program questions were phrased on the offender interview and staff survey, a direct comparison could not be made for this component of EEP.
Table 15. Comparison of Offender and Staff Agreement as to whether Employment and Work Release Activities Meet the Abilities and Interests of Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
<th>Offender Mean (n)</th>
<th>Staff Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional job meets abilities</td>
<td>3.53 (157)</td>
<td>2.69 (802)</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional job meets interests</td>
<td>3.69 (147)</td>
<td>2.49 (799)</td>
<td>1.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORCAN Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN job meets abilities</td>
<td>3.50 (94)</td>
<td>3.19 (754)</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN job meets interests</td>
<td>4.27 (81)</td>
<td>3.06 (752)</td>
<td>1.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Release</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work release job meets abilities</td>
<td>4.63 (35)</td>
<td>3.16 (463)</td>
<td>1.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work release job meets interests</td>
<td>4.38 (34)</td>
<td>3.08 (461)</td>
<td>1.30**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  * p < .05, ** p < .0001. Offenders and staff were asked to rate their agreement on a scale from one to five, with one being lowest, ‘strongly disagree’ and five being highest, ‘strongly agree’.

Finding 11: As compared to those offenders in institutional employment positions, offenders in CORCAN employment positions were more likely to report that their job corresponds to their interests and that they have access to vocational training that matches their interests.

CORCAN employees scored significantly higher than institutional employees when rating the correspondence between their interests and their job positions ($t(226) = 3.33, p < .01$) as well as their interests and their vocational programming ($t(155) = 2.81, p < .01$). Independent sample t-tests and Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to examine the above ratings for significant median differences between CORCAN and institutional employees (Mann-Whitney U tests were used for the work release items due to small group sample sizes). Results of these items are presented for CORCAN and institutional employees in Table 16.
Table 16. Mean Ratings of Offender Agreement that Employment, Vocational Programming, and Work Release Corresponded with Interests, Skills and Abilities: CORCAN vs. Institutional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Type</th>
<th>CORCAN Mean (n)</th>
<th>Institutional Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Overall Mean (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is something that I am interested in</td>
<td>3.99 (98)</td>
<td>3.43 (180)</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>3.63 (294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job uses skills / abilities that I had prior to incarceration</td>
<td>3.27 (98)</td>
<td>3.35 (179)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.28 (292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My vocational programs match my interests</td>
<td>4.22 (63)</td>
<td>3.71 (109)</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>3.95 (185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work release is something that I am interested in</td>
<td>4.27 (11)</td>
<td>4.52 (25)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4.38 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work release uses skills / abilities that I had prior to incarceration</td>
<td>3.91 (11)</td>
<td>4.24 (25)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4.13 (39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  **p < .01.  Offenders were asked to rate their agreement on a scale from one to five, with one being lowest, ‘strongly disagree’ and five being highest, ‘strongly agree’.  Overall Mean reflects all offenders who answered the question.

In addition, paired-sample t-tests found that work release job positions (overall) were significantly more likely than overall employment positions (CORCAN and institutional employment) to match offenders’ interests ($M = 4.45$ vs. $M = 3.61$, $t(37) = 3.02$, $p < .01$) and to make use of offenders’ skills and abilities ($M = 4.14$ vs. $M = 3.00$, $t(36) = 3.50$, $p < .01$). Again, it would appear that those job opportunities that are available through work releases are a more appropriate “fit” to the abilities and interests of offenders than those employment opportunities available in the institutions\(^{59}\).

\(^{59}\) Independent sample t-tests, ANOVAs, Mann-Whitney, and Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean or median ratings of correspondence with abilities and interests among the categories of the demographic variables found no significant differences.
Finally, in an effort to identify whether or not offenders could have been placed in more appropriate employment opportunities, offenders were asked if there was a different job that was currently offered in the institution that would be a better match to their personal interests and abilities. Of those who could answer definitively (n = 293), 73% indicated that there was not a job offered at the institution that would match their personal interests and abilities.

**RECOMMENDATION 5: CSC should ensure that generic work descriptions, along with the true skill level required for a given employment position, are carefully considered throughout the offender’s period of incarceration, thereby leading to more effective employment assignments and concrete vocational outcomes that will add value to employment interventions and lead to more successful employment outcomes.**

### 4.2.5 Productive Engagement of Offenders

Summary Finding 5 (Productivity / Institutional Incidents): Employment and vocational programs improved the overall functioning of the institution and time in employment programming was predictive of a decreased involvement in institutional incidents. Furthermore, as compared to offenders in CSC employment and the comparison group, offenders in ‘core employment programs’ were involved in significantly fewer institutional incidents. Finally, offenders stated that they were making a productive contribution and reported their jobs and work releases as a good use of their time. Importantly, these findings vary slightly for Aboriginal and women offenders.

Finding 12: As compared to offenders in CSC employment and the comparison group, offenders in ‘core employment programs’ were involved in significantly fewer institutional incidents (any, minor and major). Furthermore, time in employment programming was predictive of a decreased involvement in institutional incidents. However, these findings did not emerge for Aboriginal and women offenders. Notably, as compared to non-Aboriginal male offenders, Aboriginal and women offenders exhibited significantly higher rates of involvement in institutional incidents and this rate does not appear to be influenced by involvement in employment interventions. However, analyses conducted in relation to the impact of vocational congruence indicate that this may be an important construct for Aboriginal offenders.

In analyzing data from the Institutional sample, there were significant differences between employment program participants and non-participants on the rate of institutional incidents (any) while incarcerated, even after controlling for between-group differences on overall risk level, need level, total number of identified needs, age at intake, the proportion of time in other
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programs, number of current offences, and number of robbery offences60 $F(2, 17,596) = 41.10, p < .001$. Post-hoc comparisons indicated that offenders who participated in CSC work assignments had a significantly higher rate of incidents ($adj. M = 1.72, SE = 0.04$) than the comparison sample ($adj. M = 1.53, SE 0.04$), and both groups had significantly higher incident rates than offenders in core employment programs ($adj. M = 1.31, SE = 0.04$).

Similar between-group differences emerged when the rates of major incidents, $F(2, 17,596) = 17.16, p < .001$, and minor incidents, $F(2, 17,596) = 42.04, p < .001$, were considered. Offenders in CSC work assignments ($adj. M = 0.26, SE = 0.07$) and the comparison group ($adj. M = 0.22, SE = 0.007$) had significantly higher rates of major incidents than offenders in core employment programs ($adj. M = 0.18, SE = 0.003$). Participants of CSC work assignments ($adj. M = 1.10, SE = 0.04$) and those in the comparison sample ($adj. M = 1.06, SE = 0.04$) also had significantly higher rates of minor incidents than core employment participants ($adj. M = 0.80, SE = 0.004$).

When the length of time enrolled in these programs was examined, there was a significant positive impact of employment programs on institutional adjustment. In particular, longer periods of time in core employment programs were associated with significant reductions in the rate of any institutional incidents, $t(17,597) = -4.29, p < .001$, major incidents, $t(17,597) = -3.97, p < .001$, and minor incidents, $t(17,597) = -5.04, p < .001$, even after controlling for the effects of offender risk, need, age, other program participation, number of current offences, and number of robbery offences on outcome.

Rates of institutional incidents were compared on the basis of race, participation in employment programs (yes / no) and the interaction term of the two, while taking covariates into account (risk, need, age, time in other programs, number of current offences and number of current robbery offences). For the rate of any institutional incidents, there was a significant main effect of race ($F(1, 17516) = 144.06, p < .001$) but no significant of main effect of participation in employment programs (yes / no) or of the interaction term. In general, non-Aboriginal persons had a higher number of incidents ($adj. M = 1.64$) than Aboriginal persons ($adj. M = 0.88$). No

60 Robbery offences were included as a control in the model as there were statistically significant between-group differences on this variable.
significant interaction effect was found, and therefore offenders who had participated in employment programs did not have a significantly different mean rate of incidents than those who had participated for both Aboriginal (adj. $M = 0.84$ vs. adj. $M = 0.88$, respectively) and non-Aboriginal offenders (adj. $M = 1.68$ vs. adj. $M = 1.64$, respectively). Similar results were found for minor incidents, in which a significant main effect of race was found, but neither a main effect of participation in employment programming, nor a significant interaction was found. No significant effects were found for the rate of minor incidents. In addition, separate logistic regression analyses were performed for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders in which proportion of time spent in employment programs was the focal independent variable and rate of incidents was the dependent variable. After controlling for covariates, proportion of time spent in employment programs was not a significant predictor of rate of any institutional incidents for Aboriginal offenders ($t(3197) = 0.39, ns$), but was a significant predictor for non-Aboriginal offenders ($t(14,312) = -4.14, p < .001$). In general, as the proportion of time spent in programming increases, the rate of any incidents decreases ($b = -0.0007, SE = 0.0002$). Similar results were found when examining the rate of minor and major incidents, in particular.

Rates of institutional incidents were compared in a factorial ANOVA, with the main effects of gender and participation in employment programs and the interaction term. There was a significant difference between men and women offenders on their overall rate of institutional incidents (any) even after controlling for differences between the groups on the covariates, $F(1, 17,595) = 13.04, p < .001$. However, the main effect of participation in employment programs and the interaction term (gender by participation in employment programs) were not significant. Women had a significantly higher rate of incidents while incarcerated (adj. $M = 1.90, SE = 0.11$) compared to men (adj. $M = 1.50, SE = 0.04$). Similar results were found when examining the rate of major incidents, in which women (adj. $M = 0.47, SE = 0.04$) had significantly higher rates of major incidents than males (adj. $M = 0.22, SE = 0.003$) ($F(1, 17,595) = 131.73, p < .001$). Once again, there was no main effect of participation in employment programs or a gender by participation in employment program interaction. However, when examining the rate of minor incidents, there was no significant main effect of gender or participation in employment programs, but a significant interaction was found ($F(1,17,595) = 5.08, p < .05$), in which women who had participated in employment programs had similar rates to women who had not (adj. $M = \ldots$
1.21, $SE = 0.07$ vs. adj. $M = 0.94, SE = 0.15$, respectively). In addition, these women had significantly higher rates than males who had participated (adj. $M = 0.91, SE = 0.02$), who in turn had significantly lower rates than males who had not participated in employment programs (adj. $M = 1.02, SE = 0.04$).

Separate logistic regression analyses were also performed for men and women offenders in which proportion of time spent in employment programs was the focal independent variable and rate of incidents was the dependent variable. After controlling for covariates, ratio of time spent in employment programs was a significant predictor of rate of any institutional incidents for male offenders ($t(16,801) = -4.67, p < .001$), but was not a significant predictor for women offenders ($t(787) = 0.66, ns$). In general, for men, as the proportion of time spent in programming increases, the rate of any incident decreases ($b = -0.0007, SE = 0.0001$). Similar results were found when examining the rate of minor and major incidents, in particular.

As described above, Aboriginal offenders exhibited significantly higher rates of involvement in institutional incidents and this rate does not appear to be influenced by involvement in employment interventions. However, analyses that were conducted with the CEC sub-sample indicate that, when breaking the vocational congruence results out by Aboriginal status (i.e., Aboriginal vs. non-Aboriginal offenders), interesting findings emerge. More specifically, it appears that level of vocational congruence emerges as significant for Aboriginal offenders. Specifically, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted in order to determine if, after controlling period of incarceration and level of risk, level of vocational congruence would contribute to the variability in involvement in institutional incidents. For Aboriginal offenders, the multivariate results indicated that $r$ was significantly different from zero at the end of each step. After Step 3, with all independent variables in the equation, $R^2$ was .55. This indicates that the combination of these variables accounts for 55% of the variance in involvement in institutional incidents. After Step 1 with period of incarceration in the equation, $R^2 = .48$, $F(1,51) 47.78, p < .001$. After Step 2 with level of risk added to the prediction of involvement in institutional incidents, $R^2$ was .49, $F(2,50) 24.36, p < .001$. This addition did not result in a significant increment of $R^2$. After Step 3 with level of congruence added to the prediction of involvement in institutional incidents, $R^2$ was .55, $F(3,49) 19.76, p < .001$. The addition of level
of congruence to the equation reliably improved $R^2$ with an $R^2$ change value of .05, $F$ change of 5.84 ($p < .05$). While recognizing the exploratory nature of this analysis and the fact that a Bonferonni correction to compensate for an inflated Type I error rate, may negate these results, the evaluation team decided that, given the relevance and interest of this new vocational construct and the fact that this variable was approaching significance for this particular segment of the sample, it was worth reporting the results. Table 17 presents details for this small sample of Aboriginal offenders.

Table 17. Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Period of Incarceration (IV1), Level of Risk (IV2) and Level of Vocational Congruence (IV3) on Involvement in Institutional Incidents (DV) for Aboriginal Offenders ($n = 52$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IV1</th>
<th>IV2</th>
<th>IV3</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period of Incarceration</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.028***</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Risk</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Congruence</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.331*</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>580.83</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>283.76</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .55$

Adjusted $R^2 = .52$

$r = .74^{***}$

Note. $R^2 = .48$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .010$ for Step 2 (ns); $\Delta R^2 = .054$ for Step 3 ($p < .05$).

* $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$

**Finding 13:** The majority of offenders reported that their job was a good use of their time and almost all offenders indicated that work releases are a good use of their time. Furthermore, the majority of offenders indicated they were making a productive contribution through their jobs in the institution. However, just under half of those employed in institutional or CORCAN positions indicated they could be more productive doing something else (e.g., alternative job placements, vocational certification, education, correctional programs). Staff indicated that, as compared to institutional employment, CORCAN employment was more successful in productively engaging offenders.
One of the goals of the EEP is to ensure that offenders are not simply occupied by employment while incarcerated, but that they are productively and meaningfully engaged through their employment and vocational opportunities. As such, offenders were asked a number of questions to gauge whether they viewed their employment, vocational training, and work release opportunities as a productive use of their time during incarceration. Initially, offenders were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that their job (and work release if applicable) was a good use of their time. Of the 278 offenders who responded to the question, the majority (75%, \(n = 208\)) agreed or strongly agreed that their job was a good use of their time, while 14% (\(n = 38\)) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (\(M = 4.11, SD = 1.32\))\(^{61}\).

Ratings of agreement regarding work releases being a good use of offenders’ time were even more favourable. All but one of the offenders who answered the question (97%, \(n = 38\) of 39) agreed or strongly agreed that their work release was a good use of their time (\(M = 4.79, SD = 0.47\)). Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests were likewise conducted to determine if any differences existed in median rating of agreement among the categories of the demographic variables (race, region, security level, and gender) and among employment type (CORCAN and institutional). While no significant median differences were found in the majority of comparisons, a significant difference among the institutional security levels in the median rating of the extent to which work releases were a good use of the offender’s time was found, \(\chi^2(3, n = 39) = 9.72, p < .05\). Post-hoc pairwise multiple comparisons found that offenders in minimum security institutions agreed more strongly than those in medium security institutions; however, this difference was not significant when compared using a Bonferroni adjustment.

Offenders were also asked if they believed they were making a productive contribution through their job in the institution. Overall, 85% of offenders who responded to the question (\(n = 235\) of 278) indicated that they were making a productive contribution. Two-way contingency table analysis examining differences in feelings of productivity (yes or no) across the demographic

---

\(^{61}\) Independent sample t-tests and ANOVAs were conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean rating of agreement among the categories of the demographic variables (race, region, security level, and gender) and among employment type (CORCAN and institutional). No significant mean differences were found for any of the demographic variables, and there was no significant difference in mean agreement according to employment type (CORCAN or institutional).
variables found no significant differences. Comparatively, 95% \((n = 37\) of 39\) of offenders who participated in a work release indicated that they were making a productive contribution through their job. Again, two-way contingency table analysis examining differences in feelings of productivity in work release positions (yes or no) across the demographic variables found no significant differences.

Offenders employed with CORCAN and in institutional employment were asked to indicate whether or not they felt they could be more productive doing something else at the institution rather than their current employment position. Of those who responded \((n = 274)\), 45% indicated that there was something else that they could be doing that would be productive. Of those offenders who specified examples of how they could more productive \((n = 116)\), 47% \((n = 55)\) indicated that an alternative job placement would be a better use of their time, while 45% \((n = 52)\) mentioned that participating in a vocational certification program would be more productive. More than one-third \((37\%, n = 43)\) indicated that a more productive use of their time would be spent in an education program, and 17\% \((n = 20)\) indicated that participating in a correctional program would be more productive.

To complement the offender questionnaire, staff members were also asked about their perspective as to whether offenders were being productively engaged while incarcerated. Specifically, staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that employment opportunities (institutional and CORCAN) are keeping offenders productively engaged while incarcerated. Of the 791 staff who responded with regard to institutional employment opportunities, 416 (53%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that offenders were being productively engaged, while 179 (23%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement \((M = 2.55, SD = 1.22)\). Of the 753 staff who responded with regard to CORCAN employment opportunities, 237 (32%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that offenders were being productively engaged, while 313 (42%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement \((M = 3.14, SD = 1.26)\).
Examinations of mean differences in ratings of agreement between regions and institutional security levels (using ANOVA analyses) found significant regional differences for institutional employment ($F(5,769) = 5.5, p < .0001$). Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc comparisons revealed that, with regard to institutional employment, staff from the Quebec Region rated their agreement significantly higher than those from the Pacific, Prairies, and Ontario Regions (Mean differences ranged from .54 to .66). Significant mean differences were also found between security levels for institutional, but not CORCAN, employment ($F(3,656) = 3.0, p < .05$). Post hoc analyses showed that, on average, staff from maximum security institutions rated their agreement higher than those from medium security institutions (Mean difference = .38, $p < .05$).

In addition, a paired-sample t-test examining whether any mean differences existed in ratings of productive engagement between institutional and CORCAN job opportunities found that, on average, staff rated their agreement significantly higher for CORCAN opportunities than for institutional opportunities ($t(741) = 13.5, p < .0001$; Mean difference = .58).

*Finding 14: In general, staff members indicated that employment and vocational programs improved the overall functioning of the institution.*

Staff members were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree”, the extent to which they agreed that participation in employment (institutional and CORCAN) and vocational programming improves the overall functioning of the institution. Results of these items were categorized into three main levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 18.
Table 18. Ratings of Staff Agreement Regarding Ability of Employment and Vocational Training to Improve Institutional Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of EEP</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral % (n)</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional employment</td>
<td>18 (140)</td>
<td>30 (232)</td>
<td>53 (413)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN employment</td>
<td>17 (125)</td>
<td>28 (212)</td>
<td>56 (421)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational programs</td>
<td>18 (137)</td>
<td>29 (218)</td>
<td>54 (411)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way within-subjects ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between employment types and vocational programming found no significant differences in average levels of agreement between EEP components ($F(2,1486) = .6, ns.$).

In addition, ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement for each of the elements of the EEP found a significant main effect of region for institutional ($F(5,763) = 2.8, p < .05$) and CORCAN employment ($F(5, 736) = 3.3, p < .01$); however, after correcting with a Bonferroni adjustment, post hoc analyses indicated no significant differences between regions. Similarly, there were no significant differences between security levels.
Key Findings: Success – Effectiveness: Job Attainment

4.3 Evaluation Objective 3: Success -- Effectiveness

The extent to which a policy, program, or initiative is meeting its planned results.

4.3.1 Changes in Employment Need / Provision of Skills and Abilities (Job Readiness)

Summary Finding 6 (Reintegration / Job Readiness): In considering job readiness, reductions in employment need, and reintegration, in comparison to institutional employment opportunities, it appears that vocational programs, CORCAN employment and work releases were viewed as being particularly effective. Furthermore, offenders expressed motivation to become involved in third party certification programming, both within and outside of the institution, but did not associate involvement in employment interventions with the likelihood of gaining conditional release. Importantly, community partners indicated that offenders were NOT job ready upon release.

Although it was anticipated that it would be possible to examine change in employment need as an outcome variable within the quantitative analysis for the institutional sample, it was not feasible to do so due to large amounts of missing data for the comparison group (over 80% missing) and due to a low level of variability in change scores. However, the interviews and surveys administered to offenders, staff and community partners did inquire about the provision of skills and abilities and the following outcomes emerged.

Finding 15: As compared to CORCAN and Institutional employment opportunities, offenders were more likely to rate vocational programs and work release opportunities as providing skills and abilities that assist in job readiness. However, as compared to offenders in institutional employment positions, offenders in CORCAN employment positions were significantly more likely to indicate that their job is providing skills and contributing to job readiness.

As previously indicated, the employment and employability program at CSC aims to reduce offenders’ employment need through the provision of skills and abilities in the institution. Offenders were asked a series of questions to determine if their employment position, vocational training, and work release (if applicable) provided them with skills and abilities that would assist in readying them for employment in the community. Specifically, offenders were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that their job / vocational training / work release provided them with skills that would be useful in the community, the extent to which participating in
employment or work release made them ready for a job in the community, and the extent to which they agreed that they would be confident performing their job / vocational skills / work release position in the community. Results of these items are presented in Table 19.

Table 19. Offenders’ Ratings of Agreement that Employment, Vocational Programming, and Work Release Provided Skills and Abilities that Assisted in Job Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral % (n)</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job provides me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>30 (89)</td>
<td>12 (34)</td>
<td>58 (168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job has made me ready for a job in the community</td>
<td>29 (83)</td>
<td>12 (35)</td>
<td>59 (169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be confident doing the job I do in the institution in the community</td>
<td>7 (20)</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
<td>89 (254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My vocational programs provide me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td>88 (164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be confident working in the community in the area in which I took my vocational programs</td>
<td>7 (12)</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
<td>88 (162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Release</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work release provides me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td>87 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work release has made me ready for a job in the community</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>82 (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent sample t-tests and Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to examine the above ratings for significant median differences between CORCAN and institutional employees (Mann-
Whitney U tests were used for the work release items due to small group sample sizes. Results of these items are presented for CORCAN and institutional employees in Table 20.

**Table 20. Offenders’ Mean Ratings of Agreement that Employment, Vocational Programming, and Work Release Provided Skills and Abilities that Assisted in Job Readiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Type</th>
<th>CORCAN Mean (n)</th>
<th>Institutional Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Overall Mean (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job provides me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>3.92 (97)</td>
<td>3.18 (179)</td>
<td>0.74***</td>
<td>3.45 (291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job has made me ready for a job in the community</td>
<td>3.80 (95)</td>
<td>3.25 (176)</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>3.45 (287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be confident doing the job I do in the institution in the community</td>
<td>4.59 (97)</td>
<td>4.49 (17)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.50 (285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My vocational programs provide me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>4.56 (64)</td>
<td>4.33 (109)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>4.42 (186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be confident working in the community in the area in which I took my vocational programs</td>
<td>4.56 (64)</td>
<td>4.33 (106)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>4.43 (183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work release provides me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>4.18 (11)</td>
<td>4.44 (25)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.38 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work release has made me ready for a job in the community</td>
<td>4.36 (11)</td>
<td>3.88 (25)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>4.05 (39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.**  **p < .01, ***p < .001. Offenders were asked to rate their agreement on a scale from one to five, with one being lowest, ‘strongly disagree’ and five being highest, ‘strongly agree’. Overall Mean reflects all offenders who answered the question.

Interestingly, CORCAN employees scored significantly higher than institutional employees when rating whether or not their job positions would provide them with skills that would be
useful in the community ($t(213) = 3.88, p < .001$) as well as when rating whether or not their jobs have made them ready for a job in the community ($t(214) = 2.89, p < .01$). This would suggest that offenders in CORCAN employment positions obtain more job skills that are applicable in community employment and are more job ready when entering the community than those offenders working in institutional employment positions.

Independent sample t-tests, ANOVAs, Mann-Whitney, and Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean or median ratings of assistance with community job placement among the categories of the demographic variables found no significant differences with respect to race (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal). However, women offenders were significantly more likely than their male counterparts to agree that their jobs provided skills that would be useful in the community ($M = 3.78$ vs. $M = 3.37$, $t(107) = 2.06, p < .05$) and that their employment readied them for employment in the community ($M = 3.93$ vs. $M = 3.33$, $t(96) = 2.81, p < .01$). Furthermore, significant between group differences were found on several items when examined by institutional security level and region (see Table 21).
Table 21. Applicability of Employment Skills in the Community: ANOVA Results for Comparisons by Institutional Security Level and Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Between Groups df</th>
<th>Within Groups df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job has made me ready for a job in the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>5.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be confident doing the job I do in the institution in the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>3.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My vocational programs provide me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.48*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Between Groups df</th>
<th>Within Groups df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be confident doing the job I do in the institution in the community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My vocational programs provide me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be confident working in the community in the area in which I took my vocational programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2.45*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  *p < .05, **p < .01.

Post hoc pairwise comparisons using the Bonferroni correction found that as compared to those offenders in maximum security institutions, those offenders in a medium security institution were significantly more likely to indicate that their employment prepared them for work in the community (M = 3.61 vs. M = 2.87). Similar findings emerged in ratings of confidence doing
their institutional job in the community ($M = 4.74$ vs. $M = 4.26$) and in ratings indicating that their vocational programs provided them with skills that would be useful in the community ($M = 4.72$ vs. $M = 4.12$). In addition, as compared to offenders in maximum security institutions, offenders in multiple-level security institutions were significantly more likely to indicate that their employment prepared them for work in the community ($M = 3.98$ vs. $M = 2.87$).

Regional post hoc pairwise comparisons using the Bonferroni correction found that those offenders in the Ontario Region rated significantly higher than those in the Pacific Region in ratings indicating that their vocational programs provided them with skills that would be useful in the community ($M = 4.74$ vs. $M = 4.13$) and in ratings of confidence in working in the community in the area in which they took their vocational training ($M = 4.74$ vs. $M = 4.12$). Offenders in Ontario also rated their confidence in doing their institutional job once in the community significantly higher than did both offenders in the Pacific and Prairies Regions ($M = 4.83$ vs. $M = 4.34$ and $M = 4.21$, respectively).

Finally, to further gauge the extent to which institutional employment (including CORCAN employment) provided skills and abilities that would facilitate job readiness and attainment in the community, offenders were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘not at all likely’ and five being ‘very likely”, the extent to which it was likely that they would seek a job similar to the one they currently held in the institution when released to the community. The majority of those that responded to the question ($n = 288$) indicated that they were not at all likely or not likely to seek a similar job in the community (58%, $n = 166$), while 32% of respondents ($n = 93$) indicated that they were likely or very likely to seek a similar job in the community ($M = 2.51$, $SD = 1.64$).

Independent sample t-tests and ANOVAs conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean ratings of likelihood among the categories of the demographic variables found no significant differences across gender, race, security level, or region. When examining mean differences across employment type (CORCAN or institutional), results indicated that CORCAN employees were significantly more likely than institutional employees to seek a similar job in the community upon release ($M = 2.82$ vs. $M = 2.35$, $t(271) = 2.30$, $p < .05$).
Overall, the items measuring the provision of skills and abilities in institutional employment and the relationship with job readiness and employment need would suggest that offenders participating in CORCAN employment positions offer more applicable skills and translate better into community employment positions than do institutional employment opportunities. While these results do vary according to region and institutional security level, it is important to note that the majority of offenders themselves do not see their employment as translating into jobs in the community, although CORCAN jobs are more likely to be transferable than institutional jobs.

Finding 16: Staff members were more likely to indicate that Institutional and CORCAN employment opportunities as well as vocational programs were reducing offenders’ employment needs.

To further investigate the employment and employability program’s ability to reduce offenders’ employment needs through the provision of skills and abilities in the institution, staff members were asked about the capacity of the EEP to fulfill this goal. Specifically, staff members were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that offenders’ employment needs are reduced by institutional and CORCAN employment opportunities as well as participation in vocational programs. Results of these items were categorized into three main levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 22.
Table 22. Ratings of Staff Agreement Regarding Ability of Employment and Vocational Training to Reduce Employment Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of EEP</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
<th>% (n)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional employment</td>
<td>38 (287)</td>
<td>29 (221)</td>
<td>34 (158)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN employment</td>
<td>25 (184)</td>
<td>31 (231)</td>
<td>44 (324)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational programs</td>
<td>25 (187)</td>
<td>32 (240)</td>
<td>44 (333)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way within-subjects ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between employment, vocational programming, and work release found significant differences in the average ratings of agreement between EEP components \(F(1.98, 1431.88) = 39.2, p < .0001; \omega^2 = .99\). Bonferroni-adjusted pairwise comparisons revealed that the average rating of agreement for institutional employment was significantly lower than that of CORCAN employment (Mean difference = -.30, \(p < .0001\)) and vocational programs (Mean difference = -.29, \(p < .0001\)). There was no significant difference in the average levels of agreement as to whether offenders’ employment needs are reduced by CORCAN or vocational programs (Mean difference = -.01, ns.).

In addition, ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement for each of the elements of the EEP found significant differences between regions with regard to agreement with the statement that institutional employment opportunities reduce offenders’ employment needs \(F(5,745) = 4.8, p < .0001\). Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc comparisons showed that staff from the Quebec Region were more likely to rate their agreement higher than those from the Pacific, Prairies, and Ontario Regions (Mean differences ranged from .44 to .63). There were no significant differences
between security levels when asked about the ability of any EEP components to reduce offenders’ employment needs.

Community partners were also asked to indicate their opinions on EEP and its likelihood of reducing employment needs. Eighty-five percent \((n = 17 \text{ of } 20)\) indicated that vocational programs were effective in decreasing employment needs, 63% \((n = 12 \text{ of } 19)\) stated CORCAN employment opportunities decreased employment needs, and only 44% \((n = 8 \text{ of } 18)\) indicated that institutional employment opportunities were efficient in decreasing employment needs.

### 4.3.2 Employability Certificates / Employability Competencies

The number of certificates being delivered to inmates has continually increased over the past four years. Recognizing that this could be a reflection of increasing population size, these results are still presented for descriptive purposes. Table 23 provides information on the number of certificates that were obtained between 2003 and 2007. A breakdown by gender and Aboriginal status also follows.

#### Table 23. Vocational Certificates by Fiscal Year & Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>7,757</td>
<td>8,411</td>
<td>10,946</td>
<td>12,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHQ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>3,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>2,266</td>
<td>2,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairies</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>5,421</td>
<td>4,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, 10% of all certificates are going to women offenders (90% to men) and 23% are going to Aboriginal offenders (77% to non-Aboriginal offenders). Given the proportion of the

---

62 Extracted from CSC’s Criminal Justice Information Library (CJIL) data warehouse (June 13, 2008).
offender population that these sub-populations represent, this distribution seems somewhat appropriate.

◊ 2003 – 2004: 10% women, 23% Aboriginal
◊ 2004 – 2005: 10% women, 24% Aboriginal
◊ 2005 – 2006: 10% women, 23% Aboriginal
◊ 2006 – 2007: 11% women, 21% Aboriginal

Certificates are obtained in areas including, but not limited to: WHMIS, Forklift, Construction Framing, Construction Safety, Food Safety, Welding, Ladders and Scaffolding, Basic, Intermediate and Advanced AutoCAD, Textiles and Tailor Work, Dog Training, Horticulture, General Material Handling, Wood and other Labour, Sewing Machine Operation, Metal Machinist, Automotive Repair, Landscaping, Food Preparation, Upholstery, Graphic Arts, Cabinet Making, Electrical, Computers, Accounting, Bricklaying, Industrial Design, Hoisting and Rigging, Carpentry, Industrial Cleaning, First Aid, and Chainsaw Safety.63

Finding 17: Almost all offenders expressed motivation to participate in third party certification programs and further expressed interest in continuing this training in the community, upon release, where possible.

Considering the interest among offenders regarding vocational programming in general, specific questions were asked to determine offender opinion on employability certificates provided by third party organizations. Offenders were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that they would be more motivated to participate in vocational programming if their certification came from a third party (such as a public community college or a private career college) that was recognized by employers in the community. Almost all who responded to the question \( n = 227 \) of 250, 91%) agreed or strongly agreed that they would be motivated to participate in this type of program, with only 6% \( n = 14 \) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement \( M =4.65, SD=0.86 \). All demographic groups agreed equally in this item, with independent sample

---

63 Notably, during the consultation process, CORCAN representatives expressed interest in understanding the actual current location of certificates. When offenders were asked about the locations of the certificates received for those programs that they did complete, 97 of 142 respondents (68%) indicated that they had their certificates in their possession (in their cells or housing units). Certificates were also often placed in the care of family or friends in the community (11%, \( n = 15 \)), or stored in their files (8%, \( n = 11 \)). Only 8% of offenders \( n = 11 \) did not know where their vocational certificates were located.
t-tests and ANOVAs examining differences in mean ratings across the demographic variables finding no significant differences.

Recognizing that many employability certificates require several years of training and experience to complete, offenders were also asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that, where they were unable to complete their vocational programming while at the institution, they would like to be able to complete them upon release into the community. Again, almost all who responded to the question ($n = 226$ of $244$, $93\%$) agreed or strongly agreed that they would be interested in continuing their training in the community, with only $5\%$ ($n = 11$) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 0.85$). This level of agreement was especially true for women offenders, where an independent sample t-test illustrated a significantly higher level of agreement with this item for women rather than men ($M = 4.82$ vs. $M = 4.62$, $t(177) = 2.23$, $p < .05$).

To further understand the vocational interests of offenders who were interested in continuing their training once released into the community, offenders were asked to list which vocational training program they would most like to be able to complete upon release. While 37 different vocational programs were mentioned by the 106 offenders who specified a program, the most common included welding and metal fabrication (13%), culinary arts (9%), and automotive or small engine repair (7%). Many offenders (19%) noted that they would be willing to take any apprenticeship or trade certification program available to them, and 9% would like to continue their post-secondary education upon release.

Notably, results from a question on “best practices” within the staff survey further emphasize the relevance of third party certification. Many staff believe that certification and credit toward apprenticeships is a critical component of effective employment interventions.
RECOMMENDATION 6: CSC should examine current certification processes in order to determine how: 1) increased opportunities for vocational training lead to third party certification; and 2) related partnerships can be achieved. Increased third party certifications may contribute to the maintenance of high enrolment and completion rates, thereby maintaining cost-efficiency. Furthermore, the vocational description tables identifying details surrounding third party certification should be continuously monitored and updated.

4.3.3 Community Reintegration

Finding 18: The majority of staff indicated that involvement in EEP is effective at improving offenders’ reintegration into the community. Only half of the community partners agreed that this is true and almost all indicated that offenders are not “job ready” upon release into the community.

Post-release outcomes in terms of community employment status were examined in terms of reintegration, job attainment, and job retention at three and six months. It was of interest to assess whether or not staff members view employment and employability programs as facilitating offenders’ effective reintegration into the community. To gauge staff opinion in this regard, staff members were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree”, the extent to which they agreed that employment and employability programs are effective at improving offenders’ reintegration into the community. Of those who responded to the question (n = 796), the majority either agreed or strongly agreed that EEP are effective at improving offenders’ reintegration (51%, n = 404), while 26% of staff respondents (n = 206) either disagreed or strongly disagreed (M = 3.43, SD = 1.27). ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement found no significant differences between regions or security levels.

Community partners were asked to gauge the extent to which they agreed that employment and employability programs were effective at improving offenders’ reintegration into the community using a scale from one to five, one being “strongly disagree” and five being “strongly agree”. Half of the community partners who answered the question (52%, n = 11 of 21) strongly agreed or agreed that these programs were effective at improving integration, while 29% (n = 6) strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement and 19% (n = 4) were neutral (M = 3.38, SD = 1.20). In considering the impact of EEP components on job attainment, 90% (n = 19) indicated vocational programs were effective in increasing the likelihood of obtaining employment, 75%
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(n = 16) indicated CORCAN employment opportunities achieved this end and 75% (n = 14 of 20) indicated institutional employment opportunities contributed to this. With this in mind, results related to reintegration, job attainment and retention will now be discussed.

Community partners were asked whether they considered offenders to be “job ready” when they enter the community upon release. Of the 21 respondents, the majority (95%, n = 20) indicated that offenders were not “job ready”. Reasons contributing to this, according to community partners, are a lack of focus on personal issues (such as addictions, mental health issues, etc.), lack of training or education, limited support and resources in the community, lack of necessary documentation (e.g., SIN card, driver’s license, etc.), unrealistic expectations about the “real work world”, and limited motivation.

Finding 19: The majority of offenders did not seem to associate involvement in employment interventions with an increase in the likelihood of gaining conditional release. However, staff were more likely to indicate that participating in CORCAN employment and vocational programs increased the likelihood that offenders will be granted any type of conditional release. Conversely, they did not indicate that institutional employment contributed to likelihood of being granted conditional release.

Of interest was to assess whether or not offenders make a link between their successful reintegration into society and their involvement in employment in the institution and / or work releases. To this end, offenders were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that participating in their job increases their chances of any type of conditional release, and the extent to which they agreed that participating in their work release increases their chances of any type of conditional release.

Overall, 51% of offenders who responded (n = 142 of 279) disagreed or strongly disagreed that participating in their job increases their chances of any type of conditional release, while 35% of offenders (n = 98) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement (M = 2.69, SD = 1.61). However, a paired sample t-test showed that participation in work release was viewed as having a significantly larger impact on chances of conditional release than was institutional employment (t(36) = 6.04, p < .001), with 92% of offenders (n = 35 of 38) agreeing or strongly agreeing that
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participating in their work release increases their chances of any type of conditional release \((M = 4.57, SD = 0.99)\)\(^{64}\).

As considered with the offender interviews, staff links between offender involvement in employment activities and their eventual reintegration into society were also measured in terms of impact on release decisions. Staff members were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree”, the extent to which they agreed that participation in employment (institutional and CORCAN) and vocational programming increases the likelihood that an offender will be granted any type of conditional release. Results of these items were categorized into three main levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 24.

\(^{64}\) Independent sample t-tests, ANOVAs, Mann-Whitney, and Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean or median ratings of agreement among the categories of the demographic variables found no significant differences.
Table 24. Ratings of Staff Agreement Regarding Ability of Employment and Vocational Training to Increase Chances of Conditional Release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of EEP</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral % (n)</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional employment</td>
<td>43 (328)</td>
<td>29 (218)</td>
<td>28 (217)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN employment</td>
<td>31 (229)</td>
<td>32 (235)</td>
<td>37 (274)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational programs</td>
<td>22 (168)</td>
<td>30 (228)</td>
<td>48 (365)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, staff members were more likely to agree that participating in CORCAN and vocational programs increased the likelihood that offenders will be granted any type of conditional release, whereas staff members were more likely to disagree with regard to institutional employment. A one-way within-subjects ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between employment types and vocational programming found significant differences in average levels of agreement between EEP components \((F(1.91, 1386.95) = 153.75, p < .0001; \omega^2 = .95)\). Bonferroni-adjusted pairwise comparison subsequently indicated that the average level of agreement as to whether participating in institutional employment increases offenders’ chances of conditional release was significantly lower than that of CORCAN employment (Mean difference = -.27, \(p < .0001\)) and vocational programs (Mean difference = -.73, \(p < .0001\)). Additionally, agreement as to whether CORCAN employment increases offenders’ chances of conditional release was significantly lower than that of vocational programs (Mean difference = -.28, \(p < .0001\)).

In addition, ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement for each of the elements of the EEP found significant differences between regions with regard to institutional \((F(5,741) = 2.9, p < .05)\) and CORCAN employment \((F(5,716) = 2.9, p < .05)\). Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc analyses indicate
that staff from Ontario Region rated their agreement significantly higher than staff from both the Pacific (Mean difference = .40, \( p < .05 \)) and Quebec Regions (Mean difference = .42, \( p < .05 \)). Staff from the Ontario Region also rated their agreement higher than those from the Quebec Region when asked whether participation in CORCAN employment increases offenders’ chances of conditional release (Mean difference = .45, \( p < .05 \)). There were also significant differences between security levels regarding CORCAN employment (\( F(3,602) = 3.9, p < .01 \)). Specifically, staff from maximum security institutions rated their agreement significantly higher than those from medium security institutions (Mean difference = .40, \( p < .05 \)).

Finally, independent sample \( t \)-tests were conducted to determine the level of correspondence between the views of staff members and offenders with regard to whether or not they agreed that offender involvement in employment activities affected chances of conditional release. Results indicated no significant differences between the average ratings of agreement given by offenders and staff members when asked whether institutional (\( M = 2.68 \) vs. \( M = 2.77, t(173) = .62, ns \)) or CORCAN employment (\( M = 2.99 \) vs. \( M = 3.03, t(87) = .21, ns \)) increases offenders’ chances of conditional release.

### 4.3.4 Job Attainment

**Summary Finding 7 (Job Attainment):** Proportion of time in employment programming was predictive of job attainment in the community. Furthermore, CORCAN employment, vocational programs and work release opportunities were viewed by staff as facilitating the attainment of community employment upon release; however, this was not the case for institutional employment. Although offenders indicated that they were not encouraged to seek out resources in the community, community partners suggested the opposite; that is, offenders were encouraged to seek out community resources. Low employment skills, holding a criminal record and low education and / or certification were identified as the greatest roadblocks to accessing employment in the community.

Based on information extracted from the OMS, of those offenders who were released prior to the study end date, approximately 62% found employment in the community. To further address the impact of employment program participation on community employment status, a Chi-square analysis was performed examining the association between study group membership (i.e., core employment program, CSC work assignment, comparison group) and outcome. The association between group membership and employment status was statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (2, n = \)
13,203) = 9.65, p < .01. Offenders who participated in core employment programs were the most likely to find work in the community (64%), followed by offenders who participated in CSC work assignments (61%). Offenders who did not participate in any type of employment programs while incarcerated were the least likely to be employed after release (60%).

Analyses with the CEC sub-sample indicated that involvement in core employment programming was significantly related to job attainment. More specifically, a Cox regression model indicated that, as compared to the comparison group, participating in one or more of CSC’s core employment programs significantly increased an offender’s likelihood (11.4% more likely) of obtaining employment in the community ($\chi^2 = 17.52, p < .0001$). In order to further contextualize group membership, the proportion of time in employment programming was also considered. These results are now discussed.

Finding 20: Proportion of time in employment programming was predictive of job attainment in the community. This finding remains significant for women and Aboriginal offenders.

When examining offenders’ success in obtaining work upon return to the community, each logistic regression completed included offenders’ overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates. The first logistic regression showed that proportion of time participating in employment programs was a significant predictor of outcome incremental to the covariates, $\chi^2 (1, n = 11,581) = 43.71, p < .001$. Overall, these findings suggest that the length of time enrolled in employment programs reliably distinguished between offenders who found a job in the community and those who did not. For each one-unit increase in the proportion of time in employment programs, the likelihood of being employed increased by 0.4% ($OR = 1.004$).

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders to predict employment status in the community (employed versus unemployed), with proportion of time spent in employment programming as the focal variable, controlling for the
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65 Please note, those who were students or who were not employable due to a physical or mental disability, as well as those who had retired, were excluded from analyses regarding community employment status.
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following covariates: risk, need, number of needs, ratio of time in other programming, age, total time incarcerated, number of current offences and number of current robbery offences. Overall, proportion of time in employment programming was a significant predictor of community employment status (employed) for both Aboriginal ($\chi^2(1) = 6.78, p < .01, OR = 1.003, CI = 1.001$ to $1.006$) and non-Aboriginal offenders ($\chi^2(1) = 78.48, p < .001, OR = 1.006, CI = 1.004$ – $1.007$).

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for men and women offenders to predict employment status in the community (employed versus unemployed), with proportion of time spent in employment programming as the focal variable and controlling for the following covariates: risk, need, number of needs, ratio of time in other programming, age, total time incarcerated, number of current offences and number of current robbery offences. Overall, proportion of time in employment programming was a significant predictor of community employment status (employed) for male offenders ($\chi^2(1) = 77.24, p < .001, OR = 1.005, CI = 1.004$ to $1.006$) but not for women offenders ($\chi^2(1) = 2.75, \text{ns}; OR = 1.004, CI = 0.999$ – $1.009$).

Finding 21: Staff indicated that CORCAN employment, vocational programs and work release opportunities facilitated the attainment of community employment upon release. They did not, however, indicate this to be the case with institutional employment.

To further evaluate the success of the EEP in providing skills and abilities to offenders so that they are able to obtain employment in the community upon release, staff members were asked a series of questions regarding offender preparation for community employment while at the institution.

First, staff members were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that participation in employment (institutional and CORCAN), vocational programming, and work release increases the likelihood that an offender will obtain employment in the community. Results of these items were categorized into three main levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 25.
Table 25. Ratings of Staff Agreement Regarding Ability of Employment, Vocational Training, and Work Release to Facilitate Community Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral % (n)</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element of EEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional employment</td>
<td>46 (361)</td>
<td>28 (217)</td>
<td>26 (206)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN employment</td>
<td>22 (168)</td>
<td>29 (224)</td>
<td>49 (374)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational programs</td>
<td>17 (132)</td>
<td>25 (197)</td>
<td>58 (450)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work release</td>
<td>26 (124)</td>
<td>28 (138)</td>
<td>46 (224)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, staff members were more likely to agree that participating in CORCAN employment, vocational programs, and work releases increased the likelihood that offenders would obtain employment in the community; however, they were more likely to disagree that participation in institutional employment increased the likelihood of obtaining employment in the community. A one-way within-subjects ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between employment types, vocational programming, and work release found that there were significant differences in average levels of agreement between EEP components \((F(2.62, 1196.53) = 80.8, p < .0001; \omega^2 = .81)\). Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons revealed that the average rating as to whether institutional employment increases and offender’s likelihood of obtaining employment was significantly lower than that of CORCAN employment (Mean difference = -.66, \(p < .0001\)), vocational programs (Mean difference = -.85, \(p < .0001\)), and work release programs (Mean difference = -.50, \(p < .0001\)). The average level of agreement as to whether CORCAN increases offenders’ likelihood of obtaining community employment was significantly lower than that for vocational programs (Mean difference = -.20, \(p < .0001\)), but did not differ from average agreement for work release programs (Mean difference = .11, ns.). Lastly, the average level of agreement as to whether vocational programs increase offenders’ likelihood of obtaining employment was significantly higher than that for work release programs (Mean difference = .36, \(p < .0001\)).
In addition, ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement for each of the elements of the EEP found significant differences between regions on their average ratings of agreement that participation in CORCAN employment increases offenders’ likelihood of obtaining community employment ($F(5,744) = 3.8, p < .005$). Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc comparisons showed that staff from the Quebec Region rated their agreement significantly lower than those from the Ontario (Mean difference = -.42, $p < .05$) and Atlantic Regions (Mean difference = -.46, $p < .05$). By security level, staff from minimum security institutions rated their agreement higher than those from medium security institutions when asked whether participation in work release programs increased offenders’ likelihood of obtaining community employment ($F(3,396) = 3.0, p < .05$; mean difference = .42, $p < .05$). There were no other differences between regions or security levels with regard to whether participation in other EEP components improves offenders’ chances of obtaining community employment.

Finding 22: The majority of offenders did not indicate that they are encouraged to seek out resources in the community in order to help them secure employment upon release. Notably, offenders in CORCAN positions were more likely to express receiving support in this area. Staff responses to this question were negligible in that there was no clear consensus, however differences emerged with respect to region and security level. Finally, contrary to the opinions expressed by offenders, community partners indicated that offenders are encouraged to seek out community resources.

Recognizing that one of the key elements to successful job attainment for offenders is the availability of community contacts and resources, offenders were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that they have been encouraged to seek out resources in the community that will help them secure employment upon release. The majority of offenders (62%, $n = 178$) disagreed or strongly disagreed that they were encouraged to seek out community resources, with 31% ($n = 88$) agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement ($M = 2.36, SD = 1.62$).

Independent sample t-tests and ANOVAs conducted to determine if any differences existed in mean ratings of agreement among the categories of the demographic variables found no significant differences among gender, race, or institutional security level. However, offenders employed with CORCAN were significantly more likely than those employed in institutional job
placements to indicate that they had been encouraged to seek out community resources ($M = 2.61$ vs. $M = 2.18$, $t(268) = 2.10, p < .05$). In addition, an omnibus difference in mean ratings of agreement was found when examining group differences among regions ($F(4,280) = 4.43, p < .01$), with pairwise multiple comparisons (using the Bonferroni correction) indicating that those in the Ontario Region ($M = 1.66$) were significantly less likely than those in the Pacific ($M = 2.50$), Prairies ($M = 2.63$), and Quebec ($M = 2.73$) Regions to agree that they had been encouraged to seek out community resources.

Similar to the offender questionnaire, the staff survey inquired about the availability of community contacts and resources for offenders. As in the offender survey, staff members were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that offenders are encouraged to seek out resources in the community that will help them secure employment upon release. Staff responses were evenly distributed across the range of possible responses, with $35\% (n = 258)$ disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, $31\% (n = 231)$ responding neutral, and $34\% (n = 253)$ agreeing or strongly agreeing that offenders are encouraged to seek out community resources ($M = 3.00, SD = 1.18$).

ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant regional differences in mean ratings of agreement found no significant differences between regions. However, staff responses differed depending on security level ($F(3,614) = 3.6, p < .05$), with Tukey’s post hoc tests indicating that staff from minimum security institutions rated their agreement significantly higher than those from medium (Mean difference = .40, $p < .05$) and maximum security institutions (Mean difference = .46, $p < .05$).

Independent sample t-tests were conducted to determine the level of correspondence between the views of staff members and offenders when it came to whether or not they agreed that offenders are encouraged to seek out resources in the community that will aid them in obtaining employment upon release. Results indicated that staff ($M = 3.00$) rated their agreement significantly higher than did offenders ($M = 2.45$), $t(364) = 4.99, p < .0001$. 
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Building contacts and locating resources within the community assists offenders in retaining employment upon their release. As such, community partners were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being “strongly disagree” and five being “strongly agree”, the extent to which they agreed that offenders are encouraged to seek out resources in the community to help secure employment upon release. Of those community partners who answered the question \((n = 21)\), the majority (57%, \(n = 12\)) strongly agreed or agreed that offenders are encouraged to seek out resources in the community, with 29% (\(n = 6\)) disagreeing with this statement (\(M = 3.43, SD = 1.09\)).

Finding 23: Offenders, staff and community partners identified low employment skills and holding a criminal record as two of the greatest impediments in accessing employment in the community. Low education and / or certification was also high in the list for all three groups.

In order to evaluate current employment interventions and to target future areas of need and concern, it was important to understand what factors offenders regarded as prospective challenges in obtaining employment in the community. To do so, offenders were asked to indicate what they anticipated to be their greatest “roadblock” when seeking employment in the community upon release. Almost half of offenders who answered the question (49%, \(n = 143\) of 291) indicated that having a criminal record would be their largest roadblock, while not having the employment skills required was mentioned by 6% of offenders (\(n = 17\)). Other significant roadblocks mentioned by offenders included their age at release (6%, \(n = 17\)), the length of time they had been incarcerated (5%, \(n = 15\)), and not having the education or certification required for a job in the community (4%, \(n = 12\)). Interestingly, 18% of respondents (\(n = 52\)) indicated that they would not encounter any roadblocks when seeking employment in the community.

In order to target future areas of need and concern and to evaluate the congruency of opinions between staff and offenders, staff members were also asked to indicate what they anticipated to be the greatest “roadblock” offenders will face when seeking employment in the community upon release. Of the 792 staff who answered the question, 33% (\(n = 263\)) indicated that not having the employment skills required would be the largest roadblock, while not having the education / certification required was mentioned by 21% of staff (\(n = 162\)). Other significant roadblocks mentioned by staff included having a criminal record (20%, \(n = 159\)), lacking the
desire to work (8%, \(n = 61\)), and a lack of support in the community (4%, \(n = 33\)). A complete list of roadblocks provided by staff is presented in Table 60 (Appendix 9).

Community partners were questioned regarding the greatest roadblocks faced by offenders when seeking employment in the community upon release, as a means of evaluating current employment interventions and targeting future offender employment needs. The most frequently cited challenge for offenders was not having the education / certification required for the type of job they desired (35%, \(n = 7\) of 20). Having a criminal record (30%, \(n = 6\) of 20) and not having the employment skills required for the type of job they desired (25%, \(n = 5\) of 20) were also listed as significant challenges for offenders.

Finally, community partners were asked whether there was anything that should be incorporated into Employment and Employability Programs that would increase an offender’s likelihood of obtaining and retaining employment in the community. Of the 21 respondents, the majority (86%, \(n = 18\)) indicated that there were things that could be changed. The most frequently cited areas for change included the continued development of vocational programs and skills, increases in the levels of support / resources, more direct communication with the community, and ensuring that offender documentation is accurate upon release.

Finding 24: Offenders appear knowledgeable regarding essential skills required for job attainment and expressed that certain employment and vocational interventions have been effective in preparing them for employment in the community.

Fundamental in the EEP is the goal of providing skills and abilities to offenders so that they are able to obtain employment in the community upon release. In order to evaluate the success of this aim, offenders were asked a series of questions regarding their preparation for community employment while at the institution.

First, offenders were asked to list what they thought were the essential skills that they needed to possess in order to obtain a job in the community. The 286 offenders who responded to this question provided 28 essential skills, summarized here in Table 26.
Table 26. Essential Skills Required for Job Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal communication skills</td>
<td>103 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing up on time / punctuality</td>
<td>103 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work with others</td>
<td>99 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education / certification</td>
<td>76 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific trade skills</td>
<td>76 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude and behaviour</td>
<td>70 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in projects / tasks</td>
<td>55 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience / job stability</td>
<td>40 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking responsibility for performance</td>
<td>36 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to learn continuously</td>
<td>31 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percent (%) represents the proportion of respondents who listed the given essential skill. The total will be greater than 100% as offenders could indicate multiple skills.

Next, offenders were asked to consider all of the employment placements in which they had participated while at CSC, and to indicate which of those jobs they viewed as best preparing them for employment in the community. Of the 287 offenders who responded, 30% (n = 86) indicated that none of their institutional employment opportunities had readied them for employment in the community. The remainder of respondents (n = 201) outlined 36 different jobs that best prepared them for employment in the community, with the most representative jobs being summarized in Table 27. For a comprehensive list of all employment positions represented by the sample, please see Table 48, Appendix 6.
### Table 27. Employment That Best Prepared Offenders for Work in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Manufacturing</td>
<td>25 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Labourer / Food Services</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Maintenance</td>
<td>17 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Textiles</td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Construction</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Worker</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The positions listed represent 61% (n = 122 / 201) of respondents.

Similarly, offenders were asked to consider all of the vocational training which they had participated in while at CSC, and to list the training opportunities that they viewed as best preparing them for employment in the community. The 176 responding offenders listed a total of 30 programs which they indicated were especially beneficial upon release. Among the most popular were WHIMIS (39% of offenders, n = 69) and construction training (17% of offenders, n = 29). First aid and CPR (11%, n = 20), equipment operator training (11%, n = 19), culinary arts (6%, n = 11), and food safety (6%, n = 11) training were also notably mentioned. A small proportion of respondents (5%, n = 9) indicated that none of the vocational programs in which they participated would prepare them for employment in the community.
4.3.5 Job Retention

Summary Finding 8 (Job Retention): Staff indicated that participating in CORCAN employment, vocational programs, and work release opportunities increase the likelihood that offenders will retain their employment in the community. However, involvement in EEP did not emerge as a significant predictor of job retention.

Importantly, readily accessible job retention data are not recorded in OMS, thereby precluding the possibility of looking at job retention information for all offenders in the institutional sample. However, the CEC track and record job retention information for those offenders who visit a CEC. Therefore, the evaluation team was able to use the CEC sub-sample in the consideration of job retention outcomes. In examining this sample (n = 304), 139 (46%) offenders were identified by the CEC as finding employment in the community. In determining if these offenders were still working three months later, the CEC were able to follow-up with 90% (n = 125) of the sample, finding that half of the sample (n = 63) was still employed at the three-month follow-up. Follow-up at six months resulted in more extreme data loss, as there were data for only 27% (n = 38) of the sample. Nonetheless, 97% of these offenders were still employed at six months. However, this resulted in an extreme response rate for this outcome variable, in turn precluding the possibility of inferential analyses (i.e., the evaluation team could not look for statistical differences in relation to the 6-month follow-up period).

Finding 25: Involvement in EEP did not emerge as a significant predictor of job retention.

In analyzing job retention, based on the three-month follow-up, by group (i.e., core employment group, vs. CSC employment vs. comparison group) no statistical differences emerged, indicating that involvement in employment interventions was not predictive of job retention. Using the same sample, the evaluation team was able to examine potential differences in congruent and incongruent community job placements. It was anticipated that, as compared to incongruent employment in the community, congruent employment in the community would be associated with more stable periods of employment. Once again, this resulted in a poor model fit, with no statistical significance emerging. In other words, for this sample, level of vocational congruence in the community appears to be unrelated to job retention.
Finding 26: Staff members indicated that participating in CORCAN employment, vocational programs, and work release opportunities increase the likelihood that offenders would retain their employment in the community. However, they did not indicate that participating in institutional employment increases an offender’s likelihood of retaining employment in the community.

While obtaining employment in the community is one of the key goals of the EEP, equally, if not more important, is the offender’s ability to retain employment and continue to be a contributing member of society. To this end, staff members were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that participation in employment (institutional and CORCAN), vocational programming, and work release increases the likelihood that an offender will retain employment in the community. Results of these items were categorized into three main levels of agreement (strongly disagree / disagree, neutral, and agree / strongly agree) and are presented in Table 28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of EEP</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral % (n)</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional employment</td>
<td>50 (387)</td>
<td>28 (217)</td>
<td>23 (178)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN employment</td>
<td>26 (196)</td>
<td>34 (255)</td>
<td>41 (310)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational programs</td>
<td>22 (172)</td>
<td>29 (223)</td>
<td>49 (382)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work release</td>
<td>27 (133)</td>
<td>29 (139)</td>
<td>44 (213)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, staff members were more likely to agree that participating in CORCAN employment, vocational programs, and work releases increased the likelihood that offenders would retain their employment in the community. However, staff members were more likely to disagree that participating in institutional employment increases offenders’ chances of retaining employment.
in the community. This finding was echoed by community partners, with 81% \((n = 17)\) indicating that vocational programs may increase the likelihood of retaining employment, followed by CORCAN employment opportunities \((57\%, n = 12)\) and institutional employment opportunities \((35\%, n = 7 \text{ of } 20)\).

A one-way within-subjects ANOVA conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in agreement between employment types, vocational programming, and work release found significant differences in average levels of agreement between EEP components \((F(2.65, 1198.28) = 75.19, p < .0001; \omega^2 = .82)\). Bonferroni-adjusted pairwise comparisons revealed that agreement as to whether institutional employment increases offenders’ chances of retaining employment in the community was significantly lower than that for CORCAN employment \((\text{Mean difference} = -.59, p < .0001)\), vocational programs \((\text{Mean difference} = -.94, p < .0001)\), and work release programs \((\text{Mean difference} = -.55, p < .0001)\). Agreement as to whether CORCAN employment increases offenders’ chances of retaining community employment was significantly lower in comparison to vocational programs \((\text{Mean difference} = -.19, p < .0001)\), but did not differ from work release programs \((\text{Mean difference} = .04, \text{ns.})\). Finally, agreement as to whether vocational programs increase offenders’ chances of retaining employment in the community was significantly higher than that for work release programs \((\text{Mean difference} = .27, p < .0001)\).

In addition, ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement for each of the elements of the EEP found significant regional differences with regard to whether participating in CORCAN employment increases offenders’ chances of retaining community employment \((F(5,739) = 4.6, p < .0001)\). Specifically, Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc comparison show that staff from the Atlantic Region rated their agreement significantly higher than those from the Pacific \((\text{Mean difference} = .44, p < .05)\) and Prairies Regions \((\text{Mean difference} = .45, p < .05)\). As well, staff from Ontario rated their agreement significantly higher than staff from the Prairies Region \((\text{Mean difference} = .37, p < .05)\). Between security levels, there was a significant difference with respect to mean ratings of agreement as to whether participation in work release programs increases offenders’ chances of retaining employment in the community \((F(3,395) = 2.5, p < .05)\). Specifically, Bonferroni-
adjusted post hoc analyses showed that staff from minimum security institutions rated their agreement higher than those from medium security institutions (Mean difference = .39, \( p < .05 \)).

**RECOMMENDATION 7:** CSC should continue efforts to advance an approach that will lead to increased job retention rates for offenders. This may be facilitated by a continuity of data collection and management, in which relevant employment information, for a given offender, is adequately gathered and recorded at intake assessment, applied through the employment intervention process, and maintained through release into the community (i.e., job attainment and retention). This approach should ensure the collection of automated data which reflects the organization’s ability to maintain continuity for the offender as these relate to their employment needs, intervention efforts, and vocational aspirations.

### 4.3.6 Reducing Recidivism

Summary Finding 9 (Recidivism): The proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being readmitted to federal custody, being reconvicted for a new offence, and being reconvicted for a new violent offence. However, as compared to offenders who are employed in the community, offenders who are unemployed are significantly more likely to recidivate. Finally, vocational congruence may prove relevant in the examination of recidivism given that, as compared to unemployed offenders and offenders in community employment that is low in terms of vocational congruence, offenders in community employment that is highly congruent with their vocational interests remaining in the community longer.

To examine the impact of employment program participation on recidivism, a Chi-square analysis was performed examining the association between study group membership (i.e., core employment program, CSC work assignment, comparison group) and outcome. The association between group membership and readmission was statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (2, N = 12,874) = 51.64, p < .001 \). Participants of core employment programs (18%) and CSC work assignments (16%) were more likely to have been convicted of a new offence during the two-year period relative to offenders in the comparison group (11%). Furthermore, the association between group membership and re-offence was statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (2, N = 12,874) = 161.18, p < .001 \). Offenders in core employment programs (48%) and CSC work assignments only (46%) were significantly more likely to be readmitted to federal custody than offenders in the comparison sample (33%).
In examining time to recidivism, interesting results emerge as all three study groups (i.e., core employment, CSC employment and the comparison group) are performing relatively similarly. Specifically, in examining the average number of days to readmission, those offenders who received core employment programming are returning at the same rate as the comparison group (i.e., 234 days) and both the core employment and comparison groups are outperforming those in CSC employment who returned on average, within 229 days. Examining the average number of days to committing a new offence, the comparison group is actually staying out slightly longer (i.e., 269 days) as compared to the core employment group (i.e., 260 days) and finally the CSC employment group (i.e., 253 days).

Finding 27: The proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being readmitted to federal custody. This finding is consistent across Aboriginal status and gender.

After controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates, the proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being readmitted to federal custody within a fixed 2-year follow-up period ($\chi^2(1) = 43.71, p < .001, OR = 1.004, CI = 1.003-1.005$).

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal groups to address the impact of employment programs on readmission, after controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates. For both Aboriginal ($\chi^2(1) = 19.91, p < .001, OR = 1.006, CI = 1.004-1.009$) and non-Aboriginal offenders ($\chi^2(1) = 59.37, p < .001, OR = 1.005, CI = 1.004-1.007$), the proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being readmitted to federal custody within a fixed 2-year follow-up period.

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for male and female groups to address the impact of employment programs on readmission, after controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current
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offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates. For both men \( \chi^2(1) = 76.08, p < .001, OR = 1.005, CI = 1.004-1.007 \) and women offenders \( \chi^2(1) = 8.13, p < .01, OR = 1.007, CI = 1.002-1.013 \), the proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being readmitted to federal custody within a fixed 2-year follow-up period.

Finding 28: The proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being reconvicted for a new offence. This finding was consistent across Aboriginal status but did not emerge as significant for women offenders.

In considering the impact of employment programs on new offence conviction, after controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates, the proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being reconvicted within a fixed 2-year follow-up period \( \chi^2(1) = 37.15, p < .001, OR = 1.005, CI = 1.003-1.006 \).

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal groups, regarding the impact of employment programs on new offence convictions, after controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated, as the covariates. For both Aboriginal \( \chi^2(1) = 12.74, p < .001, OR = 1.006, CI = 1.003-1.010 \) and non-Aboriginal \( \chi^2(1) = 24.17, p < .001, OR = 1.004, CI = 1.003-1.006 \) offenders, the proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being reconvicted within a fixed 2-year follow-up period.

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for male and female groups, regarding the impact of employment programs on new offence convictions, after controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates. While no significant association was found for women offenders \( \chi^2(1) = 3.40, p = .06, OR = 1.00, CI = 1.000-1.013 \), for male offenders, the proportion of time spent in employment
programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being reconvicted within a fixed 2-year follow-up period ($\chi^2(1) = 32.66, p < .001, OR = 1.005, CI = 1.003-1.006)$.

Finding 29: The proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being reconvicted for a new violent offence. This finding was consistent across Aboriginal status but did not emerge as significant for women offenders.

After controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates, the proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being reconvicted with a violent offence within a fixed 2-year follow-up period ($\chi^2(1) = 9.23, p < .01, OR = 1.004, CI = 1.001-1.007)$.

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal groups to address the impact of employment programs on reconviction with a violent offence, after controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates. For both Aboriginal ($\chi^2(1) = 5.47, p < .02, OR = 1.006, CI = 1.001-1.012$) and non-Aboriginal offenders ($\chi^2(1) = 4.12, p < .05, OR = 1.003, CI = 1.000-1.006$), the proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being reconvicted with a violent offence within a fixed 2-year follow-up period.

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for male and female groups to address the impact of employment programs on reconviction with a violent offence, after controlling for overall risk level, overall need level, total number of identified needs, age, time in other programs, number of current offences, number of robbery offences and total time incarcerated as the covariates. For male offenders ($\chi^2(1) = 7.84, p < .01, OR = 1.004, CI = 1.001-1.006$), the proportion of time spent in employment programming was associated with a slight increase in the likelihood of being reconvicted with a violent offence within a fixed 2-year follow-up period. This finding did not emerge as significant for women offenders.
Finding 30: As compared to offenders who are employed in the community, offenders who are unemployed in the community were significantly more likely to recidivate (i.e., readmission, new offence, and/or new violent offence).

A final area of interest was the effect of obtaining work in the community on readmission, new offence, and new violent offence rates. After controlling for covariates (risk, need, number of needs, time in other programming, age, total time incarcerated, number of current offences, number of current robbery offences), employment status in the community was significantly associated with readmission ($\chi^2(1) = 451.79, p < .001$), new offence ($\chi^2(1) = 168.19, p < .001$), and new violent offences ($\chi^2(1) = 51.50, p < .0001$). Those unemployed were almost 2.9 times more likely to be readmitted within one year than those who were employed ($OR = 2.89, CI = 2.62 – 3.18$), were almost 2.2 times more likely to commit a new offence within two years than those who were employed ($OR = 2.19, CI = 1.95-2.47$), and were almost 1.2 times more likely to commit a new violent offence within two years than those who were employed ($OR = 1.21, CI = 1.15-1.27$).

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal groups to examine the relationship between employment in the community (following release) and re-offence, after controlling for covariates (risk, need, number of needs, time in other programming, age, total time incarcerated, number of current offences, number of current robbery offences). For both Aboriginal ($\chi^2(1) = 21.10, p < .001$) and non-Aboriginal ($\chi^2(1) = 143.67, p < .001$) offenders, community employment was a significant predictor where those who were unemployed were more likely to commit a new offence. For example, Aboriginal offenders who were unemployed in the community were 1.9 times more likely to commit a new offence ($OR = 1.91, CI = 1.45-2.53$) and non-Aboriginal offenders were 2.2 times more likely to re-offend ($OR = 2.25, CI = 1.97-2.56$). In examining new violent offences, similar results emerged, with Aboriginal ($OR = 1.20, CI = 1.07-1.35, \chi^2(1) = 9.81, p < .01$) and non-Aboriginal offenders ($OR = 1.20, CI = 1.14-1.28, \chi^2(1) = 38.56, p < .0001$), who were unemployed in the community, being 1.2 times more likely to be reconvicted with violent offences. Similar results were obtained when examining readmission, where Aboriginal offenders who were unemployed in the community were 2.8 times more likely to be readmitted to a federal institution ($OR = 2.81, CI = 2.24, 3.52, \chi^2(1) = 80.34, p < .001$) and non-Aboriginal offenders who were unemployed were
2.9 times more likely to be readmitted \((OR = 2.86, CI = 2.57-3.19, \chi^2(1) = 353.79, p < .001)\). Thus, community employment appears to be a key step toward promoting successful reintegration for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders.

Separate logistic regression analyses were performed for male and female groups to examine the relationship between employment in the community (following release) and re-offence, after controlling for covariates (risk, need, number of needs, time in other programming, age, total time incarcerated, number of current offences, number of current robbery offences). Although a significant relationship was not found for women \((\chi^2(1) = 1.79, ns; OR = 1.52, CI = 1.97-2.56)\), community employment was a significant predictor for men, where those who were unemployed were more likely to commit a new offence \((\chi^2(1) = 172.46, p < .001)\). For example, male offenders who were unemployed in the community were 2.3 times more likely to commit a new offence \((OR = 2.26, CI = 2.00-2.55)\). For readmission, both men \((\chi^2(1) = 432.28, p < .001)\) and women \((\chi^2(1) = 17.17, p < .001)\) offenders who were unemployed in the community were more likely to be readmitted to a federal institution, by 2.9 times for men \((OR = 2.91, CI = 2.63-3.22)\) and by 2.6 times for women \((OR = 2.64, CI = 1.67-4.19)\). Thus, community employment appears to be a key step toward promoting successful reintegration for both men and women offenders.

Notably, the validity of “length of time in employment programming”, as an independent variable, has already been raised as a potential limitation. Furthermore, findings concerning readmission and re-offence are most likely mediated by job attainment and retention. A mediator variable is said to explain the relationship between a predictor (i.e., time in employment programming) and outcome variable (i.e., recidivism). Involvement in employment programming is associated with job attainment and being employed is associated with a lower likelihood of recidivism; in turn, retaining that job becomes critical to ensuring better long-term outcomes. Consequently, job attainment and, most certainly job retention, are proposed as critical in mediating the relation between involvement in employment programming and recidivism. The next section of this report will speak briefly to the potential impact of vocational congruence; another potential mediator in this relationship.
Finding 31: As compared to unemployed offenders and offenders in low vocational congruence employment in the community, offenders in high vocational congruence employment in the community were remaining in the community longer (i.e., time to recidivism is longer).

As previously described, level of vocational congruence was not predictive in the majority of correctional outcomes examined in this evaluation. However, in examining time to failure as a function of employment status (i.e., unemployed vs. low congruence employment vs. high congruence employment), a Cox regression survival analysis was performed and the following results emerged.

This analysis revealed a statistically significant effect of employment status after adjusting for two covariates (i.e., risk and need), \( \chi^2 (2, n = 203) = 7.992, p = .018 \). Survival time was well predicted by the covariates, \( \chi^2 (2, n = 203) = 17.459, p < .001 \); however, once again, the univariate results reveal that only risk (\( p < .01 \)) emerged as a significant variable, with need not contributing significantly to this model (\( p = .598 \)). The results of this analysis are provided in Table 29, including regression coefficients, degrees of freedom, probability values, and odds ratios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Risk (SIR)</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Need</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>1.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed with Low Congruence</td>
<td>-.416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed with High Congruence</td>
<td>-.772</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analyzing time to failure for recidivism, these results indicate that both level of risk and employment status are predictive of time to recidivism. There were no statistical differences between unemployed offenders and those offenders in low-congruence employment positions. However, statistically significant differences emerged for unemployed offenders and those
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offenders in high-congruence employment positions. Specifically, compared to unemployed offenders, for those offenders in high congruence employment, each one point increase in congruence increased the probability of surviving by 54%. The survival curves (Figure 1) revealed that there is a clear linear relationship between employment status designations and time to failure. More specifically, those designated as ‘unemployed’ had the shortest time to failure, followed by those rated as ‘low congruent employment’, followed by those rated as ‘high congruent employment’.

Figure 1. Survival Analysis Examining Time to Failure for Recidivism by Community Employment Status

---

66 Results of these analyses were similar across gender and Aboriginal status. However, differences emerged for those offenders less than 30 years of age. Specifically, employment status did not emerge as a significant variable for this age group ($p = .314$), and the survival curves suggested that those in low-congruence employment positions were remaining in the community longer than both high-congruence and unemployed offenders. For more detailed information on this and other related vocational congruence information, please refer to Taylor, 2008.
It is recognized that a Bonferroni correction to compensate for an inflated Type I error rate would negate these results. However, given the exploratory nature of examining vocational congruence with offenders, it is of value to report these results as they provide evidence for the value of continued investigations in this area.

**RECOMMENDATION 8: CSC should more closely analyze the relationships between job attainment, job retention, and recidivism. This analysis would be facilitated by improved data integrity (as discussed in Recommendation 7).**

### 4.4 Evaluation Objective 4: Cost-Effectiveness

Cost-effectiveness determines the relationship between the amount spent and the results achieved relative to alternative design and delivery approaches.

The next section will provide staff perspectives on general cost-effectiveness as it relates to EEP. Following this, the cost-effectiveness analysis will be presented, as it relates to:

1. EEP usability and general program costs
2. EEP enrolment and completion rates
3. EEP involvement and release rates
4. EEP involvement and job attainment
5. EEP involvement and recidivism

Finally, quantitative outcomes related to incentive pay, along with staff and offender perspectives on incentive pay are provided.

**Summary Finding 10 (Cost-Effectiveness):** On a per inmate basis, Employment and Employability Programs (EEP) are offered in a cost-efficient manner, and economical in comparison to other interventions. Furthermore, high participation and successful completion rates in EEP are associated with lower unit costs and EEP are cost-effective in increasing participants’ likelihood of obtaining early institutional release. In addition, employment programs are cost-effective in increasing offenders’ ability to obtain employment in the community. Finally, staff viewed CORCAN’s role of maintaining self-sufficiency as taking precedence over the role of contributing to successful offender reintegration.
Finding 32: Staff opinions on the general cost-effectiveness of EEP were negligible in that there was no strong agreement regarding this issue. However, in considering the role of CORCAN, many staff indicated that CORCAN’s role of maintaining financial self-sufficiency takes precedence over the role of contributing to successful offender reintegration.

CSC strives, with all of its programs and initiatives, to operate in a cost-effective manner. With employment being one of the most costly programs offered and being one of the few that has the potential for creating revenue (through its CORCAN operations), the cost-effectiveness of the EEP is especially important. To learn more about the cost-effectiveness of the EEP, staff members were asked a series of questions inquiring about the costs of running the EEP.

First, to get a general perspective, staff members were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘not at all cost-effective’ and five being ‘extremely cost-effective’, how cost-effective are employment and employability programs. The majority of those who responded to the question \((n = 716)\) indicated that EEP are either cost-effective or extremely cost-effective \((38\%, n = 274)\), while 27\% of staff respondents \((n = 196)\) indicated that EEP are either not cost-effective or not at all cost-effective \((M = 3.13, SD = 1.15)\). ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of cost-effectiveness found significant differences between regions \((F(5,697) = 3.5, p < .01)\). Specifically, Tukey’s post hoc comparisons revealed that staff from the Prairies Region rated their agreement significantly lower than staff from the Quebec (Mean difference = -.48, \(p < .01\)) and Atlantic Regions (Mean difference = -.46, \(p < .05\)). There were no differences in ratings of cost-effectiveness between security levels.

Staff members were also asked about CORCAN operations and their role in cost-effectiveness. Specifically, staff members were asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which they agreed that CORCAN, operating as a Special Operating Agency, is fulfilling its dual role of maintaining financial self-sufficiency and contributing to the successful reintegration of offenders. The majority of those who responded to the question \((n = 735)\) agreed or strongly agreed \((38\%, n = 280)\), while slightly fewer staff respondents \((35%; n = 254)\) either disagreed or strongly disagreed \((M = 3.02, SD = 1.26)\). ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant
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regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement found significant regional differences \((F(5,713) = 3.6, \ p < .005)\). Tukey’s post hoc comparisons indicated that on average, staff from the Atlantic Region rated their agreement significantly higher than those from the Prairies Region (Mean difference = .53, \(p < .05\)). There were no significant differences between institutional security levels.

To follow up, staff members were asked if they viewed one of CORCAN’s dual roles as predominating over another. Almost two thirds (63%) of staff that responded answered the question definitively (yes or no; \(n = 335\) of 532), that is, one role predominates over the other. For those that indicated that one role did predominate \((n = 335)\), the majority (42%, \(n = 197\)) indicated that CORCAN’s role of maintaining financial self-sufficiency takes precedence over the role of contributing to successful offender reintegration. Two-way contingency table analyses were conducted to examine differences between regions and security levels with regard to whether one role predominates over the other, and if so, which role. There were no significant regional or security level differences regarding either question.

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA)

In the following Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) of Employment and Employability Programs (EEP), the primary outcomes considered are indicators of institutional adjustment (rate of institutional incidents, days to release), employability upon release (likelihood of obtaining employment in the community), and successful community reintegration (days to readmission, days to re-offence). By measuring both institutional and post-release outcomes, the short- and longer term influences of participation in EEP are considered. By focusing on measures of institutional adjustment and community employment / reintegration, the intended purposes of EEP are also considered – namely, productively engaging offenders while incarcerated, and increasing offenders’ chances of successful reintegration into the community. In addition to these outcomes, more descriptive financial information will be provided. More specifically, a descriptive comparison of the cost per inmate for employment and employability programs with alternative programs that target diverse criminogenic needs will be presented. In addition, the cost-effectiveness of the incentive pay program is examined by evaluating the ability of
employment programs offering the possibility of incentive pay to productively engage offenders during incarceration.

In order to maintain data integrity and conciseness across the menu of employment-related programs, only direct program costs were utilized, namely expenditures for Operating and Maintenance (O&M) and salary. This approach allowed for consistency in cost comparisons for CORCAN employment programs to those of CSC employment programs. Importantly, in allocating costs to programs, the following formulas were utilized:

1. Total Cost by Activity and Cost Centre\(^{68}\) = \(\sum O&M \text{ Region} + \sum \text{Salary Region}\)
2. Unit Cost of Treatment = \(\frac{\sum O&M \text{ Region} + \sum \text{Salary Region}}{\text{Number of Participants}}\)

Overall, it appears that on a per inmate basis EEP are offered in a cost-efficient manner and in comparison to other correctional interventions, employment interventions are an economical and worthwhile investment. Furthermore, there are relatively high participation and successful completion rates associated with employment interventions, thereby contributing to lower unit costs. Finally, employment initiatives emerge as cost-efficient in relation to both institutional and community outcomes.

Finding 33: On a per inmate basis, Employment and Employability Programs are offered in a cost-efficient manner, and economical in comparison to other correctional interventions.

There is a clear necessity to deliver employment related interventions, as demonstrated by the fact that over half of the offenders in this evaluation were identified as exhibiting some or considerable need in the employment domain. Moreover, the majority of offenders demonstrate need in not only one, but many, of the seven need domains. Accordingly, it is recognized that programming intervention efforts are multi-faceted and the costs associated with a given program vary as a function of individual program requirements. For example, a program may necessitate the involvement of a registered psychologist and / or registered nurse. This would directly impact related programming costs. Nevertheless, in order to consider the costs of

\(^{67}\) Additional Costing methodology utilized within this CEA is provided in Appendix 8.

\(^{68}\) Once the study groups were selected, the appropriate activities and cost centres were identified using CSC’s Financial Coding Manual.
employment interventions, as compared to other correctional programs, the evaluation team examined employment program costs as a function of average unit costs (per inmate) for a variety of different programs.

On a per inmate basis, employment and employability programs are comparable or relatively inexpensive as compared to alternative programming interventions targeting diverse criminogenic needs. Furthermore, the cost per inmate is lower for CORCAN employment interventions than for other employability and educational programs. Using Fiscal Year 2006-2007 as an example, educational programs cost an average of $1,560 per inmate, compared to employability programs at an average of $1,466 per inmate, CORCAN employment at a cost of $374 and core employment (i.e., employability and CORCAN) at a cost of $779 per inmate (see Table 30).

Within Table 30, costing information was determined using the appropriate cost centres and activity codes according to CSC Financial coding manuals. The cost data were assessed as reported in the Integrated Financial & Material Management System (IFMMS). The IFMMS defines direct program-related costs as consisting of the O&M and salaries directly utilized by the program. For a detailed description of the costing centres, please refer to Appendix 10.
Table 30. Relative Cost per inmate for Employability and CORCAN programs, 2005-2006 / 2006-2007\textsuperscript{70}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$27,491,503</td>
<td>12,132</td>
<td>$27,627,215</td>
<td>12,101</td>
<td>$2,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>$13,082,753</td>
<td>8,721</td>
<td>$13,308,821</td>
<td>8,530</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Inmate</td>
<td>$2,266</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>$2,388,318</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>$2,367,240</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>$1,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability Skills and Career Counselling</td>
<td>$1,194,825</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>$1,172,426</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>$1,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Employability Skills / On the job training</td>
<td>$123,144</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$112,757</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$12,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Employability Skills Program (NESP)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$27,335</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employability</strong></td>
<td>$3,706,287</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>$3,679,758</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>$1,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORCAN Employment Only</strong></td>
<td>$1,626,540</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>$1,588,540</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>$399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Core Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Employability &amp; CORCAN Employment)</td>
<td>$5,332,827</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>$5,268,298</td>
<td>6,771</td>
<td>$840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{69} Table 30 provides a breakdown of the costs and enrolments associated with: 1) programs excluding education and employment (eg., Violent Offender Programs, Substance Abuse Programs, Sex Offender Programs); 2) Education Programs (i.e., all educational programs excluding those educational programs related to employability initiatives); 3) Employability initiatives (including vocational training and institutional work placements); and 4) CORCAN Employment opportunities. This table descriptively illustrates the costs of Employability Programs and CORCAN Employment in relation to other programs offered to inmates by CSC. The table is for comparative purposes only; numbers in each column will not sum cumulatively.

\textsuperscript{70} Enrolments were accessed from the Corporate Reporting System http://infonet/pa/corporate_e.asp. CORCAN Employment Cost and Enrolments were accessed from CORCAN’s Comptroller Group.
Finding 34: High participation and successful completion rates in employability programs are associated with lower unit costs.

Due to the high completion rates of employability initiatives, the portion of program expenditures utilized to achieve this successful outcome is far greater than the portion utilized by drop-outs. In other words, it can be estimated that approximately 70 to 80 cents of every dollar spent on employability initiatives is used to achieve the expected result of successful completion. Using completion and drop-out rates for employability initiatives in fiscal year 2006-2007 (see Table 31 and Figure 2), the portions of program expenditures utilized by completions and drop-outs were calculated (see Table 32). This was done by multiplying the cost per enrolled offender by the numbers of completions and drop-outs, respectively.

**Table 31. Program Completion and Drop-out Rates 2006-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Drop-outs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>66.61%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability Skills and Career Counselling</td>
<td>69.82%</td>
<td>20.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Employability Skills Program (NESP)</td>
<td>80.33%</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Completion and drop-out rates were accessed from the Corporate Reporting System. Completion and drop-out rates across a given program will not sum to 100% given that additional program status outcomes are excluded from this table (i.e., transfers, releases, reached Warrant Expiry, paroled).
Figure 2. Distribution of Employability Initiative Expenditures on Completions and Drop-outs for Fiscal Year 2006-2007

Program Expenditures

Table 32. Distribution of Employability Initiative Expenditures on Completions and Drop-outs for Fiscal Year 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employability Initiative</th>
<th>Program Cost</th>
<th>Completions (n)</th>
<th>Costs utilized by completions</th>
<th>Drop-outs (n)</th>
<th>Costs utilized by drop-outs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>$2,367,240</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>$1,575,900</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$206,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability Skills and Career Counselling</td>
<td>$1,172,426</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>$817,999</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>$241,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Employability Skills / On the job training</td>
<td>$112,757</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Employability Skills Program (NESP)</td>
<td>$27,335</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>$21,808</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$4,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Absolute numbers of program completions and drop-outs were derived from percentage data provided in the Corporate Reporting System.
Finding 35: Employment programs are cost-effective in increasing participants' likelihood of obtaining early institutional release.

Inmates who participated in any type of employment program were released into the community earlier than those who did not participate in any employment programs. As expected, the comparison group remained in the institution longer than either core employment or CSC employment participants. Using the number of days served in the institution by the comparison group as a baseline, the core employment group was released an average of 88 days earlier than could be expected, and the CSC employment group was released on average 119 days earlier than anticipated (see Table 33).

Table 33. Indicators of Productive Engagement -- Early Release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Average Days Saved to Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Employment</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC Employment</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CSC employment group is contributing the most in terms of cost savings associated with early release, followed by the core employment group. More specifically, as compared to offenders not involved in employment programming, CSC is saving an average of $15,662.24 per core employment program participant, and $21,179.62 per CSC Employment participant (see Table 34). Cost savings were calculated by multiplying the number of days saved by the daily average rate of maintaining an offender in an institution, minus the total costs of community supervision. The assumption underlying this analysis is that the offender will be supervised in the community to a maximum of the average days saved. Across security levels and gender, the

---

71 Average days saved to release was calculated as a function of days to release for the comparison group as a baseline.
annual average cost of incarceration per inmate is $88,067\textsuperscript{72} and the annual average cost of community supervision per offender is $23,105\textsuperscript{73}.

Table 34. Early Release Cost Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Days Saved (1)</th>
<th>Average Daily Cost of Incarceration (2)</th>
<th>Extended Cost of Incarceration (3) (1 x 2)</th>
<th>Average Daily Cost of Community Supervision (4)</th>
<th>Extended Cost of Community Supervision (5) (1 x 4)</th>
<th>Cost Savings of Early Release (6) (3 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Employment</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$241.28</td>
<td>$21,232.64</td>
<td>$63.30</td>
<td>$5,570.40</td>
<td>$15,662.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC Employment</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$241.28</td>
<td>$28,712.32</td>
<td>$63.30</td>
<td>$7,532.70</td>
<td>$21,179.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average daily costs: Incarceration = Annual average cost of incarceration per inmate / 365 days; Community = Annual average cost of community supervision per inmate / 365 days.

Importantly, in discussing results concerning early release from a Federal institution, it is equally critical to consider how successful that individual was upon release. The following section will consider the success of the inmates after their release date by examining the likelihood of obtaining employment, the number of days to readmission and the number of days to re-offence.

Finding 36: Employment and Employability Programs are cost-effective in increasing offenders’ ability to obtain employment in the community. However, cost-efficiency is negligible when considering time to readmission and time to committing a new offence.

For the purposes of the present evaluation, successful reintegration of offenders into the community is defined as the offenders’ ability to find employment, to remain in the community as long as possible, and to abstain from committing a new offence. As such, the indicators used for this analysis include the proportion of offenders who found community employment, the

\textsuperscript{72} Annual cost of keeping an inmate in a federal penitentiary Source: Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview 2007, Public Safety.

\textsuperscript{73} Annual cost of keeping an inmate in the community Source: Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview 2007, Public Safety.
average time to readmission for any revocation, and the average time to committing a new offence in the community.

Participation in Employment and Employability Programs increased offenders’ likelihood of finding a job, which, as previously discussed, has been identified as a predictor of successful reintegration. At a maximum unit cost of $1,222.12 (i.e., core program costs / inmate ($779) plus incentive pay costs ($443.12)), the net effect of participating in core employment is an additional 3% of offenders gaining employment compared to the CSC employment group, and an additional 4% when compared to the comparison group (see Table 35).

Table 35. Reintegration Indicator Results -- Obtaining Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Core Employment</th>
<th>CSC Employment</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Found Employment</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CSC employment group is returning to custody sooner and committing a new offence more rapidly than both the core employment and comparison group. In fact, on average, the core employment group is being readmitted to custody at the same time as the comparison group, and the core employment group is committing a new offence sooner than the comparison group (see Table 36). As discussed above, this difference is not statistically significant.

---

74 As described on Page 81.
Table 36. Reintegration Indicator Results -- Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Core Employment</th>
<th>CSC Employment</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Days to Readmission</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Days to Committing New Offence</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these results, Employment and Employability Programs do not appear to emerge as particularly cost-effective. The comparison group was more likely to stay out in the community longer and had the longest length of time to committing a new offence. However, as depicted in Table 37, the associated costs in relation to readmission are negligible.

Table 37. Average Days to Readmission and Extended Costs of Community Supervision for Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Group</th>
<th>Days to readmission</th>
<th>Average daily cost of community supervision (^{76})</th>
<th>Extended cost of community supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Employment</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>$63.30</td>
<td>$14,812.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC Employment</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>$63.30</td>
<td>$14,495.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>$63.30</td>
<td>$14,812.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{75}\) As described in the “Reducing Recidivism” section of this report.

\(^{76}\) These costs do not reflect the cost of programs, only the costs related to community supervision. In terms of days to readmission, there is no cost savings associated with partaking in Employment Programs.
4.4.1 Incentive Pay

Summary Finding 11 (Incentive Pay): Incentive pay is viewed as being a positive motivator and contributing to a sense of independence and self-sufficiency as well as productivity. Jobs offering incentive pay are also viewed as more appealing by offenders. However, the fair distribution of incentive pay job opportunities is viewed differently by both staff and offenders and staff indicated that incentive pay causes conflict among offenders.

Finding 37: Employment Programs that offer the possibility of incentive pay are cost-effective in productively engaging offenders while incarcerated.

As previously discussed, incentive pay is a motivational tool used within CORCAN operations. It is anticipated that this will result in increased motivation to become, and remain, involved in employment opportunities during incarceration, in turn contributing to more positive institutional adjustment, and eventual success in the community, for those offenders receiving this incentive.

Table 38. Breakdown of Incentive Pay Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
<th>Per inmate per year</th>
<th>Per inmate per pay period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$1,726,008</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>$423.66</td>
<td>$16.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$1,883,712</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>$443.12</td>
<td>$17.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As detailed in Table 38, on average, incentive pay costs the organization about $443 per inmate per year, or $17.04 per pay period (26 pay periods per year).

Inmates who participated in core employment programs, where there is an increased possibility of being awarded incentive pay (because CORCAN employees are represented within this group) were less likely to be involved in institutional incidents. The core employment group demonstrated an average of 1.31 incidents annually. This translates into 0.41 fewer incidents per year than the CSC employment Group, and 0.22 fewer incidents per year than the comparison group (see Table 39). Contrary to expectations, those offenders who participated in CSC

---

77 Incentive pay data provided by CORCAN Comptroller Group.
employment were involved in more institutional incidents relative to the comparison group and core employment participants.

In terms of cost-effectiveness, these results can be interpreted as the investment of $779 per inmate (from Table 30) participating in core employment programs decreases the average rate of incidents by 0.41 incidents per year, per inmate. These results must be interpreted in light of the limitation regarding the inability to directly compare incentive pay recipients with other offenders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 39. Indicators of Productive Engagement -- Institutional Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.2 Offender and Staff Perspectives on Incentive Pay

As part of many CORCAN employment opportunities, offenders are able to earn incentive pay (a bonus or stipend) in addition to their daily pay rate. Offenders were asked a series of questions about their views on the incentive pay program, beginning with whether or not offenders in general, and themselves specifically, were in favour of the incentive pay program. Of those who responded \((n = 300)\), the majority (86%, \(n = 260\)) of offenders indicated that inmates in general are in favour of the incentive pay program. A slightly lower proportion (82%, \(n = 246\)) were personally in favour of the incentive pay program. Those offenders who were currently employed in CORCAN positions were more likely to be in favour of incentive pay than offenders employed in institutional jobs \((\chi^2(1, n = 253) = 5.71, p < .05)\).

Those offenders not in favour of the incentive pay program \((n = 22)\) were asked to explain why they felt this way. Most commonly, offenders indicated that incentive pay was too low or

---

78 As described in the “Productive Engagement of Offenders” section of this report.
unrealistic (32%, $n = 7$), and that it should be offered for all jobs and / or to all offenders (27%, $n = 6$). A few offenders were not in favour of the fact that incentive pay workers pay room and board (14%, $n = 3$).

Finding 38: Both offenders and staff viewed incentive pay as being a positive motivator and providing offenders with a sense of productivity. Offenders also indicated that it provides them with additional funds for release and increased skill sets, while staff indicated that incentive pay provides offenders with a sense of independence and self-sufficiency and teaches them how to manage money. Notably, just under one quarter of offenders indicated that outside of earning money, there were no additional benefits to incentive pay.

Offenders were asked to list some possible benefits of the incentive pay program, aside from earning money. Of those who responded to the question ($n = 247$), almost half (43%) indicated that incentive pay is a positive motivator. Others noted the benefits of providing funds to assist offenders on release (22%, $n = 54$), making offenders feel more productive (giving them something to show for their work); (17%, $n = 41$), and that incentive pay jobs teach more realistic skills (11%, $n = 26$). Interestingly, 22% of offenders ($n = 55$) stated that there are no additional benefits to incentive pay aside from earning more money.

As with the offender interview, staff members were asked to list the benefits of the incentive pay program for offenders, aside from making a higher income. Of those who responded to the question ($n = 537$), 81% ($n = 435$) indicated that incentive pay increases offenders’ motivation to work. Others noted that incentive pay allows offenders to feel more productive / gives them something to show for their work (71%, $n = 382$), allows them to feel more independent / self-sufficient (50%, $n = 267$), and teaches offenders how to manage money (32%, $n = 172$). Of note, 2% of respondents ($n = 10$) stated that there are no other benefits of the incentive pay program, while an additional 2% ($n = 12$) provided answers that were unrelated to the question.

Finding 39: As compared to staff, offenders were significantly more likely to indicate that the distribution of incentive pay is fair. Conversely, just under half of staff indicated that incentive pay is not distributed fairly, stating that distribution of incentive pay positions is based on CORCAN’s business needs, staff preference, past performance in jobs, and availability of job placements. Furthermore, although the offenders in this sample indicated otherwise, staff indicated that incentive pay causes conflict among offenders that results in muscling, jealousy, and resentment. The majority of staff indicated no conflict among staff as a result of incentive pay.
Offenders were also asked how fairly they believed the distribution of incentive pay jobs was handled. When asked to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘not at all likely’ and five being ‘very likely”, the extent to which incentive pay jobs are distributed fairly among offenders, 70% of offenders either agreed or strongly agreed (n = 163) that incentive pay jobs were distributed fairly. Fewer offenders disagreed or strongly disagreed (21%, n = 48), while the remainder were neutral (M = 3.90, SD = 1.40). Offenders were also asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘not at all likely’ and five being ‘very likely”, the extent to which incentive pay jobs cause conflict among offenders in the institution. The majority of offenders (74%, n = 174) disagreed or strongly disagreed that incentive pay causes any conflict, while 17% agreed or strongly agreed (n = 41) that this was the case (M = 1.90, SD = 1.31).

Independent sample t-tests and ANOVAs were conducted to determine if mean differences in ratings of fairness of job distribution and conflict existed across the categories of the demographic variables. A comparison of mean differences across employment type (CORCAN versus institutional employment) revealed that those offenders currently employed in CORCAN jobs were more likely to agree that incentive pay jobs are distributed fairly (M = 4.11 vs. M = 3.72, t(271) = 2.17, p < .05).

There was a significant omnibus difference across regions when offenders were asked whether incentive pay causes conflict among offenders in the institution (F(4,231) = 2.76, p < .05). Offenders from the Quebec Region were more likely than offenders from the Ontario and Prairies Regions to agree that incentive pay causes conflict among offenders, and offenders in the Atlantic Region were likewise more likely than offenders from the Ontario Region to agree that incentive pay causes conflict among offenders. However, none of these pairwise comparisons was significant after a Bonferroni correction was applied.

Staff member views on a number of matters regarding incentive pay were likewise sought. As in the offender questionnaire, staff members were queried regarding the extent to which they would agree, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, that incentive pay jobs are distributed fairly among offenders. Of those who responded to the question (n = 720), the majority either disagreed or strongly disagreed (41%, n = 298), while
28% of staff respondents \((n = 205)\) either agreed or strongly agreed \((M = 2.73, \ SD = 1.23)\). ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement found no significant differences between regions or between security levels.

Independent sample t-tests examining mean differences in agreement between the offender and staff respondents found that offenders \((M = 4.10)\) rated their agreement higher than staff members \((M = 2.73)\) when asked whether incentive pay jobs are distributed fairly \((t(929) = 14.0, \ p < .0001)\).

To follow up, staff members were asked to list reasons why they agreed or disagreed that incentive pay jobs were distributed fairly among offenders. Of those who agreed or strongly agreed and provided reasons for their agreement \((n = 148)\), 55% indicated that distribution of incentive pay jobs is based on offenders’ skills / abilities \((n = 81)\). Staff members who indicated that incentive pay jobs are distributed fairly among offenders also reasoned that these jobs are based on the availability of job placements \(52%, n = 77\), on offenders’ past performance in that job \(47%, n = 70\), on offenders’ interests \(40%, n = 59\), on CORCAN business needs \(40%, n = 58\), and on offenders’ employment needs \(27%, n = 40\). Interestingly, of those who disagreed or strongly disagreed and provided reasons for their disagreement, \((n = 97)\), many listed the same reasons as those provided by staff who agreed. For instance, 74% indicated that incentive pay jobs are not distributed fairly because they are based on CORCAN’s business needs \((n = 72)\). Other reasons for indicating that incentive pay jobs were not distributed fairly included that placement in an incentive pay job is based on staff preference \(42%, n = 41\), on the availability of job placements in the institution \(38%, n = 37\), on offenders’ skills / abilities \(18%, n = 17\), and on offenders’ past performance in the job \(18%, n = 17\). A complete list of reasons as to why staff feel incentive pay jobs are or are not distributed fairly is provided in Table 61 (Appendix 9).

Also of interest was whether or not staff members viewed the incentive pay program as causing conflict among offenders and among staff members in the institution. Twenty-six percent of respondents \((n = 118 \text{ of } 460)\) indicated that the program does cause conflict among staff.
members. Of those who provided reasons ($n = 113$), common reasons for conflict included competition between staff for workers (30%, $n = 34$), tensions between program and employment staff (9%, $n = 10$), tensions over decision-making (6%, $n = 7$). A greater proportion of staff (62% of 430 respondents; $n = 266$) indicated that the program causes conflict among offenders in the institution. Of these, 95% ($n = 252$) provided reasons for conflict among offenders. Common reasons for conflict among offenders included muscling / influencing CORCAN workers or applicants (17%, $n = 43$ of 252 respondents), jealousy over pay differences (16%, $n = 41$), resentment due to lack of access / availability of incentive pay jobs (14%, $n = 35$), and jealousy over job status / special treatment (13%, $n = 32$). It must be noted that a large number of staff respondents provided answers to the questions that were unrelated to reasons for conflict between staff (41%; $n = 46$) or conflict between offenders (16%; $n = 39$). It is not clear as to why these questions were not interpreted as intended.

**Finding 40:** Approximately two thirds of offenders indicated that jobs that offer incentive pay are more appealing than other jobs. This is particularly true for male and non-Aboriginal offenders. The majority of offenders indicated that it is the extra money involved that makes the job more appealing; however, just under one fifth indicated that incentive pay jobs are “better” jobs.

Finally, offenders were asked whether jobs that offer incentive pay are more appealing than other jobs. Of those who responded ($n = 299$), 69% indicated that yes, incentive pay jobs were more appealing. Two-way contingency table analysis examining differences in appeal (yes / no) among the levels of the demographic variables found that significantly more men than women stated that incentive pay jobs were more appealing ($\chi^2(1, n = 234) = 4.08, p < .05$). In addition, significantly more non-Aboriginal offenders indicated that incentive pay jobs were more appealing than Aboriginal offenders ($\chi^2(1, n = 222) = 4.67, p < .05$). When asked to explain why incentive pay jobs were more appealing, 94% of offenders noted the extra payment involved ($n = 184$), 16% mentioned that the types of jobs that involved incentive pay were better ($n = 32$), and 8% noted that incentive pay jobs were more appealing because they offered more hours ($n = 16$).
Finding 41: Staff indicated that incentive pay keeps offenders motivated and productively engaged.

Finally, the links between the incentive program and effective institutional employment were assessed by asking staff members to rate, on a scale from one to five, with one being ‘strongly disagree’ and five being ‘strongly agree’, the extent to which the amount of incentive pay earned by offenders is sufficient to keep them motivated while incarcerated. Of those who responded to the question \((n = 756)\), the majority agreed or strongly agreed \((49\%, n = 368)\), while 21% of staff respondents \((n = 156)\) disagreed or strongly disagreed \((M = 3.36, SD = 1.10)\). Staff members were also asked to rate, on the same scale, the extent to which the amount of incentive pay earned by offenders is sufficient to keep them productively engaged while incarcerated. Of those who responded to the question \((n = 751)\), the majority agreed or strongly agreed \((44\%, n = 330)\), while 21% of staff respondents \((n = 161)\) disagreed or strongly disagreed \((M = 3.29, SD = 1.09)\).

ANOVAs conducted to determine if there were any significant regional or security level differences in mean ratings of agreement for each of the above questions found significant regional differences with regard to whether the amount of incentive pay earned by offenders is sufficient to keep them both motivated \((F(5,734) = 3.2, \ p < .01)\) and productively engaged \((F(5,728) = 4.1, \ p < .005)\) while incarcerated. However, significant between-group differences regarding motivation disappeared after applying a Bonferroni correction. On average, staff from the Ontario Region rated their agreement higher than staff from the Quebec Region when asked whether incentive pay amounts are sufficient to keep offenders productively engaged \((\text{Mean difference} = .40, \ p < .05)\). There were no significant differences between security levels for either question.
4.5 Evaluation Objective 5: Unintended Outcomes

Unintended outcomes are areas wherein the policy, program, or initiative created or encountered any positive or negative effects that were not expected.

4.5.1 Important Issues Resulting from EEP: Staff & Community Partner Perspectives

Summary Finding 12 (Unintended Outcomes): There is a shortage of vocational programs, work release options and job opportunities. However, according to offenders, existing EEP assisted them in “staying out of trouble”, keeping occupied, increasing positive work habits, learning new skills and knowledge, and gaining confidence with job skills. Furthermore, numerous EEP best practices are actively being undertaken by a variety of institutions across the country.

Finding 42: Staff maintained that EEP lead to positive changes in offender dispositions but indicated that there is a shortage of program and job opportunities. There is also a need to continue to develop and delivery vocational programming and skills. Furthermore, offenders identified certification and labour market needs as additional areas of key relevance.

Staff members were asked whether there were any important issues (positive or negative) that have come about as a result of an employment activity or employability and vocational programs. Of the 376 respondents who answered definitively (yes or no), 217 (58%) listed important issues that have resulted from EEP. Of these, the most commonly mentioned positive factor was seeing a positive change in offenders’ dispositions (12%, n = 25). Among negative issues mentioned, the most common was a shortage of programs and jobs (11%, n = 24). Individual factors endorsed by more than 5% of respondents are listed in Table 40. A complete list of positive and negative issues is provided in Table 62 in Appendix 9.
Table 40. Issues Resulting from EEP: Most Frequently Suggested by Staff Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive changes in offenders’ dispositions 25 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders emerge with marketable skills 21 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases likelihood of success upon release 17 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of programs and jobs 24 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs not meaningful to offenders 21 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require additional resources 13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs not reflective or relevant to job market 13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates antisocial behaviour 12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough certification 12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions with CORCAN 10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The issues listed make up 78% of those mentioned by staff members.

Community partners were also asked if there were any important issues (positive or negative) that have come about in the community as a result of an employment activity or a vocational program. Of those that answered definitively (yes or no; n = 17), just over half (59%, n = 10) indicated that important issues had emerged. Examination of these issues found no predominant themes; however, feedback similar to that offered by staff and offenders was provided. For example, shortage of programs and jobs, jobs not being meaningful, and the need for certification were mentioned. Interestingly, community partners raised concerns over reintegration of offenders serving life sentences and the suitability of jobs for older offenders.

4.5.2 Staff Suggestions for Ensuring EEP Leads to Community Jobs and Job Retention

Staff members were asked whether there was anything they believed should be incorporated into employment programs that would increase offenders’ (including populations such as women and Aboriginal offenders) likelihood of obtaining and retaining employment in the community. Of the 475 respondents who answered definitively (yes or no), 411 (87%) made suggestions. The most common suggestion was to develop vocational programs and skills (22%, n = 92).
Individual suggestions endorsed by more than 5% of respondents are listed in Table 41. A complete list of suggested changes is provided in Table 63 in Appendix 9.

**Table 41. Changes to Employment Programs: Most Frequently Suggested by Staff Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes:</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of vocational programs and skills</td>
<td>92 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement recognized third party certification and accreditation</td>
<td>44 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more meaningful and diverse jobs</td>
<td>33 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure jobs reflect those in the real world</td>
<td>31 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure direct communication with community</td>
<td>24 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer apprenticeship programs</td>
<td>22 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The changes listed make up 60% of the changes mentioned by staff members.

### 4.5.3 Offender Perspectives on Changes that Would Benefit EEP

Offenders were asked whether there was anything they believed should be changed about employment programs that would make employment programs more beneficial to their reintegration efforts. Of the 302 respondents, the majority (80%, $n = 242$) indicated that there should be changes made and suggested changes to the employment programs. Individual suggestions endorsed by more than 5% of respondents are listed in Table 42. A complete list of suggested changes is provided in Table 49 in Appendix 6.
### Table 42. Changes to Employment Programs Most Frequently Suggested by Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes:</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More job opportunities</td>
<td>117 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More skills training</td>
<td>112 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs should pay better</td>
<td>54 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs should be more meaningful / realistic</td>
<td>32 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All jobs should get incentive pay</td>
<td>22 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer cleaning jobs</td>
<td>19 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more work releases</td>
<td>19 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer certification / count hours worked</td>
<td>14 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs placements should match offenders’</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The changes listed make up 80% of the changes mentioned by offenders.

Similarly, offenders were asked whether there was anything they believed should be changed about vocational programs that would make vocational programs more beneficial to them upon release. Of the 297 respondents, almost two-thirds (64%, $n = 194$) suggested changes to vocational programs. Individual suggestions endorsed by more than 5% of respondents are listed in Table 43. A complete list of suggested changes is provided in Table 50 in Appendix 6.
Table 43. Changes to Vocational Programs Most Frequently Suggested by Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes:</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More trades certification / apprenticeships</td>
<td>83 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More vocational programs in general</td>
<td>57 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More computer skills / clerical training</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer post-secondary courses / academic training</td>
<td>17 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer vocational programs to all offenders</td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training should reflect community labour market needs</td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked in institutional jobs should count toward certification in community</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training should be more in-depth / specialized</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The changes listed make up 80% of the changes mentioned by offenders.

4.5.4 Offender Perspectives on Personal Benefits from Involvement in EEP

Finding 43: Offenders indicate that EEP assists them in “staying out of trouble” / keeping occupied, increasing positive work habits, learning new skills and knowledge, and gaining confidence with job skills.

Offenders were asked how they have personally benefited from being employed while incarcerated. Of the 283 offenders who responded, 36% (n = 101) indicated that they have benefited by staying out of trouble or keeping occupied. Other common benefits included improved work habits (24%, n = 67), gaining more confidence in job skills (23%, n = 66), increased self-esteem (16%, n = 46), and learning new job skills (16%, n = 44). Interestingly, 12% (n = 35) of respondents indicated that they have not personally benefited from being employed while incarcerated. A detailed list of all responses is provided in Table 51 in Appendix 6.

Similarly, offenders were asked how they have personally benefited from participating in vocational programs while incarcerated. Of the 165 offenders who responded, 55% (n = 91) indicated that they have gained more confidence in job skills. In a similar vein, 24% (n = 39) stated they have learned new skills or knowledge through their vocational training. Other
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notable benefits included increased self-esteem (16%, \( n = 26 \)), being more employable and increasing job opportunities (14%, \( n = 23 \)), and improved interpersonal communication skills (12%, \( n = 20 \)). A detailed list of all responses is provided in Table 52 in Appendix 6.

Offenders were asked to think of some benefits of work release programs, aside from earning more money. Of the 127 offenders who responded, 51% (\( n = 65 \)) indicated that work releases assist with an offender’s gradual reintegration into society. Other benefits mentioned include feeling more independent / self-sufficient (18%, \( n = 23 \)), providing funds to assist on release (17%, \( n = 21 \)), increasing job opportunities upon release (16%, \( n = 20 \)), and having the opportunity to show credibility and trustworthiness (10%, \( n = 13 \)). Of note, only one respondent (1%) indicated that, over and above earning more money, there are no other benefits to work release programs. A detailed list of all responses is provided in Table 53 in Appendix 6.

4.5.5 Community Partner Perspectives on Work Release Opportunities

Finding 44: Community partners indicated that there are not enough work release opportunities, but indicated that those work releases that are available are effective in improving offenders’ reintegration. They further indicated that work release opportunities contribute to the attainment and retention of jobs.

Work releases have played an integral role in meeting offenders’ employment needs as well as contributing to successful reintegration upon release by facilitating the attainment of employment in the community. To evaluate the extent to which community partners agree that work releases are beneficial to offenders, respondents were asked to rate on a scale from one to five, with one being “strongly disagree” and five being “strongly agree”, the degree to which they agreed that there are a sufficient number of work release opportunities for offenders, the extent to which they agreed that work releases were effective in improving offenders’ reintegration into the community, and the extent to which they agreed that work releases increased the likelihood that offenders will retain employment in the community.

As indicated in Table 44, seventy-five percent (\( n = 15 \)) of community partners who answered the first item (\( n = 20 \)) strongly disagreed or disagreed that sufficient opportunities existed, while 10% (\( n = 2 \)) agreed with this statement and 15% (\( n = 3 \)) were neutral. Also, the majority of
community partners who responded to the second item (85%, \( n = 17 \) of 21) strongly agreed or agreed that work releases were effective in improving offenders’ reintegration into the community, while only 10% \( (n = 2) \) disagreed with this statement. Furthermore, community partners strongly agreed or agreed (81%, \( n = 17 \)) that work release opportunities increase the likelihood that offenders will obtain employment in the community, while 10% \( (n = 2) \) disagreed with this statement. Finally, when asked to rate the extent to which they agreed work releases increased the likelihood that offenders will retain employment in the community, 78% \( (n = 14 \) of 18) of community partners strongly agreed or agreed with this statement, while 17% \( (n = 3) \) were neutral and one disagreed (5%).

Table 44. Ratings of Community Partner Agreement Regarding Work Release Opportunities and Links with Reintegration and Employment Status in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Release</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/ Disagree % (( n ))</th>
<th>Neutral % (( n ))</th>
<th>Agree/ Strongly Agree % (( n ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient number of meaningful opportunities</td>
<td>75 (15)</td>
<td>13 (3)</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve reintegration</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>80 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase likelihood of obtaining employment</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>80 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase likelihood of retaining employment</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>17 (3)</td>
<td>78 (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.6 Best Practices

Finding 45: Numerous “EEP Best Practices” are actively being undertaken by a variety of institutions across the country and a jurisdictional review indicates that some initiatives identified as international “best practices” have already been implemented by CSC.

The underscoring of “best practices” not only provides an informal recognition process, it also provides the opportunity to share and learn from initiatives being undertaken in jurisdictions, regions, and institutions outside of one’s own. Although “best practices” are not identified as a
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specific outcome within the evaluation strategy, discussions with management, staff, and offenders have resulted in the following outcomes related to both CSC and international best practices. In addition to the general discussion that follows, Appendix 11 provides examples of detailed best practice initiatives from each of the CSC regions.

CSC Staff Survey: Outcomes
After consultations with numerous EEP stakeholders, it became clear to the evaluation team that additional information on EEP best practices would be of value to the evaluation. In turn, the survey completed by the staff included a single question on regional and institutional best practices. More specifically, the question asked “In your opinion, which institution(s) and / or Region(s) display best practices in their implementation of Employment and Employability Programs? In what ways are they an example of best practices?”. Two hundred and sixty-eight staff members responded to this question, 47% \((n = 125)\) of whom acknowledged and described the existence of best practices within CSC. An additional 44% \((n = 118)\) indicated that they did not know of existing best practices, thereby emphasizing the continued need to recognize, and share, on going EEP best practice initiatives. Finally, the remaining 9% \((n = 25)\) indicated that there were no best practices \((n = 18)\) or the question was not applicable \((n = 7)\).

The general themes that most often emerged from this question highlighted best practices involving community partnerships, work releases, and opportunities that lead to certification, accreditation or apprenticeships. Furthermore, initiatives that maximized the work day, thereby ensuring an environment more representative of the “real world” experience, were also underscored. Corresponding to this message, initiatives ensuring that appropriate documentation and identification is in place for an offender prior to their release were also mentioned as critical to successful reintegration into the “real world”. Finally, initiatives directly linked to labour market needs were also raised as critical to successful outcomes.

A final message that emerged from the thematic coding of the best practice question was in relation to the security level of the institution in which employment interventions are being offered. More specifically, it was often argued that employment interventions offered within minimum and medium security institutions are more successful than those interventions offered
in maximum security sites. Overall, each of these themes appears to correspond directly with priorities typically set out, and strived for, by CSC. Nonetheless, the fact that they have been highlighted as “best practices” suggests that these critical priorities are not regularly being met by the organization. More concrete examples of best practices emerging from the staff survey results, and not discussed above, appear in Appendix 11.

**RECOMMENDATION 9: CSC should implement a national communications strategy in relation to on going employment initiatives, best practices, outcomes, challenges, lessons learned, and successes.**

**International Jurisdictional Review: Outcomes**

The jurisdictional review of inmate pay and incentive pay also resulted in some interesting findings regarding best practices in different jurisdictions. These findings are sometimes consistent with practices currently being undertaken by CSC; however, they also offer new ideas and perspectives that may be of value for Canadian practices. Best practices emerging from this jurisdictional review will be briefly summarized in the following paragraphs.

Singapore Prison Services identified a “Progressive Privileges” framework as a best practice that allows all inmates to be considered for vocational training and employment once they reach the treatment phase after a period of incarceration. The allocation of labour / training is based on an inmate’s “personal route map”, which helps to determine the skills an inmate possesses and his inclinations. Thereafter, where possible, suitable labour may be assigned to the inmate after due consideration from the institutional labour committee (essentially a panel with relevant representatives that assess and deliberate inmate job placement). The committee assigns jobs, while attempting to match inmates’ vocational needs and skills to appropriate jobs.

Queensland Corrective Services⁷⁹, highlighted a best practice in which, two high security centres, commissioned in 1999 and 2002, introduced a 12 hour per day, 7 day per week operation in their prison industries. The 12-hour day enables prisoners to work in the morning and undertake other activities (e.g., criminogenic programs, recreational activities) in the afternoon. Similarly, those prisoners working the afternoon shift may avail themselves of a similar array of

---
⁷⁹ Queensland Corrective Services Appendix – Remuneration Rates (Jan.9/06) – Appendix 2.
options each morning. At one such institution (Wolston Correctional Centre), a rationalisation of the bonus payments to prisoners was undertaken to ascertain the possibility of setting maximum levels of bonus payments despite the procedure indicating the prisoners could qualify for up to 100% bonus.

This ‘bonus’ arrangement was trialled in 2004, proved successful, and remains in operation. Level 1 employment classification receive a daily rate of $2.11 with nil maximum bonus, level 2 receive a daily rate of $2.73 with a maximum bonus of 40%, level 3 receive a daily rate of $3.41 with a maximum bonus of 50%, and level 4 receive a daily rate of $4.11 with a maximum bonus of 60%. Commercial industries employ levels 2 to 4 only. Bonus payments are only applicable to commercial industries. All other categories of employment (e.g., landscaping, kitchen) only attract rates of pay according to the levels 1 to 4, employment classifications. All prisoners also receive an amenities allowance of $9.27 per week to purchase their personal hygiene needs.

To further enhance best practice, a review of offender remuneration has also recently been undertaken by Queensland Corrective Services. A “Prisoner Incentives Scheme Working Party” has been formed to further develop a remuneration model that integrates operational and commercial demands with prisoner intervention needs. The proposed model would include standard pay levels across all centres, and participation in employment and programs would be determined according to assessed level of risk and need. Remuneration would be based on all available information concerning the offender’s participation in all recommended activities.

5.0 FINAL RECOMMENDATION & OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

This evaluation contributes to our knowledge on Employment and Employability Programs within the Correctional Service of Canada. Overall, a number of positive outcomes emerge from this work and yet limitations still exist. Consequently, suggestions for improvement are proposed. Importantly, in considering the facilitation of EEP across security levels and regions, differences have been highlighted. More specifically, lower levels of security (i.e., minimum and medium) are often viewed as being more efficient and effective at delivering employment and employability interventions. Furthermore, regionally, it appears that different strengths and weaknesses emerge from various areas of the country. This highlights the necessity for ongoing
communication in terms of best practices, “what works”, and what has yet to be mastered. It seems evident that all parties involved in this evaluation see benefits of EEP; however, gaps exist in terms of availability of job placements and vocational programs. Furthermore, the true meaningfulness of current interventions is arguably lacking. It is anticipated that the work currently being completed by CSC’s Transformation Team\textsuperscript{80} will contribute to the resolution of these gaps, particularly with respect to the availability of job placements and vocational programs.

**RECOMMENDATION 10: CSC should further consider the relevance of security environment (i.e., minimum vs. medium vs. maximum security) and its impact on the delivery of employment interventions. The environment should be capable of providing an intervention that is most reflective of the community work environment (i.e., more closely resemble a typical “real world” work week).**

Notably, this evaluation was driven by the logic model and the associated immediate, intermediate and long-term outcomes. Accordingly, there is little discussion on recent progress that’s been made in the area of employment and employability for offenders. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that a former evaluation of EEP was conducted by the Evaluation Branch in 2003. This evaluation was followed by a management action plan, from which the following accomplishments have been achieved:

1. EEP’s governing principles document was revised in March 2003 and communicated to all stakeholders.
2. Annual Regional Operational Strategies were developed and are now being reported on quarterly.
3. Regional training strategies were developed and implemented in June 2003 and over 6000 certificates were earned through vocational courses.
4. A business manager from OMSR was assigned to work closely with CORCAN in relation to data quality and integrity needs.
5. Regional strategies were developed for an aggressive restructuring of vocational training in line with revised EEP governing principles.
6. Detailed guidelines (along with a Case Management Bulletin) on the inclusion of employment information into the correctional plan were provided to staff.
7. Training material was reviewed and revised in order to more efficiently incorporate the integration of employment needs into the correctional plan.
8. The revised governing principles document identifies issues and challenges that could limit progress towards the goal of scheduling activities for a 7.5 hour work day.

\textsuperscript{80} Please refer to http://infonet/Corporate/National/OurOrganization/reviewHome.htm?lang=en.
Importantly, five Regional Managers of Employment and Employability were hired and are responsible for stewarding and addressing this matter.

9. A National Steering Committee was established to discuss and work on a direction for CD# 730 (Inmate Program Assignment and Payments).

10. Case Management Bulletin provides guidance regarding the ongoing identification of gaps between employment needs and employment assignments.

11. Regional EEP managers are responsible for the ongoing monitoring of scheduling procedures.

12. All work descriptions were revised to include length of stay, learning objectives, and signatures of supervisor and offender.

13. The National Employability Skills Program (NESP) has been fully implemented in accordance with the CORCAN Business Plans Results and Performance. Furthermore, the Community Integration Program is available throughout the country.

14. Over 4000 staff have been trained in EEP awareness, managing offenders in the workplace, and communicating with external partners about offenders.

There is one remaining recommendation from the original EEP Evaluation that at the time of the writing of this report is still unresolved. Specifically, Recommendation 4e from the Management Action Plan (MAP), suggests that CSC “Develop an automated offender schedule that can accommodate attendance and pay”. This recommendation relates directly to limitations identified in both this, and the previous, evaluations. Accordingly, the final recommendation of this evaluation relates to continued efforts to ensure this matter is resolved.

**RECOMMENDATION 11: CSC should continue efforts to ensure that an automated offender schedule that accommodates attendance and pay is developed and implemented.**

Moving forward from this report, a new MAP will be developed based on the findings and recommendations outlined herein and the Office of Primary Interest (OPI) will take on the responsibility for implementing this MAP. In all likelihood, within 5 years, another evaluation of EEP within CSC will be conducted and at that time, it is hoped that outcomes for staff, offenders and community partners will reflect continued growth and improvement in the area of employment and employability interventions and their ability to contribute to: 1) public safety; 2) the operations, and safety and security, of institutions; and 3) the well-being of staff and offenders.
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Appendix 1: CORCAN’s Employment Continuum

CORCAN EMPLOYMENT CONTINUUM

**INTAKE**

**CORRECTIONAL PLAN BUILDING**
- Assessments
  - Vocational Assess (if form 1253 satisfied)
  - Link to 14 Nat’l Occupational Classification
- Needs Identification
  - Employment
- Intake Program Board
  - Correctional Plan Finalization
  - Identification Of Documentation Gap and plan to address

**PROGRAM BOARD ASSIGNMENT & SKILLS BUILDING**
- Addressing Needs/Skill Building
  - Hard Skills
    - Construction
    - Culinary Arts
    - Agriculture
    - Woodworking
    - Equipment Operator
  - Soft Skills
    - NESP
    - CIP
    - Guiding Circles
    - PLAR
- Job Placement & Experiential Learning
  - Placement to jobs that link with vocational assessment results
  - Integrating skills learned in NESP

**INSTITUTION**

**ADMINISTRATIVE READINESS**
- Awareness
  - Parole Officers
  - Wardens
  - Managers
  - Work Supervisors
  - Correctional Officers
  - Program Staff
  - Parole Board
  - Families
  - Communities
  - Employers
- Critical Documentation
  - S.I.N.
  - Birth Certificates
  - Health Card
  - Vocational Certificates
  - Bank Account
  - Resume
  - Driver’s Licence when applicable
- Job Readiness Activities
  - Community Integration Program
  - In Reach by CECs
  - Resume Building
  - Job Search
  - Financial Management
  - Volunteer Support
- Referral to CEC

**COMMUNITY & CECs**

**SECURING EMPLOYMENT UPON RELEASE**
- Developing and maintaining new partnerships with employers
- Enabling offenders secure employment
- Streaming offenders to viable employment leads
- Follow up on job leads / placement and motivate offenders to obtain / maintain employment, focusing on job retention

**RESULTS and Performance FY 2007-2008**
- Offer 1,920 full-time equivalent training positions for offenders.
- Generate $61 million in revenue from sales.
- Full implementation of National Employability Skills Program.
- Assist 1,613 offenders to find jobs in the community.
- Improve employment retention rates of offenders who secure employment via CEC’s.
- Increase percentage of offenders whose employment needs have been met.

Data Collection & Reporting on Result

1) Monthly Corporate Results by Region
   - Number of Offenders Job Placed
   - Employment Type
   - National Occupational Classification
2) Quarterly Reports
   - Number of Offenders Receiving Employment related services
   - List of Employ
   - Financial Expenditures
   - Code of employment
3) Details of Offender
   - Number of released offenders without critical documentation
   - Job Placements
4) Details of Offenders
   - Receiving Employment related services

Community Strategy
Appendix 2: EEP Logic Model

Activities
- Assessing Employment Needs/Abilities/Interests
- Program Board Assignment

Outputs
- Employment needs assessed
- Vocational interest & aptitude assessments completed
- Eligible offenders assigned to employment programs by Program Board
- Employability-related certificates earned

Immediate Outcomes
- Enhance ability to identify employment programs for correctional plan
- Effective/appropriate program assignment
- Provide a sense of purpose
- Financial benefit for offenders
- Develop/maintain employability skills/competencies

Intermediate Outcomes
- Appropriate institutional employment interventions
- Positive Institutional Adjustment
- Institutional self-sufficiency
- Develop/maintain employability skills/competencies

Long-Term Outcomes
- Job retention
- Lower cost of Incarceration
- Successful Reintegration of Offenders into the Community, Contributing to Public Safety

Employment Continuum
- Promote Transition to Employment in the Community
- Offenders released with key documentation/identification
- Offenders complete job readiness programs/sessions
- Referrals to CECs
- Partnerships with community employers
- Offenders use CEC services
- Enhanced ability of offenders to obtain employment in community
Appendix 3: Key Informant Interview / Survey Protocols

**Employment and Employability Programs Evaluation: Staff Survey**

The Employment and Employability Program (EEP) aims to enhance inmates’ chances of obtaining and maintaining employment upon release by providing vocational training and employment in the institution. CSC is currently reviewing the relevance, success, and cost-effectiveness of the EEP, and would like to know about your experiences with the program, as well as your opinion of the program in general.

You are being asked to participate in a 20 minute survey regarding Employment and Employability Programs. Your participation in the survey is voluntary, and any information you provide will be anonymous. In addition, you are free to refuse to answer any specific questions, and you may withdraw from the study at any time.

Your responses to the survey questions will be anonymous (i.e., your name will not be associated with the survey protocols). Protocols are subject to access as per Section Four (4) of the Access to Information Act. No identifying information (e.g., name, position) will be included on the protocols, and your name will not appear in any evaluation report or documentation. Survey responses will be aggregated and presented in summary form within the evaluation report. Therefore, your responses to the survey questions will remain anonymous.

The information you provide will be added to the comments of other community partners, staff, and offenders. This information will provide valuable insights into relevancy, success, and cost-effectiveness of CSC’s Employment and Employability Programs, as well as identifying any potential modifications to processes or procedures that might be important for the future.

Before we ask you to agree to take part in this evaluation, we will do our best to answer any questions you may have. Do you have any questions?

*****************************************************************************

My signature below indicates that I have read the above, and that I agree to take part in an interview regarding the Employment and Employability Programs. The interviewer will also sign to guarantee the conditions stated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant Name (PRINT)</th>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewer Name (PRINT)</th>
<th>Interviewer Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEM图1. Location: ______________________

DEM0.2. Institutional Security Level: ______________________

DEM0.3. Classification: ______________________

DEM0.4. How long have you been in your current position? (in months): ______________________

Definitions

➢ For the purposes of this evaluation, EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES refer to two distinct categories of employment:

1) CORCAN Employment Opportunities; and
2) INSTITUTIONAL Employment Opportunities (Institutional Services)

Some questions ask you to answer specifically regarding one or the other type of employment, and others ask about EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES in general. Please read the questions carefully.

➢ EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS refer to those interventions which lead to external, "third party", certification (i.e., NESP, WHIMIS, AutoCad, etc.).

SECTION A – OBJECTIVE #1 (RELEVANCE)

A.1. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities are meeting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Offenders’ needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Offenders’ abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Offenders’ interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.2. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that CORCAN employment opportunities are meeting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Offenders’ needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Offenders’ abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Offenders’ interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A.3. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that **EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS** are meeting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Offenders’ needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Offenders’ abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Offenders’ interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.4. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that information provided by **vocational assessments** (e.g., COPS/CAPS, ESPORT, VPI) is relevant, given the employment opportunities available . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In the institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.5. Which of the following do you think is the greatest **roadblock** that offenders encounter when seeking employment in the community upon **release**? (Select ONE)

- i. Having a criminal record (unwillingness of employers to hire offenders)
- ii. Not having the employment skills required for the type of job they want
- iii. Not having the education/certification required for the type of job they want
- iv. Lack of support in the community
- v. Length of time incarcerated (absence from workforce)
- vi. Age at release
- vii. Lack of required documentation (SIN card, resume, etc).
- viii. Other
- ix. Don’t know
- x. N/A

a. if **Other**, please specify: ___________________________

**SECTION B – OBJECTIVE #2 (SUCCESS – Efficiency & Effectiveness)**

**Efficiency**

B.1. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that the following are appropriately incorporated into offenders’ correctional plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Employment Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Employability and Vocational Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B.2. What is the greatest roadblock to the effective incorporation of **EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES** into an offender’s correctional plan? (Select ONE)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Offender’s other programming needs (e.g., educational, correctional)</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. Inadequate vocational assessment tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Availability of job placements at the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Availability of vocational programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Refusal to participate in employment activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>viii. N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If **Other**, please specify: ________________________________

### B.3. What is the greatest roadblock to the effective incorporation of **EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS** into an offender’s correctional plan? (Select ONE)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Offender’s other programming needs (e.g., educational, correctional)</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. Inadequate vocational assessment tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Availability of job placements at the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Availability of vocational programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Refusal to participate in employment activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>viii. N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If **Other**, please specify: ________________________________

### B.4. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that the information provided by **vocational assessments** (e.g., COPS/CAPS, ESPORT, VPI) is useful when incorporating employment and employability programs into an offender’s correctional plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B.5. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that there is a **sufficient number of meaningful EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY opportunities** for offenders with employment needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B.6. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that the following employment opportunities are given to those with greater employment needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Employability and Vocational Program opportunities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.7. What are the factors that determine which offender will be placed in a particular employment activity (Select all that apply)?

- ☐ i. Offender’s employment needs
- ☐ ii. Offender’s interests
- ☐ iii. Offender’s skills/abilities
- ☐ iv. Availability of job placement
- ☐ v. CORCAN Business Needs
- ☐ vi. Other
- ☐ vii. Don’t know
- ☐ viii. N/A

a. if Other, please specify: _______________________________________

B.8. What are the factors that determine which offender will be placed in a particular employability and vocational program (Select all that apply)?

- ☐ i. Offender’s employment needs
- ☐ ii. Offender’s interests
- ☐ iii. Offender’s skills/abilities
- ☐ iv. Availability of vocational placement
- ☐ v. CORCAN Business Needs
- ☐ vi. Other
- ☐ vii. Don’t know
- ☐ viii. N/A

a. if Other, please specify: _______________________________________

B.9. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that the following are keeping offenders productively engaged while incarcerated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B.10. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that **job opportunities that include incentive pay** are distributed fairly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **Why** do you feel this way (select all that apply)?

- ☐ i. Assignment to incentive pay jobs is based on offenders’ employment needs
- ☐ ii. Assignment to incentive pay jobs is based on offenders’ interests
- ☐ iii. Assignment to incentive pay jobs is based on offenders’ skills/abilities
- ☐ iv. Assignment to incentive pay jobs is based on the availability of job placements in the institution
- ☐ v. Assignment to incentive pay jobs is based on CORCAN Business Needs
- ☐ vi. Assignment to incentive pay jobs is based on offenders’ past performance in that job
- ☐ vii. Assignment to incentive pay jobs is done on a rotational basis
- ☐ viii. Assignment to incentive pay jobs is based on staff preference
- ☐ ix. Other
- ☐ x. Don’t know
- ☐ xi. N/A

i. **if Other**, please specify: __________________________

B.11. Aside from earning more money, what are the **benefits of the incentive pay program** for inmates (Select all that apply)?

- ☐ i. Learn how to manage money
- ☐ ii. Feel more independent/self-sufficient
- ☐ iii. More motivated to work
- ☐ iv. Feel more productive/have something to show for work
- ☐ v. Other
- ☐ vi. Don’t know
- ☐ vii. N/A

a. **if Other**, please specify __________________________

B.12. Does the incentive pay program cause **conflict** among offenders within the institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **if yes**, please explain:

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
B.13. Does the incentive pay program cause conflict among staff within the institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. if yes, please explain:
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

**Effectiveness**

B.14. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that employment and employability programs are effective at improving offenders’ reintegration into the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.15. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that offenders’ employment needs are reduced by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. EMPLOYABILITY and VOCATIONAL programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.16. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree and 5 being ‘strongly agree, to what extent do you agree that while offenders are involved in employment and employability programs in the institution, they are encouraged to seek out resources in the community that will help them to secure employment upon release?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### B.17. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that participation in the following increases the likelihood that an offender will be granted any type of conditional release?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EMPLOYABILITY and VOCATIONAL programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B.18. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that participation in the following increases the likelihood that an offender will **obtain** employment in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EMPLOYABILITY and VOCATIONAL programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B.19. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that participation in the following increases the likelihood that an offender will **retain** employment in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EMPLOYABILITY and VOCATIONAL programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION C: OBJECTIVE #3 (COST-EFFECTIVENESS)

#### C.1. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘not at all cost-effective’ and 5 being ‘extremely cost-effective’, how **cost-effective** are Employment and Employability Programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all Cost-effective</th>
<th>Not Very Cost-effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Cost-effective</th>
<th>Very Cost-effective</th>
<th>Extremely Cost-effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C.2. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that the amount of incentive pay earned by offenders is sufficient to keep them...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Motivated in employment while incarcerated?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Productively engaged in employment while incarcerated?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.3. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that the **overall functioning** of the institution is improved by each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EMPLOYABILITY and VOCATIONAL programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.4. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that CORCAN, operating as a Special Operating Agency (SOA), is fulfilling its **dual role** of maintaining financial self-sufficiency and **contributing to the successful reintegration** of offenders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In your opinion, does one of these roles predominate over the other?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If YES – which role predominates?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Maintaining financial self-sufficiency</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Contributing to successful offender reintegration</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Other</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Don’t know</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| c. if Other, please specify _______________________________________________
SECTION D: OBJECTIVE #4 (UNINTENDED FINDINGS)

D.1. Is there anything that you think should be incorporated into Employment and Employability Programs that would increase the offender’s (including populations such as women and Aboriginal offenders) likelihood of obtaining and retaining employment in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If yes, please explain:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

D.2. Are there any important issues (positive or negative) that have come about as a result of an EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY or EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If yes, what were they?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

D.3. In your opinion, which institutions(s) and/or Region(s) display best practices in their implementation of Employment and Employability Programs? In what ways are they an example of best practices?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

SECTION E: WORK RELEASES

E.1. Does your institution offer WORK RELEASE opportunities to the offenders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If YES: Please complete the following questions regarding work release. If NO: Please skip this section. Thank you for completing the survey!
## E.2. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that **WORK RELEASES** are meeting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Offenders’ needs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Offenders’ abilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Offenders’ interests</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## E.3. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that **WORK RELEASES**…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. are appropriately incorporated into offenders’ correctional plans?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. assist offenders in obtaining employment in the community?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. assist offenders in retaining employment in the community?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## E.4. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that there is a sufficient number of meaningful **WORK RELEASE** opportunities for offenders with employment needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Offenders’ needs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Offenders’ abilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Offenders’ interests</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation!
The Employment and Employability Program (EEP) aims to enhance inmates’ chances of finding and keeping employment upon release by providing vocational training and employment in the institution. CSC is currently reviewing the EEP, and would like to know about your specific experiences with the program, as well as your opinion of the program in general.

You are being asked to participate in a 30 minute interview regarding Employment and Employability Programs. Your participation in the interview is voluntary, and any information you provide will be anonymous. In addition, you are free to refuse to answer any specific questions, and you may withdraw from the study at any time. However, please note that if you tell us anything that threatens the good order or security of a facility, parole office or halfway house or if you give us information about the abuse of a child, or if you give us detailed information about a future crime that might cause serious harm to anyone, including yourself, we would have to report it.

Your responses to the interview questions will be anonymous (i.e., your name will not be associated with the interview transcripts). Transcripts are subject to access as per Section Four (4) of the Access to Information Act. No identifying information will be included on the transcripts, and your name will not appear in any evaluation report or documentation. Interview responses will be aggregated and presented in summary form within the evaluation report. Therefore, your responses to the interview questions will remain anonymous.

The information you provide will be added to the comments of other community partners, staff, and offenders. This information will provide valuable insights into the relevancy, success, and cost-effectiveness of CSC’s Employment and Employability Programs, as well as identifying any potential modifications to processes or procedures that might be important for the future.

Before we ask you to agree to take part in this evaluation, we will do our best to answer any questions you may have. Do you have any questions?

My signature below indicates that I have read the above, and that I agree to take part in an interview regarding Employment and Employability Programs. The interviewer will also sign to guarantee the conditions stated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant Name (PRINT)</th>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewer Name (PRINT)</th>
<th>Interviewer Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

| DEMO.1. Region Code: ______________________ |
| DEMO.2. Security Level Code: ______________________ |
| DEMO.3. Length of sentence (in months): ______________________ |
| DEMO.4. Race code: ___________________ |
| DEMO.5. Gender code: ____________ |

**DEMO.6.** Currently INSTITUTIONAL / CORCAN employed? ________________

**DEMO.7.** Currently EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS participant? ________________

### SECTION A – VOCATIONAL ASSESSMENT

*The first couple of questions will ask you about the vocational assessments that you may or may not have completed as part of your intake process. . .*

**A.1.** Have you completed a vocational assessment (e.g., CAPS/COPS, ESPORT, Vocational Preference Inventory, D’aptitudes Informatisé)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If **no**, why didn’t you complete a vocational assessment? (DO NOT READ LIST – Select all that apply)

- ☐ i. Didn’t meet educational requirements
- ☐ ii. Didn’t have identified employment need
- ☐ iii. Personal choice
- ☐ iv. Language requirements
- ☒ v. Operational constraints
- ☐ vi. Other
- ☐ vii. Don’t know
- ☒ viii. N/A

b. If **Other**, please specify ____________________________________________

c. If **yes**, which of the following vocational assessments have you completed? (READ LIST - Select all that apply)

- ☒ i. CAPS/COPS
- ☒ ii. ESPORT
- ☒ iii. VPI
- ☒ iv. D’aptitudes Informatisé
- ☒ v. Other
- ☐ vi. Don’t know
- ☒ vii. N/A

  - ☐ viii. N/A

d. If **Other**, please specify ____________________________________________
If answered yes to question A.1 (completed a vocational assessment):

A.2. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that the information provided by your vocational assessment(s) is an accurate reflection of your skills/abilities/interests?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.3. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that the information provided by your vocational assessment(s) will be useful in guiding you when you are looking for a job in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION B – INSTITUTIONAL & CORCAN EMPLOYMENT

The next section will ask about your employment in the institution and/or with CORCAN . . .

B.1. Have you participated in any of the following programs (select all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. INSTITUTIONAL employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the next few questions, please think about your current or most recent job in the institution. If you currently have more than one job, please think about the job that you spend the most time at…

B.2. What is your current or most recent job in the institution? ________________________________

a. How long have/did you held/hold this position (months)? ________________________________
B.3. Thinking about this most recent job, on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 5 being 'strongly agree', to what extent do you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My job is something that I am interested in</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My job uses the skills and abilities that I had prior to incarceration</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My job uses the skills and abilities that I gained here at CSC</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My job is a good use of my time</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My job provides me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. My performance on the job is assessed fairly</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Participating in my job increases my chances of any type of conditional release</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.4. Do you feel like you are making a **productive contribution** through your job in the institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.5. Do you feel as though you would be **more productive** doing something else instead of working at your current or most recent job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If **yes**, which of the following do you feel would be a more productive use of your time? (READ LIST - Select all that apply)

- ☐ i. Educational Program
- ☐ ii. Correctional Program (e.g., VPP, OSAP, etc)
- ☐ iii. Other job placement
- ☐ iv. Vocational certification program
- ☐ v. Don’t know
- ☐ vi. N/A

B.6. Is there a **different job** currently offered in your institution that you think would be a better match to your interests and abilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix - Key Informant Interview / Survey Protocols**

**a. If yes, what other job do you think would be a better match to your interests and abilities?**

_______________________________________________

**B.7. In your opinion, what are the essential skills to have in order to find a job in the community? (DO NOT READ LIST - Select all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. Interpersonal communication skills</th>
<th>j. Work with others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Managing information</td>
<td>k. Participating in projects and tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Using numbers</td>
<td>l. Creativity and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Think and solve problems</td>
<td>m. Showing up on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Positive attitude and behaviours</td>
<td>n. Ability to follow instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Taking responsibility for performance</td>
<td>o. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Adaptability</td>
<td>p. Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Willingness to learn continuously</td>
<td>q. N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Working safely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. If Other, please specify: _____________________________

**B.8. Thinking about the skills you have used during your current or most recent employment, which of the following statements applies? (READ LIST)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The skills I have used are mostly ones I had before coming to CSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The skills I have used are mostly new skills I did not have before coming to CSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The skills I have used are a combination of some skills that I had before, and some new skills I did not have before coming to CSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.9. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘not at all confident’ and 5 being ‘very confident’, how confident would you be doing the job you do in the institution in the community?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.10. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘not at all likely’ and 5 being ‘very likely’, how likely is it that you will seek a similar job in the community?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Likely</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the next few questions, please think about your experiences in institutional jobs in general.*
B.11. In general, which job do you feel has **best prepared** you for employment in the community (DO NOT READ LIST)?

|   | 1 | Admin - Clerk |   |   | 2 | Admin - Editor Publication |   |   | 3 | Admin - Library |   |   | 4 | Admin - Other |   |   | 5 | Agribus - Abattoir |   |   | 6 | Agribus - Dairy Worker |   |   | 7 | Agribus - Farm Hand |   |   | 8 | Cleaner |   |   | 9 | Coach |   |   | 10 | Construction Worker |   |   | 11 | CORCAN Admin. |   |   | 12 | CORCAN Construction |   |   | 13 | CORCAN Manufacturing |   |   | 14 | CORCAN Textiles |   |   | 15 | Electrician Assistant |   |   | 16 | Equipment Restoration - Services Provider |   |   | 17 | Fleet Mechanic's Assistant - Institutional Driver |   |   | 18 | Food Serv - Baker |   |   | 19 | Food Serv - Beverage Person |   |   | 20 | Food Serv - Butcher |   |   | 21 | Food Serv - Cook |   |   | 22 | Food Serv - Dishwasher |   |   | 23 | Food Serv - Food Prep Work |   |   | 24 | Graphic Designer |   |   | 25 | HIV/Aids Peer Education And Counselling |   |   | 26 | Hobby Shop/Crafts Worker |   |   | 27 | Industry - Assembler |   |   | 28 | Industry - Cabinetmaker |   |   | 29 | Inmate Grievance Coordinator |   |   | 30 | Inst Maint - Carpentry |   |   | 31 | Inst Maint - Elder Assist And Grndskeep |   |   | 32 | Inst Maint - Furnace Maintenance |   |   | 33 | Inst Maint - Groundskeeper |   |   | 34 | Inst Maint - Masonry Assistant |   |   | 35 | Inst Maint - Plumbing |   |   | 36 | Inst. Maint. - Greenhouse/Horticulture |   |   | 37 | Maint - General Labourer |   |   | 38 | Manufacturing - Upholsterer |   |   | 39 | Metal Worker |   |   | 40 | Painter |   |   | 41 | Peer Education Coordinator |   |   | 42 | Photographer |   |   | 43 | Prisoners' Advocate |   |   | 44 | Production Operator |   |   | 45 | Recreation Worker |   |   | 46 | Recycling |   |   | 47 | Senior Plumber |   |   | 48 | Serv - Laundry |   |   | 49 | Serv - Printing Services |   |   | 50 | Serv. - Animal Care Giver |   |   | 51 | Serv. - Care Giver |   |   | 52 | Serv. - Inmate Canteen |   |   | 53 | Serv. - Inmate Committee |   |   | 54 | Serv. - Peer Counselor |   |   | 55 | Serv. - Sis Stores Clerk |   |   | 56 | Serv. - Sis/Laundry |   |   | 57 | Services - Barber/Hairstylist |   |   | 58 | Spiritual/Cultural Services |   |   | 59 | Tattooist |   |   | 60 | Tutor |   |   | 61 | Van Body Refurbishment |   |   | 62 | Vehicle Repair (Hlvw) |   |   | 63 | None |   |   | 66 | Other |   |   | 77 | Don’t Know |   |   | 88 | N/A |   |

a. If **Other**, please specify:

B.12. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’, and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that participating in employment in the institution has made you **ready** for a job in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.13. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree and 5 being ‘strongly agree, to what extent do you agree that during your employment in the institution, you have been encouraged to seek out resources in the community that will help you to secure employment upon release?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.14. What do you think is the greatest roadblock that you might encounter when seeking employment in the community upon release? (DO NOT READ LIST – Select FIRST mention)

☑ 1 Having a criminal record (unwillingness of employers to hire offenders)
☑ 2 Not having the employment skills required for the type of job you want
☑ 3 Not having the education/certification required for the type of job you want
☑ 4 Lack of support in the community (from friends/family)
☑ 5 Length of time incarcerated (absence from workforce)
☑ 6 Age at release (e.g., close to retirement, competition with younger job-seekers)
☑ 7 Finding an affordable and reliable way to get to work
☑ 8 Finding adequate and affordable child care
☑ 9 Lack of required documentation (SIN card, resume, etc.)
☑ 66 Other
☑ 77 Don’t know
☑ 88 N/A

a. if Other, please specify: ____________________________

B.15. In what ways do you feel you have personally benefited from being employed while incarcerated? (DO NOT READ LIST - Select all that apply)

☑ i. Increased self-esteem ☑ viii. Improved interpersonal communication
☑ ii. Gained respect of others ☑ ix. More confidence in job skills
☑ iii. Gained trust of others ☑ x. Gained confidence from others
☑ iv. Improved time management ☑ xi. No personal benefit
☑ v. Improved work habits ☑ xii. Other
☑ vi. Improved self-discipline ☑ xiii. Don’t know
☑ vii. Improved anger management ☑ xiv. N/A

a. If Other, please specify: ____________________________

B.16. Is there anything that you think should be changed about employment programs that would make them more beneficial to you upon your release into the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page.....
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**a. If yes, what do you think should be changed? (DO NOT READ LIST – Select all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i. More skills training</th>
<th></th>
<th>vi. We should be able to choose our job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. More job opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>vii. All jobs should get incentive pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Make placements more fair (no favouritism)</td>
<td></td>
<td>viii. Jobs should pay better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Fewer cleaning jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Better supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. If Other, please specify ________________________________**

---

*As you may know, some offenders are provided with incentive pay for their job placements. Thinking about the incentive pay program...*

**B.17. Do you believe that offenders in general are in favour of the incentive pay program?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.18. Are you in favour of the incentive pay program for inmates?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. If no, why are you not in favour of the incentive pay program?**

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

**B.19. Aside from earning more money, what are some other benefits of the incentive pay program for inmates? (DO NOT READ LIST - Select all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i. Learn how to manage money</th>
<th></th>
<th>vi. Provide funds to assist family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Feel more independent/self-sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>vii. No other benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. More motivated to work</td>
<td></td>
<td>viii. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Feel more productive/have something to show for work</td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Provide funds to assist on release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. If Other, please specify: ________________________________**

---

**B.20. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that jobs that involve incentive pay ...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. Are distributed fairly**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. Cause conflict among offenders in the institution**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.21. In your opinion, do you think that jobs that involve incentive pay are more appealing to offenders, compared to jobs that don’t involve incentive pay?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Why do you think this? (Do NOT read, select all that apply)

- [ ] i. Because of payment
- [ ] ii. The types of jobs that offer incentive pay are better
- [ ] iii. Jobs that offer incentive pay offer more hours than other jobs
- [ ] iv. Other
- [ ] v. Don’t know

b. If Other, please specify: _____________________________________________

SECTION C: EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The following questions ask about vocational certification training. This includes training such as WHIMIS, Food Safety, equipment operator, construction, culinary arts, and any other vocational training program that offers certification...

C.1. Have you participated in EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS while incarcerated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If no, why haven’t you participated in EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS? (Select all that apply)

- [ ] i. Didn’t meet educational requirements
- [ ] ii. Didn’t have identified employment need
- [ ] iii. Personal choice
- [ ] iv. Language requirements
- [ ] v. Operational constraints
- [ ] vi. Other
- [ ] vii. Don’t know
- [ ] viii. N/A

b. If Other, please specify _____________________

c. If yes, which EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS have you participated in (DO NOT READ LIST, select all that apply)?

- [ ] i. Agriculture
- [ ] ii. CIP
- [ ] iii. Construction
- [ ] iv. Culinary Arts
- [ ] v. Equipment Operator
- [ ] vi. Food Safety
- [ ] vii. Guiding Circles
- [ ] viii. NESP
- [ ] ix. PLAR
- [ ] x. WHIMIS
- [ ] xi. Woodworking
- [ ] xii. Other
- [ ] xiii. Don’t Know
- [ ] xiv. N/A

d. If Other, please specify: ________________________________________________
If answered **yes** to C.1 (participated in vocational training):

C.2. Did you **complete all** of your **EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **If no**, which **EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS** didn’t you complete (DO NOT READ LIST, select all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Agriculture</th>
<th>viii. NESP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. CIP</td>
<td>ix. PLAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Construction</td>
<td>x. WHIMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Culinary Arts</td>
<td>xi. Woodworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Equipment Operator</td>
<td>xii. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Food Safety</td>
<td>xiii. Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Guiding Circles</td>
<td>xiv. N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **What was the reason** for not completing your **EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS**? (DO NOT READ LIST, Select all that apply)

| 1 | Transferred to another institution |
| 2 | Was assigned an employment placement |
| 3 | Was assigned an education program |
| 4 | Took a correctional program |
| 5 | Didn’t like it |
| 6 | It was too hard |
| 7 | It got cancelled |
| 8 | Conflict with instructor |
| 9 | Conflict with inmate(s) |
| 66 | Other |
| 77 | Don’t know |
| 88 | N/A |

i. **If other**, please specify _____________________________________________

c. **For those EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS** which you completed, where is your certificate of completion? (DO NOT READ LIST, Select ONE option)

| 1 | In my file |
| 2 | In my cell |
| 3 | With a family member or friend in community |
| 4 | Other |
| 77 | Don’t know |
| 88 | N/A |

i. **If other**, please specify _____________________________________________
### C.3. Thinking about your EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS in general, on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’, and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. My employability and vocational programs match my interests

b. My employability and vocational programs have provided me with skills that will be useful in the community

c. I would be confident working in the community in the area in which I took my employability and vocational programs

### C.4. Which EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS have best prepared you for employment in the community? (DO NOT READ LIST - Select all that apply)

- i. Agriculture
- ii. CIP
- iii. Construction
- iv. Culinary Arts
- v. Equipment Operator
- vi. Food Safety
- vii. Guiding Circles
- viii. NESP
- ix. PLAR
- x. WHIMIS
- xi. Woodworking
- xii. Other
- xiii. Don’t Know
- xiv. N/A

a. If Other, please specify: ____________________________________________________

### C.5. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that you would feel more motivated to participate in EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS if your certification came from a third party that was recognized by employers in the community (e.g., public accredited colleges or registered private career colleges)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-
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C.6. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that, if you were unable to **complete** your EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS in the institution, you would like to be able to complete them upon release into the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Which EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS would you most like to be able to complete after release into the community?

C.7. In what ways do you feel you have benefited **personally** from your EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS? (Select all that apply)

- i. Increased self-esteem
- ii. Gained respect of others
- iii. Gained trust of others
- iv. Improved time management
- v. Improved work habits
- vi. Improved self-discipline
- vii. Improved anger management
- viii. Improved interpersonal communication
- ix. More confidence in job skills
- x. No personal benefit
- xi. Other
- xii. Don’t know
- xiii. N/A

a. If Other, please specify:

C.8. Is there anything that you think should be changed about EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS to make it more beneficial to you upon your release into the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If yes, please explain:
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**SECTION D: WORK RELEASES**

*The last section will ask about any work releases that you may have participated in . . .*

D.1. Have you participated in any work releases during your time in this institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If No: Thank you for participating in the interview!

D.2. What is your current or most recent work release job? ________________________________

b. How long have/did you held/hold this position (months)? _____________________

D.3. Thinking about your most recent work release placement, on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. My work release is something that I am interested in

b. My work release uses my skills and abilities

c. My work release is a good use of my time

d. My work release provides me with skills that will be useful in a job in the community

e. My performance on the work release is assessed fairly

f. Participating in my work release increases my chances of any type of conditional release

D.4. Do you feel like you are making a **productive contribution** through your work release?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.5. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’, and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that participating in a work release has made you **ready** for a job in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.6. Aside from earning more money, what are some other benefits of work releases for inmates? (DO NOT READ LIST - Select all that apply)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Learn how to manage money</td>
<td>vi. Provide funds to assist family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Feel more independent/self-sufficient</td>
<td>vii. No other benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. More motivated to work</td>
<td>viii. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Feel more productive/have something to show for work</td>
<td>ix. Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Provide funds to assist on release</td>
<td>x. N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If Other, please specify: ____________________________

Thank you for your participation!
The Employment and Employability Program (EEP) aims to enhance inmates’ chances of obtaining and maintaining employment upon release by providing vocational training and employment in the institution. CSC is currently reviewing the relevance, success, and cost-effectiveness of the EEP, and would like to know about your experiences with the program, as well as your opinion of the program in general.

You are being asked to participate in a 15 minute survey regarding Employment and Employability Programs. Your participation in the survey is voluntary, and any information you provide will be anonymous. In addition, you are free to refuse to answer any specific questions, and you may withdraw from the study at any time.

Your responses to the survey questions will be anonymous (i.e., your name will not be associated with the survey protocols). Protocols are subject to access as per Section Four (4) of the Access to Information Act. No identifying information (e.g., name, position) will be included on the protocols, and your name will not appear in any evaluation report or documentation. Survey responses will be aggregated and presented in summary form within the evaluation report. Therefore, your responses to the survey questions will remain anonymous.

The information you provide will be added to the comments of other community partners, staff, and offenders. This information will provide valuable insights into relevancy, success, and cost-effectiveness of CSC’s Employment and Employability Programs, as well as identifying any potential modifications to processes or procedures that might be important for the future.

My signature below indicates that I have read the above, and that I agree to take part in a survey regarding the Employment and Employability Programs.

My signature below indicates that I have read the above, and that I agree to take part in a survey regarding the Employment and Employability Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant Name (PRINT)</th>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Employment and Employability Programs Evaluation: Community Survey

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

DEMO.1. Province: __________________________
DEMO.2. Community Organization: _______________________
DEMO.3. Position Title: __________________________
DEMO.4. How long have you been in your current position? (in months) : _____________________

Definitions

➢ For the purposes of this evaluation, EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES refer to two distinct categories of institutional employment:

1) CORCAN Employment Opportunities; and
2) INSTITUTIONAL Employment Opportunities (Institutional Services)

Some questions ask you to answer specifically regarding one or the other type of employment, and others ask about EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES in general. Please read the questions carefully.

➢ EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS refer to those institutional interventions which lead to external, "third party", certification (i.e., NESP, WHIMIS, AutoCad, etc.).

SECTION A – OBJECTIVE #1 (RELEVANCE)

A.1. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that employment opportunities in the COMMUNITY are meeting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Offenders’ needs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Offenders’ abilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Offenders’ interests</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.2. Which of the following do you think is the greatest roadblock that offenders encounter when seeking employment in the community upon release? (Select ONE)

☐ i. Having a criminal record (unwillingness of employers to hire offenders) ☐ vi. Age at release

☐ ii. Not having the employment skills required for the type of job they want ☐ vii. Lack of required documentation (SIN card, resume, etc).

☐ iii. Not having the education/certification required for the type of job they want ☐ viii. Other

☐ iv. Lack of support in the community ☐ ix. Don’t know

☐ v. Length of time incarcerated (absence from workforce) ☐ x. N/A

a. if Other, please specify:

TRANSITORY RECORD
### Efficiency

**B.1.** On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that there is a **sufficient number of meaningful EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY opportunities** in the institutions for offenders with employment needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness**

**B.2.** On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that employment and employability programs are **effective** at improving offenders’ **reintegration** into the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.3.** On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that offenders’ employment needs are reduced by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities

b. CORCAN employment opportunities
c. EMPLOYABILITY and VOCATIONAL programs

**B.4.** On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that while offenders are involved in employment and employability programs in the institution, they are encouraged to **seek out resources in the community** that will help them to secure employment upon release?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Effectiveness
B.5. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that participation in the following increases the likelihood that an offender will **obtain** employment in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EMPLOYABILITY and VOCATIONAL programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.6. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that participation in the following increases the likelihood that an offender will **retain** employment in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. INSTITUTIONAL employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CORCAN employment opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EMPLOYABILITY and VOCATIONAL programs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.7. In your opinion, would you consider offenders **“job ready”** when they enter the community upon release?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **If no**, why not?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
SECTION C: OBJECTIVE #4 (UNINTENDED FINDINGS)

C.1. Is there anything that you think should be incorporated into Employment and Employability Programs that would increase an offender’s (including populations such as women and Aboriginal offenders) likelihood of obtaining and retaining employment in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If yes, please explain:
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

C.2. Are there any important issues (positive or negative) that have come about in the community as a result of an EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY or EMPLOYABILITY AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. If yes, what were they?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

SECTION D: WORK RELEASES

D.1. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that there is a sufficient number of meaningful WORK RELEASE opportunities for offenders with employment needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.2. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree **WORK RELEASES** are effective at improving offenders’ reintegration into the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.3. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’, to what extent do you agree that **WORK RELEASES** increase the likelihood that an offender will…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. obtain employment in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. retain employment in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation!
Appendix 4: Data collection Sources/Methods and Analytical Techniques

Measures and Procedures

**Offender Management System (OMS):** Information regarding the institutional and CEC sample participants was collected from CSC’s Offender Management System (OMS). OMS data included offence history, release and admission summary data, and data gathered in the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA)\(^81\).

**The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA):** The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) is a comprehensive evaluation of the offender conducted at the time of admission to the Federal system. Briefly, the OIA consists of two core components that were of interest to the present evaluation: Static Factors Assessment and Dynamic Factors Analysis.

**Dynamic Factor Analysis:** As part of the Dynamic Factor Analysis, offenders are rated on seven dynamic factors: employment and education, family / marital relations, associates / social interaction, substance abuse, community functioning, personal emotional orientation and attitude. Each dynamic factor is rated on a scale ranging from “no immediate need for improvement” to “considerable need for improvement”. Offenders identified as having “some” or “considerable” needs in particular areas are generally referred to treatment to address those needs.

**Static Factor Assessment:** The static factor assessment examines criminal record history (youth and adult), offence severity, current offences, as well as sex offence history in order to aid in determining criminal risk. The overall “Level of Intervention Based on Static Factors” (high, medium, low) is then determined based on a review of these static factors. This provides an indication of overall risk levels at intake.

**Financial Data:** Financial information regarding the EEP was obtained through financial records maintained by CSC, including: 1) CSC’s Cost of Maintaining Offenders (COMO) data base\(^82\) and 2) Integrated Financial & Material Management System (IFMMS).

**Cost-Effectiveness Analysis:** The purpose of Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) is to provide management with strategic information to potentially reallocate resources if needed. It is not to compare one program to another or to identify a single best program – a common application of cost-benefit analysis. Although frequently used interchangeably, CEA is a more specific and simple calculation than Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA). CEA forms a ratio of activity, output, or outcome to its cost, serving as a measure of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, respectively.

---

\(^81\) See CSC Commissioner’s Directive 705-6, “Correctional Planning and Criminal Profile”.

\(^82\) This data base is used by CSC to estimate the cost of keeping offenders in the Federal correctional system. The costs for common/shared services (for example, personnel, material and utilities) are distributed between adjacent correctional facilities, while capital costs (land, facilities and buildings etc.) are excluded from COMO.
It calculates the cost of producing one unit of activity (e.g., cost per offender in EEP), one output (e.g., successful completion of EEP), or one outcome (e.g., days to release).

Unlike cost-benefit analysis, which collects all outcomes and forms and estimate of their money value, CEA concentrates on a single measurable outcome (e.g., days to release). CEA also does not attempt to value indirect outcomes, whereas a CBA would attempt to include all possible results, such as the intangible value of an increased sense of self-efficacy among offenders who participate in employment programming.

In order to perform a CEA, more than one alternative must exist. In the case of EEP, and corresponding to previous group comparisons throughout this report, groups consist of offenders involved in core employment programs, offenders involved with only CSC employment, and non-participants (i.e., offenders who had no involvement in employment interventions). In addition, the outcomes of the program must be quantifiable and attributable to the intervention (Mason & Tereraho, 2007). Further, it must be decided when to measure outcomes to be sure that the program has had sufficient time to influence behaviour, but not too much time so that other extraneous factors might be responsible for outcomes (Mason & Tereraho, 2007).

Analytical Procedures

**OMS Data:** The evaluation team conducted descriptive, parametric and non-parametric analyses on data emerging from the institutional and CEC samples. The specifics of these analyses are outlined as the findings are presented.

**Interview Data:** The evaluation team conducted descriptive, parametric and non-parametric analyses on data emerging from the institutional and CEC samples. Also, the evaluation team conducted frequency analyses of dichotomous and rating-scale questions, and qualitative analyses of open-ended interview questions. For open-ended questions, a preliminary analysis of each question was conducted in order to identify themes. Each open-ended response was then carefully reviewed and coded according to the final themes generated through the analysis. Frequencies and percentages were then calculated to provide an overview of findings.

---

83 Note that in some cases, participants were unable or unwilling to respond definitively to some of the dichotomous or rating-scale questions, and chose to respond only with “qualitative” open-ended responses instead. In cases where there was significant missing data in response to dichotomous or rating scale questions, only the open-ended responses were analyzed.
## Appendix 5: Staff Respondents Employee Classifications

### Table 45. Summary of Staff Respondents Employee Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Classification:</th>
<th>Staff Respondent ( n ) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Program (WP)</td>
<td>245 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Officer (CX)</td>
<td>177 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services (AS)</td>
<td>74 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk and Regulatory (CR)</td>
<td>59 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Labour and Trades (GL)</td>
<td>59 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Service (GS)</td>
<td>46 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Service (NU)</td>
<td>27 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Services (ED)</td>
<td>20 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Group (EX)</td>
<td>16 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Group (PS)</td>
<td>15 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Social Services (SI)</td>
<td>9 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer System (CS)</td>
<td>9 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management (FI)</td>
<td>8 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration (PM)</td>
<td>7 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Administration (PE)</td>
<td>6 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Scientific Support (EG)</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Services (FS)</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating, Power and Stationary (HP)</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Services (HS)</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Group (EL)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Social Science (ES)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Service (IS)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Services (LA)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Services (MA)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing and Supply Service (PG)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaritary, Stenographic and Typing Service (ST)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Employment Coordinator</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opex</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>49 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Additional Thematic Coding: Offender Interviews

Table 46. Comprehensive List of Offender Employment Positions by Employment Type (CORCAN or Institutional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Type</th>
<th>CORCAN</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>CORCAN &amp; Institutional</th>
<th>Total n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Textiles</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Labourer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Agribusiness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Repair (HLVW)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Canteen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Worker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Construction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Generalist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Care Giver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores Clerk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic’s Assistant / Driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Graphics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber / Hairstylist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual / Cultural Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby Shop / Crafts Worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Grievance Coordinator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Restoration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinetmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner’s Advocate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Care Giver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Painter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Compost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Computer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 99 180 2 281 (100%)
Table 47. Comprehensive List of Vocational Training Taken by Offenders Respondents during Incarceration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Training Participants n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHIMIS 139 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid 45 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction 39 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Operator 31 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety 28 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Arts 18 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESP 16 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction / Workplace Safety 16 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding / Metalwork / Pipefitting 11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2S Confined Spaces Safety 8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Safe 7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodworking 6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial 6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive / Small Engine Repair 5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician 5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine First Aid / Kennel Attendant 4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture 4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver 3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Counselling 3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Cutting 3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAR 2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing 2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR 2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporting Dangerous Goods 2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Education 2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagging 2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Circles 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toastmasters 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamstress (PMT) 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdressing 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby Shop Safety 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Computers 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanist Apprentice 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEE (OPEX Employment Training) 1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48. Comprehensive List of Employment Positions that Best Prepared Offenders for Work in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Manufacturing</td>
<td>25 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Labourer / Food Services</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Maintenance</td>
<td>17 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Textiles</td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Construction</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Worker</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Agribusiness</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Committee</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Repair (HLVW)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician Assistant</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Canteen</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores Clerk</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Services</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Care Giver</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber / Hairstylist</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN Generalist</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby Shop / Crafts Worker</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Grievance Coordinator</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Release Program</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Job</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Restoration</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Mechanic / Driver</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner’s Advocate</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Worker</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Care Giver</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual / Cultural Services</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Painter</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army Volunteer</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 49. Changes to Employment Programs Most Frequently Suggested by Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes:</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More job opportunities</td>
<td>117 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More skills training</td>
<td>112 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs should pay better</td>
<td>54 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs should be more meaningful / realistic</td>
<td>32 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All jobs should get incentive pay</td>
<td>22 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer cleaning jobs</td>
<td>19 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more work releases</td>
<td>19 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer certification / count hours worked</td>
<td>14 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs placements should match offenders’ skills</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the balance between correctional</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs and employment programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve timing of job placements (offer</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier in sentence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better supervision</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve offender awareness of community</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours should be more regular / realistic</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make placements fair (no favouritism)</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer computer skills training</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should be able to choose our job</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer apprenticeship programs</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay should be more fair (according to hours</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worked)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help offenders find jobs after release / teach</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employability skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve vocational assessments</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer post-secondary education</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve offender awareness of institutional</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job materials should be more available</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance should be assessed more</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more offender input into jobs</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified offenders should teach / supervise</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stability in workshops</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House offenders with similar jobs in the</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same living unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table cont.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Count (&lt;%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offenders should have to interview for jobs</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve job descriptions</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform the community about how offenders earn their pay in institutions</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer specific jobs for offenders serving life sentences</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School should be mandatory</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve working conditions (more hygienic)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 50. Changes to Vocational Programs, as Suggested by Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Offender Respondents $n$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More trades certification / apprenticeships</td>
<td>83 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More vocational programs in general</td>
<td>57 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More computer skills / clerical training</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer post-secondary courses / academic training</td>
<td>17 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer vocational programs to all offenders</td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training should reflect community labour market needs</td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked in institutional jobs should count toward certification in community</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training should be more in-depth / specialized</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide continuity of certification in community</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality of instructors for certificate programs</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve timing of vocational program delivery</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase work releases for on-site training</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve balance between vocational certificate programs and correctional programs</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase class sizes / reduce waitlists</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more employability skills training</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational certificates should match offenders’ interests</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve offender awareness of institutional vocational programs</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer incentive pay for participation in vocational programs</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer educational bursaries</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase public awareness of lack of vocational programs in institutions</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more women-centered skills training</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 51. Personal Benefits of Being Employed While Incarcerated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeps me occupied / out of trouble</td>
<td>101 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved work habits</td>
<td>67 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More confidence in job skills</td>
<td>66 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased self-esteem</td>
<td>46 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned new job skills</td>
<td>44 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned money / gained financial responsibility</td>
<td>38 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved interpersonal communication</td>
<td>36 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive use of time / sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>34 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved time management</td>
<td>29 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained respect of others</td>
<td>28 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved self-discipline</td>
<td>23 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained confidence from others</td>
<td>16 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved anger management skills</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained trust of others</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps me physically healthy</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made job connections</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of independence</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive pay is motivating</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy contact with non-offenders</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perks of the job (e.g., extra food)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No personal benefits</td>
<td>35 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52. Personal Benefits of Participating in Vocational Programs while Incarcerated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More confidence in job skills</td>
<td>91 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned new skills / knowledge</td>
<td>39 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased self-esteem</td>
<td>26 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More employable / increased job opportunities</td>
<td>23 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved interpersonal communication</td>
<td>20 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved work habits</td>
<td>18 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved self-discipline</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of accomplishment / productive use of time</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have something to show for what I’ve learned</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained respect of others</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved time management</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved anger management skills</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped obtain / retain institutional job</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be financially beneficial in community</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of previously learned skills</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased motivation to learn / work</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps me occupied</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No personal benefit</td>
<td>20 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53. Benefits of Work Release Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Offender Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gradual reintegration into society</td>
<td>65 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel more independent / self-sufficient</td>
<td>23 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funds to assist on release</td>
<td>21 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases job opportunities upon release</td>
<td>20 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to meet/work with prosocial people</td>
<td>20 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows credibility / trustworthiness</td>
<td>13 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased stability / normal routine</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More motivated to work</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel more productive / have something to show for work</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to contribute to community</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases chances of conditional release</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases knowledge / skills / experience</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to stay out of institution</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to reinforce family bonds</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of scenery from institution</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funds to assist family</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opens up institutional jobs for other offenders</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves interpersonal skills</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other benefits</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Jurisdictional Review of Inmate Pay and Incentive Pay

United States
In the United States, inmate workers in Federal Prison Industries, Inc. (FPI) locations receive pay at five levels ranging from 5th grade pay (lowest) to 1st grade pay (highest). Each institution establishes minimum times in grade, which shall not be less than specified guidelines. Forms of offender remuneration include *temporary incentive pay plans* and *long-term piecework rates*. Offenders are also eligible for a share of any annual corporate gain sharing awards and can receive awards for suggestions and special achievements.\(^{84}\)

The total number of qualifying inmates for *premium pay* may not exceed 15% of first grade inmates at a location. They receive a specified amount over and above all other pay and benefits to which they may be entitled (longevity pay, overtime, piecework, etc.). The premium pay rate is currently an additional .20 per hour. Premium pay is a means of recognizing the value of those traits supportive of morale and good institutional adjustment. It is not a form of bonus or incentive pay for highly productive inmates.

Except as provided for in detail in the FPI Accounting Manual, the maximum pay rate for each grade under the *incentive pay system* may not exceed 120% of the standard hourly pay rate for corresponding pay grades. The Superintendent of Industries (SOI) may approve hourly rates under incentive pay plans to exceed 120% of the corresponding standard hourly rates under unusual circumstances for a period not to exceed three months.

*Piecework rates* are incentives for workers to strive for higher pay and production benefiting both the worker and FPI. Piecework rates may be of two major types: individual piecework (in which an individual’s pay goes up or down depending on his / her own output) or Group Wage Fund (in which all members of a group strive for higher rates or production output as a unit, and all shard in a pool of funds distributed among work group members equally).\(^{85}\)

---

\(^{84}\) Information obtained from Todd Baldau, Federal Prison Industries, June 2007.
\(^{85}\) All of the above current pay practices are outlined in the Program Statements “Accounting Procedures for Civilian and Inmate Payrolls” (#8570.01) and “Work Programs for Inmates” (#8120.02).
**England & Wales**

In England and Wales, prisoners receive payment if they participate constructively in the regime of the establishment. The pay schemes and rates of pay which operate within establishments are a matter for local management, subject to rules and centrally prescribed minimums of £2.50 (unemployed) or £4.00 (employed) per week\(^86\).

*Piecework* is work which is paid according to the quantity and quality produced. Establishments may set piecework pay schemes for certain jobs rather than a standard rate of pay. Piecework schemes may include rates of pay below the minimum employed rate, but prisoners must have the opportunity to earn the minimum employed rate. Piecework pay schemes in prisons must specify the rate of pay and the minimum quantity and quality of production which is expected and the piece or bonus rates and deductions which can be earned or forfeited, depending on individual or group productivity.

Governors may establish *higher rates of pay schemes* for any purposeful activity that occupies one or more full session per week. Higher rates of pay schemes are a key earnable privilege under IEP, and may provide for pay differentials or restrict eligibility for certain activities based on incentive level, or a combination of both. Higher rates of pay schemes are only available to prisoners who are on enhanced or standard levels of the incentives and earned privileges scheme.

Governors and directors of contracted-out prisons may establish systems of *bonus payments* to recognise and reward productivity, achievement such as obtaining nationally recognised qualifications or reaching challenging sentence plan targets, or additional hours in purposeful activity. Bonus payments are considered a privilege for prisoners, not a right. Governors and Directors of contracted-out prisons must publish the criteria for bonuses and ensure that they are applied consistently. The bonus must be recommended by the manager of the activity and approved by a senior manager or senior budget holder.

---

\(^{86}\) Pay system detailed in Prison Service Orders “Prisoner’s Pay” (#4460) and “Incentives and Earned Privileges” (#4000).
**Finland**

The prison service in Finland includes both “closed” and “open” institutions. Closed prisons are those that accommodate inmates sentenced to prison and persons serving imprisonment for non-payment of fines. Open institutions are those that accommodate persons working or taking part in some other activity and being considered suitable for the freer conditions in open institutions compared to closed institutions and being assumed not to abscond from the institution.

Prisoners are paid an *activity allowance or wage* (market relevant wage for “professional” work in open institutions) according to three payment categories\(^{87}\). The higher activity allowance and wage categories can be considered as “performance pay”. In accordance with the legislation, the activity allowance is paid based on the demands, regularity and duration of the work, studies or other activity as well as the personal performance of the prisoner.

The pay for professional work in open institutions is €3.70, €4.10, or €4.50 euro per hour if they work for the prisoner services. The tax rate varies individually but in most cases it is under 20%. Prisoners pay the prison €1.60 per working hour for the food and lodging. In addition to this, there are possible debt payments and payments for the dependents of the offenders (e.g., children).

Taxable (market relevant) wages paid for prison work in open institutions can also be considered as performance pay. Based on the new act on imprisonment, prisoners in open institutions receive proper wages for their work if it is considered to be professional work, otherwise they receive an activity allowance. According to a regulation of the Criminal Sanctions Agency, prisoners receive wages in certain specified workshops if they master the basic skills of working life and certain predetermined professional skills required in the work in question. The Criminal Sanctions Agency recommends that prisons determine the required professional skills in accordance with the so-called competence-based qualifications (general qualification for adults in which skills are demonstrated in practice based on national criteria).

---

\(^{87}\) All information obtained from Eila Lempiainen, Finland Criminal Sanctions Agency, July 2007.
At the moment, open institutions are in a transition period. In most open institution workshops, prisoners get the activity allowance for the first couple of weeks until they learn the required vocational skills. In some workshops, the work supervisors are experienced in guiding apprenticeship students and, thus, already have the criteria for required vocational skills. Additionally, it has to be remembered that the regulation of the Criminal Sanctions Agency provides a possibility that the requirements of vocational skills do not necessarily need to match the skill requirements of the competence-based qualifications as long as the requirements of vocational skills are determined in advance.

Paid work does not function as such a good incentive as could be expected because prisoners pay taxes, prison food and lodging from their wages. Possible debts and payments for dependents are also deducted from their wages. Prisoners with both debts and dependents might receive less money for their own use than what they would get if they received the activity allowance.

**Singapore**

Within Singapore Prison Services, domestic prison workers (employed directly by the prison) are promoted through seven grades sequentially (labour trainee / kitchen worker, senior trainee, basic worker, senior worker, chief worker, skilled worker). A domestic worker will begin at the lowest grade for a period of three months, after which he/she will be automatically promoted to the next higher grade. Subsequent promotions will come about once the worker has completed the stipulated period (six months).

Prison industry workers (employed by Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises, SCORE) are promoted based on performance and productivity level in the workshops. These latter offenders must maintain a set target for a certain period before being promoted to a higher grade. Wages are calculated through either fixed rate (5 grades – chief foreman, foreman, asst foreman, party/line leader, worker) or piece rate (applicable to operations such as laundry where the work is voluminous, continuous and quantifiable). The piece rate is established after a detailed work-study, which determines the optimal number of pieces an inmate can be expected
to produce within a given time frame. Inmates on piece rate systems can expect to earn between S$12 to about S$40 per week depending on their output\textsuperscript{88}.

**Hong Kong**

As part of the prisoners’ earnings scheme, offenders in Hong Kong Correctional Services receive different earning grades ranging from A to F according to the jobs they perform (these grades are then further divided into apprenticeship and skilful rates, where the amount for the apprenticeship rate in a earning grade is just slightly above half of the skilful rate in that earning grade). The earning grade of a job is pre-determined under a job evaluation process. The criteria under evaluation include: (i) knowledge, capability and skill; (ii) condition of work; (iii) effort; (iv) responsibility; and (v) trustworthiness.

Prisoners first assigned to a workshop would normally be assigned to a work post of the lowest earning grade and will receive the corresponding apprenticeship rate. Subject to the achievement to the required performance level, the offender will be promoted to the skilful rate. As an incentive, a prisoner who displays good performance at work may be assigned to other work posts of higher earning grades when a vacancy exists. The offender must undergo the apprenticeship period in the new work post before showing good performance for the promotion to the skilful rate\textsuperscript{89}.

**Queensland, Australia**

Queensland Corrective Services\textsuperscript{90} operates a prisoner remuneration scheme that enables all offenders working within the prison environment to receive payment for either working within prison-based commercial industries or work in support of the correctional centre (e.g., landscaping, kitchen duties). Offenders work in high or low security correctional centres, or in work camps. The maximum base rates for high and low security facilities are based on four levels of employment classification (level 1, $2.11; level 2, $2.73; level 3, $3.41; level 4, $4.11), with an incentive bonus of up to 100% of base rate. The overall ceiling is level 4 plus incentive.

\textsuperscript{88} All information obtained from Justin Vikneswaran, Organisational Planning, Prison HQ, Singapore Prison Service, June 2007.

\textsuperscript{89} All information obtained from the Correctional Services Department, The Government of the HKSAR, June 2007.

\textsuperscript{90} All information was obtained from FP Rockett, DG Queensland Corrective Services, July 2007.
($57.54). In work camps, the maximum daily rates of pay are based on six levels of employment classification (level 1, $2.80; level 2, $5.71; level 3, $6.69; level 4, $7.20; level 5, $8.03; level 6, $8.21; overall ceiling, $57.54)\textsuperscript{91}.

**Tasmania, Australia**

Corrective Services Tasmania does not currently operate an incentive pay scheme for offenders\textsuperscript{92}. In the past with the inmates working in the vegetable processing area, they have increased their allowance during daylight savings time when the demand for the product was higher. However, this was for each allowance period and not on an incentive basis.

They have recently introduced integrated offender management and are looking at the possibility of doing something similar with those inmates who are participating in programs / education that are identified as being required under the assessment process. Again, this will not be an incentive or performance based payment – it will be an increase in their allowance during the period they are engaged in the program / education.

\textsuperscript{91} Queensland Corrective Services Appendix – Remuneration Rates (Jan.9/06) – Appendix 1.
\textsuperscript{92} Information obtained from Ginna Webster, Tasmania Prison Service, June 2007.
Appendix 8: CORCAN / CSC Employment Analysis and Labour Market Comparison

This section will examine trends in the Canadian labour market and industries, as they relate to inmate employment and employability training provided by Correctional Services Canada’s CORCAN job placements. This evaluation component encompasses an examination of CORCAN financial statements, a breakdown of employment assignment availability and respective sectors, and a labour market analysis. Trends in the labour market and industrial growth sectors will be identified and compared to what CSC offers in order to ascertain if there is, and will be, a continued demand for these types of job and / or products. Furthermore, industrial sectors where there is significant and continued growth will be identified.

CORCAN Financial Analysis

Table 40 and Figure 3 depict CORCAN’s financial situation for fiscal years 1999-2000 to 2006-2007. Revenue is defined as the increase in economic resources resulting from the ordinary activities of an entity; in this case it is the result of sales by CORCAN. Cost of Goods Sold is defined as the expense representing the cost to acquire or produce the goods to be sold. Operating Income is the difference between the cost of production and the monies received from the sale of the goods. Operating income should ideally be positive, as it is seen as a loss of income otherwise.

CORCAN is comprised of five business lines: Agribusiness and Forestry, Services, Textiles, Manufacturing, and Construction. The aim of these business lines is to actively encourage and assist offenders in practising good work habits, and developing marketable skills through the production of saleable goods in a structured, cost efficient work environment comparable to that in the private sector. CORCAN includes an Appropriation for Training and Correctional Activities to compensate for costs resulting from the training and correctional nature of the environment in which it must operate. Further, in 1989, the federal government introduced the concept of the Special Operating Agency (SOA), which would give certain government organizations, such as CORCAN, an opportunity to become more productive, efficient, and competitive. To qualify for SOA status, a government organization must be large enough to justify the change, be wholly concerned with the delivery of goods and services, be subject to the influences of the marketplace and offer a potential for improvement. CORCAN achieved SOA status on April 1, 1992. This status gives CORCAN greater flexibility to market its products, purchase goods and services, deploy staff, and enter into contracts with private sector organizations. In addition, it is able to offer an expanded range of training and employment opportunities to offenders.

The move to SOA status does not represent the privatization of CORCAN. Indeed, CORCAN functions as part of CSC, and its operation is guided by CSC's Mission and Core Values. Although much of the basic role and responsibility of CORCAN under SOA remains the same, important differences are created through the granting of specific mandates, called delegations.

93 The evaluation team would like to send our sincere appreciation to Jean-François Létourneau and his colleagues from Human Resources and Social Development Canada (HRSDC) who completed an external peer review of this appendix.
Delegations enable CORCAN to operate in a businesslike manner, and provide a wider range of services to inmates. One of the key delegations is the right to operate on revolving funds, which means that the positive margin generated by CORCAN can be retained by CSC and put back into additional correctional programming, rather than going to general government revenues, as had been the case in the past. Under SOA status, CORCAN is able to expand its correctional activities by investing program revenues in certain correctional activities that support the overall CORCAN mandate.

As exhibited in the CORCAN financial statements, it is evident that CORCAN has not had positive operating margin since the Fiscal Year 1999-2000. The cost of producing goods is greater than the revenue received from the sale. It appears that Agribusiness, Textiles, and Manufacturing have consistently relied on the Correctional and Training fees to break even due to increases in production costs.

According to Statistics Canada, this trend is consistent with what has been occurring in the Canadian economy. As depicted by the linear trends in Figure 3, costs of production are steadily increasing and the positive margin is decreasing. If this trend continues, revenues will decline, costs of production will intensify, and CORCAN will not show a positive margin. Given CORCAN’s mandate to provide employment and employability training and skills to offenders, it is not unusual that the cost of production is high as it is a training service and, as such, the costs of production are higher due to higher waste. However, CORCAN may be able to maximize the positive margin by concentrating on industries for which production costs are decreasing, return on investment is increasing, or where the production learning curve is shortest. Nevertheless the decreasing positive margin is attributable to the fact that CORCAN’s mandate is to train and provide an employment experience for federally incarcerated offenders while providing services and supplying goods to the private and public sector under competitive conditions. Since CORCAN was granted SOA status economic performance has been improving. CORCAN incurred economic losses of $7.3 million total for fiscal years 1992 to 1995, however in fiscal year 1996-1997 CORCAN demonstrated a $200,000 surplus.95

CORCAN costs support both the business activities it chooses to pursue and the training and correctional activities which are part of its mandate. The costs of these training and correctional activities are part of the reality of operating in correctional institutions across Canada. Because of this, the cost of the training and correctional activities cannot be recovered by means of a pricing strategy as is the case for the cost of the business activities, but they must be recognized and recovered through an alternate mechanism.

---

95 Source: Departmental Performance Report for the Period Ending March 31, 1997 (Treasury Board Website).
### Appendix – Labour Market Analysis

Table 54. CORCAN Financial Statements by Industry (in thousands) (1999 - 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue 2006-2007</td>
<td>$7,896</td>
<td>$5,022</td>
<td>$3,935</td>
<td>$32,392</td>
<td>$11,062</td>
<td>$60,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods Sold</td>
<td>$10,919</td>
<td>$5,586</td>
<td>$4,977</td>
<td>$34,048</td>
<td>$10,723</td>
<td>$66,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>-$3,023</td>
<td>-$564</td>
<td>-$1,042</td>
<td>-$1,656</td>
<td>$339</td>
<td>-$5,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue 2005-2006</td>
<td>$6,674</td>
<td>$5,123</td>
<td>$3,836</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$8,094</td>
<td>$46,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods Sold</td>
<td>$10,140</td>
<td>$4,728</td>
<td>$5,180</td>
<td>$27,755</td>
<td>$8,687</td>
<td>$56,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>-$3,466</td>
<td>$395</td>
<td>-$1,344</td>
<td>-$5,005</td>
<td>-$593</td>
<td>-$10,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue 2004-2005</td>
<td>$6,448</td>
<td>$5,773</td>
<td>$3,472</td>
<td>$25,273</td>
<td>$12,561</td>
<td>$53,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods Sold</td>
<td>$9,779</td>
<td>$5,515</td>
<td>$4,952</td>
<td>$29,706</td>
<td>$12,491</td>
<td>$62,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>-$3,331</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>-$1,480</td>
<td>-$4,433</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>-$8,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue 2003-2004</td>
<td>$7,370</td>
<td>$5,126</td>
<td>$3,145</td>
<td>$19,477</td>
<td>$14,866</td>
<td>$49,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods Sold</td>
<td>$10,315</td>
<td>$4,647</td>
<td>$4,338</td>
<td>$24,059</td>
<td>$13,719</td>
<td>$57,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>-$2,945</td>
<td>$479</td>
<td>-$1,193</td>
<td>-$4,582</td>
<td>$1,147</td>
<td>-$7,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue 2002-2003</td>
<td>$10,172</td>
<td>$4,859</td>
<td>$5,770</td>
<td>$28,515</td>
<td>$13,369</td>
<td>$62,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods Sold</td>
<td>$13,037</td>
<td>$4,962</td>
<td>$6,510</td>
<td>$29,439</td>
<td>$14,157</td>
<td>$68,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>-$2,865</td>
<td>-$103</td>
<td>-$740</td>
<td>-$924</td>
<td>-$788</td>
<td>-$5,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue 2001-2002</td>
<td>$11,026</td>
<td>$5,163</td>
<td>$3,342</td>
<td>$26,679</td>
<td>$19,923</td>
<td>$66,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods Sold</td>
<td>$13,731</td>
<td>$5,427</td>
<td>$3,963</td>
<td>$27,535</td>
<td>$20,213</td>
<td>$70,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>-$2,705</td>
<td>-$264</td>
<td>-$621</td>
<td>-$856</td>
<td>-$290</td>
<td>-$4,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue 2000-2001</td>
<td>$10,632</td>
<td>$4,876</td>
<td>$4,481</td>
<td>$18,781</td>
<td>$15,347</td>
<td>$54,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods Sold</td>
<td>$12,075</td>
<td>$4,438</td>
<td>$4,666</td>
<td>$19,970</td>
<td>$15,708</td>
<td>$56,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>-$1,443</td>
<td>$438</td>
<td>-$185</td>
<td>-$1,189</td>
<td>-$361</td>
<td>-$2,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue 1999-2000</td>
<td>$10,866</td>
<td>$2,465</td>
<td>$5,952</td>
<td>$21,770</td>
<td>$15,481</td>
<td>$56,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods Sold</td>
<td>$12,576</td>
<td>$2,915</td>
<td>$5,584</td>
<td>$20,060</td>
<td>$14,565</td>
<td>$55,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>-$1,710</td>
<td>-$450</td>
<td>$368</td>
<td>$1,710</td>
<td>$916</td>
<td>$834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An examination of the available CORCAN and CSC employment assignments and the proportion of inmates currently working in those assignments indicate that with respect to CORCAN employment, the majority of inmates are working in manufacturing, textiles, and laundry. With respect to CSC employment, the majority of inmates are working as cleaners and food preparation workers (see Table 41 for relevant excerpts; other employment opportunities offered by CORCAN or CSC accounted for no more than 7%, but most often less than 1% of offender employment assignments).
Table 55. CORCAN and CSC Employment Assignments 2003 - 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R03 - E CORC MANUFA</td>
<td>32.81%</td>
<td>32.59%</td>
<td>32.23%</td>
<td>30.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R05 - E CORC TEXTILE</td>
<td>13.02%</td>
<td>15.36%</td>
<td>14.99%</td>
<td>15.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11 – LAUNDRY</td>
<td>12.68%</td>
<td>13.05%</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C02 - E CLEANER</td>
<td>31.98%</td>
<td>32.06%</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
<td>33.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34 - FOOD PREP WORK</td>
<td>13.34%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>12.01%</td>
<td>11.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the average weekly number of hours worked per offender in each employment assignment indicates that the average number of hours per week is roughly 13 hours (maximum hours per hours week = 30, minimum hours per week = 2.37\(^{97}\)), which is not comparable to the usual 40-hour work week considered as full-time employment in the community. However, this does not imply that offenders are not productive while incarcerated; many offenders also participate in correctional programs.

Labour Market Analysis – Economic Context

The Canadian economy has undergone a remarkable transition after struggling for a great part of the 1990s. The 1990s were characterized by restrictive monetary and fiscal policies aimed at stabilizing inflation and controlling budgetary deficits\(^ {98}\). Between 2002 and 2005, the Canadian economy was affected by several significant economic developments\(^ {99}\):

- Low interest rates in the early part of the decade contributed to a boom in the housing construction market; however, 2006 saw a slump in the US housing market and as a result lumber prices sagged;
- Robust demand for oil and other natural resources has created new wealth, particularly in Western Canada, and was the main driver for the growth in employment. Conversely, there was a steady decline for pulp and paper; this trend is anticipated to continue as reflected in the falling North American newspaper circulation as readers have turned their attention to internet for information and increased competition from tropical countries such as Brazil and Indonesia where trees regenerate faster than in Canada’s boreal forests\(^ {100}\);
- A soaring dollar which in effect has made exports, particularly factory products, more expensive;

---

\(^{96}\) Source: Corporate Reporting System – Employment Analysis.


• Unemployment rate reached the lowest levels since the 1970s (6.4% in 2005, 6.1% in 2006, and has been steady around 6% in 2007)\textsuperscript{101}; and
• Total employment is expected to grow at a rate of 1.1% over the 2006-2015 period\textsuperscript{102}.

As a result of the economic events of the last few years, the Canadian economy has transformed – the industries of the 1990s such as auto manufacturing, textiles, clothing manufacturing, furniture making, lumber, pulp and paper, have weakened. Jobs in the textile and clothing industry declined at a double digit rate, whereas employment in furniture, lumber, pulp and paper declined by one-third compared to the 1990s\textsuperscript{103}. Manufacturing jobs contracted by 3.7% in 2005, and are worsening with the rising exchange rate\textsuperscript{104}. In 2006 mining was the only industry where employment increased in every province\textsuperscript{105}.

Joblessness is at a 33-year low, as result of the shift to full-time employment and the growth in demand for unskilled labour mainly in the resource and construction industries, towards the end of 2005 the demand for unskilled labour increased by 20%. Employment in temporary firms declined by 10% and growth in rural areas was close to matching (1.3%) that of urban economic growth (1.4%)\textsuperscript{106}. This shift from the bustling industries from the 1990s, coupled with the inevitable decline in overall labour force participation rate due to an aging population and low birth rates, will drastically change the Canadian economy and the labour market. For example, occupations that will face excess supply include\textsuperscript{107}:

• Office equipment operators (NOC\textsuperscript{108} 142)
• Service station attendant (NOC 6621)
• Floor covering installers (NOC 7295)
• Fishing vessel skippers (NOC 8262)
• Logging and forestry workers (NOC 842)
• Agriculture and horticulture workers (NOC 843)
• Machine operators and related workers in textile processing (NOC 944)
• Industrial sewing machine operators (NOC 9451)
• Electronics assemblers, fabricators, inspectors and testers (NOC 9483)\textsuperscript{109}

In spite of this a number of occupations are showing signs of excess demand:

• Legislators and senior management (NOC 001)
• Human resources managers (NOC 0112)
• Human resources and business service professionals (NOC 112)

\textsuperscript{101} Statistics Canada Cansim Tables.
\textsuperscript{102} See Lapointe and colleagues.
\textsuperscript{104} See Lapointe and colleagues.
\textsuperscript{105} See Cross.
\textsuperscript{106} See Lapointe and colleagues.
\textsuperscript{107} Lists of occupations facing excess supply and demand were extracted from Lapointe and colleagues.
\textsuperscript{108} NOC is the National Occupational Classification for Statistics.
\textsuperscript{109} See Lapointe and colleagues.
• Supervisors, library, correspondence and related information
• Clerks (NOC 1213)
• Geologists, geochemists and geophysicists (NOC 2113)
• Civil engineers (NOC 2131)
• Mechanical engineers (NOC 2132)
• Computer engineers (NOC 2147)
• Software engineers (NOC 2173)
• Natural and Industrial engineering and manufacturing technologists and technicians (NOC 2233)
• Physicians, dentists and veterinarians (NOC 311)
• Optometrists, chiropractors and other health diagnosing and treating professionals (NOC 312)
• Therapy and assessment professionals (NOC 314)
• Head nurses and supervisors (NOC 3151)
• Other technical occupations in health care (except dentists) (NOC 323), such as registered nursing assistants, audiology technicians and physiotherapy technicians
• Medical radiation technologists (NOC 3215)
• Nurse aides and orderlies (NOC 3413)
• Health Other aides and assistants in support of health services (NOC 3414)
• Lawyers and Quebec notaries (NOC 4112)
• University professors (NOC 4121)
• Social science, education, government service and religion Psychologists (NOC 4151)
• Art, culture, Editors (NOC 5122) recreation and sport
• Professional occupations in public relations and communications (NOC 5124)
• Accommodation service managers (NOC 0632)
• Real estate agents and salespersons (NOC 6232)
• Residential home builders and renovators (NOC 0712)
• Facility operation and maintenance managers (NOC 0720)
• Contractors and supervisors trades and related workers (NOC 721), such as in pipefitting trades and carpentry trades
• Occupations Supervisors, oil and gas drilling and service (NOC 8222)
• Oil and gas well drillers, servicers, testers and related workers (NOC 8232)
• Occupations specific to processing, manufacturing and utilities
• Supervisors, processing occupations (NOC 921), such as in petroleum, gas and chemical processing and utilities, and plastic and rubber products manufacturing

Most of the management occupations currently facing excess demand pressures are expected to continue to do so over the next 10 years, as the projected number of new job openings is expected to be greater than the projected number of new job seekers. The growing need to replace retiring workers will open up positions in many occupations, including legislators and senior management, human resources managers, as well as supervisors in trades, facility operation, oil and gas drilling and service, and processing. Shortage pressures are also expected

---

110 See Lapointe and colleagues.
to emerge in two other managerial occupations: managers in health, education, social and community services, and managers in public administration.

Increased health care needs resulting from the aging of the population will result in demand outpacing supply for several health care occupations. Occupations such as physicians, optometrists, health diagnosing and treating professionals, head nurses and supervisors, nurse aides and orderlies are expected to continue to face shortage pressures over the next decade. At the same time, other occupations in the health field – therapy and assessment professionals and medical radiation technologists – are likely to continue to display signs of pressure even though projections point to a relative balance between new job openings and new job seekers. This stems from the fact that future supply would have to outpace future demand in order to alleviate the current pressures.

Shortage pressures among human resources and business service professionals are expected to remain, as employers continue to place greater emphasis on recruiting and retaining quality employees to handle the increasingly complex jobs of our economy.

Pressures are also expected to persist over the next decade among oil and gas well drillers, servicers, testers and related workers as a result of an increase in demand associated with large capital spending projects, such as the tar sands development projects in Alberta. Finally, strength in non-residential construction (e.g., 2010 Olympics in British Columbia) and in renovation will benefit civil engineers and residential home builders and renovators. Though the majority of employment opportunities are in the skilled labour market, there is still a need to fill support positions.

Moreover, certain Canadian sectors requiring low-skilled labour will be feeling labour market pressures due to the retirement of the aging population. According to the Alliance of Sector Councils (TASC), certain key sectors will be experiencing unprecedented labour shortages, including:

- The Construction Sector estimates 150,000 worker will retire between 2005-2014
- Industrial growth and the looming retirement boom in the Mining Sector will create a demand for up to 81,000 workers
- Over the next ten years it is anticipated the Trucking Industry will require 37,000 new truck drivers
- There will be a need for 62,000 skilled workers in Aircraft Maintenance by 2016
- The Electronic Sector, specifically in the installation, maintenance and repair of appliance have reported that more than 1/3 of the current workforce is 55 years or older, and 25% plan on retiring in the next five years.
- The Bus Industry will require mechanics and drivers as an estimates 45% of workers are planning to retire in the next 5 to 7 years
- Half of the Automotive and Motorcycle Repair Industry reports a lack of qualified staff

---

111 See Lapointe and colleagues.
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- Plastics Processing Industry will add 28,500 new jobs by this year, and turnover will add 25,000 jobs annually
- The Electricity Sector reports 40% of the workforce to be eligible for retirement by 2014
- Roughly 50,000 skilled Metal Trades will be needed in the next five years
- Automotive Parts Manufacturing projected a 42% vacancy rate across Canada last year

As noted in CORCAN annual reports, the effects of the shifting Canadian economy have affected CORCAN’s positive margin and business structure. In a purely economic scrutiny the majority of CORCAN industries have been strained due to the impact of the changing economy. As such, it is natural that CORCAN has been reporting negative operating income. It is also evident that the industries and employment assignments currently available do not reflect the skills and work experience that will be in high economic demand in the community. In order to facilitate successful reintegration in the community, offenders should be taught skills that are in high demand in the community and thereby increase their chances of obtaining employment. Working in food preparation or laundry does not teach many transferable skills and does not give offenders the skills they need to compete in today’s labour market. CORCAN and CSC Employment assignments should be better matched with the labour market. CSC, does offer assignments in certain key industries and sectors where there will be labour shortages such as metal workers, construction workers and vehicle repair. These areas currently represent approximately 10% of all assignments. In a pure economic sense CORCAN has not efficiently adjusted to market conditions as some of the training offered is not reflective of current market supply and demand, and if it is not addressed it may impact the ability of inmates to obtain and retain jobs.

Labour Market Analysis – Correctional Context

Importantly, CORCAN operates in a correctional environment where it may neither be realistic nor achievable to function in a pure economic sense. As described above, CORCAN drastically improved its economic performance since being designated a SOA, therefore this form of private industry approach has been particularly effective in achieving positive financial results. This approach may not be feasible in the context of job readiness training. The ability for CORCAN to be fluid in its ability to adjust to labour market supply and demand is hindered by the nature of the environment in which it operates. Consequently, labour market analysis needs to be adapted to the correctional context. Research indicates that incarceration itself, and having a criminal record, impedes inmates from obtaining employment. Furthermore, an ex-offender is often faced with stigmatization and it is conceivable that a criminal record prevents inmates from working in some professions, and from obtaining security clearance or being bondable. Finally, some would argue that being incarcerated may erode or stifle skills in the fast-paced globalized technology age.

CORCAN needs to realistically adjust to labour market demands based on what is practical in the correctional context. There is a need to be pro-active with respect to the changing offender profile and the delivery of interventions striving to develop skills based on labour market needs. Industries such as manufacturing and agri-business are not easily adaptable to market conditions and require heavy cash investments. CORCAN may benefit from being better equipped to shift with labour market demands, but labour market demands need to be analyzed in the correctional
context. There is a definite need to become more responsive to changes in the labour market by conducting annual labour market analysis (with a correctional context in mind) and aligning the type of training and skills offered with economic demand.
Table 56. Greatest “Roadblocks” to the Effective Incorporation of Employment Activities into Offenders’ Correctional Plans, as Listed by Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadblock</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of job placements at the</td>
<td>245 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of vocational programs</td>
<td>204 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s other programming needs</td>
<td>147 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal to participate in employment activities</td>
<td>109 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of meaningful or diversified employment</td>
<td>17 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate vocational assessment tools</td>
<td>16 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not reflect employment in real world</td>
<td>10 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of hands on / trades training</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities do not meet criminogenic needs</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adapted to reflect offender’s mental health</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration between CORCAN</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Several respondents specified multiple answers (n = 16, 2%), or an answer unrelated to the question (n = 7, 1%); as such, their responses could not be included.
Table 57. “Roadblocks” to the Effective Incorporation of Employability and Vocational Programs into Offenders' Correctional Plans, as Listed by Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadblock</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of vocational programs</td>
<td>290 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of job placements at the institution</td>
<td>143 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s other programming needs</td>
<td>141 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal to participate in employment activities</td>
<td>108 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate vocational assessment tools</td>
<td>29 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of meaningful or diversified employment</td>
<td>13 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with program delivery</td>
<td>9 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not reflect employment in real world</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of hands on / trades training</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge regarding program availability</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities do not meet criminogenic needs</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adapted to reflect offender’s mental health</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff not willing to incorporate program into correctional plan</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No roadblocks</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Several respondents specified multiple answers (n = 8, 1%), or an answer unrelated to the question (n = 3, <1%); as such, their responses could not be included.
Table 58. Factors that Determine which Offender will be Placed in a Particular Employment Activities as Listed by Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors:</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of job placement</td>
<td>510 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s skills / abilities</td>
<td>375 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s interests</td>
<td>332 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s employment needs</td>
<td>249 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN business needs</td>
<td>242 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security risks / abilities</td>
<td>5 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender attitude and behaviour</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender obtaining position through contact</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program criteria</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender motivation</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s correctional plan</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC Policy / Program Board</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of job</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of sentence</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional needs</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>74 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Due to multiple responses, the percentage of respondents will not sum to 100%.
Table 59. Factors that Determine which Offender will be Placed in a Particular Employability and Vocational Program, as listed by Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of job placement</td>
<td>306 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s interests</td>
<td>295 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s skills / abilities</td>
<td>290 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s employment needs</td>
<td>254 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORCAN business needs</td>
<td>136 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC Policy / Program Board</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of sentence</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s correctional plan</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to uphold CSC’s good name</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender attitude and behaviour</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program criteria</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender motivation</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random assignment</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Due to multiple responses, the percentage of respondents will not sum to 100%.
### Table 60. Largest “Roadblock” to Seeking Employment in the Community, as Provided by Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadblocks:</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not having the employment skills required</td>
<td>263 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having the education / certification required</td>
<td>162 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a criminal record</td>
<td>159 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of desire to work</td>
<td>61 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support in the community</td>
<td>33 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time incarcerated (absence from workforce)</td>
<td>25 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of required documentation (SIN card, résumé, etc.)</td>
<td>20 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>13 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temptation to return to criminal lifestyle</td>
<td>8 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interpersonal / communication skills</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at release</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience</td>
<td>4 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with mental / physical health or disability</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial support or finances</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitude toward self</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation of resources (prison vs. community)</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealistic expectations</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not want to work for minimum wage</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training not reflective of job market needs</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Several staff respondents provided multiple answers (n = 19, 2%), or answers unrelated to the question (n = 4, <1%); these responses are not listed.
Table 61. Reasons why Incentive Pay Jobs are, or are not, Distributed Fairly among Offenders, as Provided by Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons why Incentive Pay Jobs are Distributed Fairly:</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on offenders’ skills / abilities</td>
<td>81 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the availability of job placements in the institution</td>
<td>77 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offenders’ past performance in that job</td>
<td>70 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on CORCAN business needs</td>
<td>59 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offender’s employment needs</td>
<td>58 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on staff preference</td>
<td>40 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done on a rotational basis</td>
<td>22 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offender attitude and behaviour</td>
<td>16 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offender classification (Protective Custody vs. General Population)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on institutional needs and / or experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons why Incentive Pay Jobs are Not Distributed Fairly:</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on CORCAN business needs</td>
<td>72 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on staff preference</td>
<td>41 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the availability of job placements in the institution</td>
<td>37 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offenders’ skills / abilities</td>
<td>17 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offenders’ past performance in that job</td>
<td>17 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offenders’ interests</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offender’s employment needs</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done on a rotational basis</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offenders’ ability to manipulate staff</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on length of sentence and release date</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offender attitude and behaviour</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on offender classification (Protective Custody vs. General Population)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on institutional needs and / or experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Several staff respondents provided answers unrelated to the question (n = 5, 2%); these responses are not listed.
Table 62. Issues Resulting from Employment Activities as Suggested by Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Issues:</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive changes in offenders’ dispositions</td>
<td>25 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders emerge with marketable skills</td>
<td>21 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases likelihood of success upon release</td>
<td>17 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders learn about community / real world expectations</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders leave the institution with certification</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful initiatives can be used as models by other regions</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Issues:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of programs and jobs</td>
<td>24 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs not meaningful to offenders</td>
<td>21 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require additional resources</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs not reflective or relevant to job market</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough certification</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions with CORCAN</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts with Correctional Programs and leads to decline in attendance</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational / bureaucratic mismanagement of EEP</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No motivation to participate in employment</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration among offenders due to low wages</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment / training should not be provided in institutions</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational assessments are not completed properly</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed offenders drain other systems</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional employment exploits offenders</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Several respondents (9%, n = 19) provided answers unrelated to the question; these responses are not listed.
Table 63. Changes to Employment Programs Most Frequently Suggested by Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes:</th>
<th>Staff Respondents n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of vocational programs and skills</td>
<td>92 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement recognized third party certification</td>
<td>44 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more meaningful and diverse jobs</td>
<td>33 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure jobs reflect those in the real world</td>
<td>31 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure direct communication with community</td>
<td>24 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer apprenticeship programs</td>
<td>22 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on developing work ethic</td>
<td>14 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment should be relevant to today’s job market</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more opportunities in general</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more opportunities for women offenders</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate more job-hunting skills</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate employment at lower security levels</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of computer skills</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate life skills</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more work release and ETA opportunities</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure complete staff commitment and support</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer employment opportunities for offenders with</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer culture-specific employment for Aboriginal</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offenders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase CORCAN operations / financial flexibility</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use aptitude testing to determine skills and</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer NESP</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on social skills</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay according to the work done, not hours</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure required documents are ready upon release</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer opportunities for advancement / promotion</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More staff for supervision / training</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make employment a mandatory part of</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offenders’ Correctional Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs should reflect security level / sentence</td>
<td>2 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer education on the benefits of employment as part</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Correctional Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate incentive pay</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Several respondents (n = 13, 3%) offered responses that were unrelated to the question; these responses are not listed.
Appendix 10: Costing Centres for Employment Interventions / Costing Methodology

**ACTIVITY**

An activity is a subdivision of the CSC Program / Activity structure to identify the purpose of a transaction. A manager performs one or more activities and records expenditures using the appropriate activity code. A budget may be input at each activity.

**COST CENTRE (CC)**

A cost centre is a subdivision of an activity. A cost centre is used to subdivide expenditures but does not necessarily have a separate budget identified with it. The use of cost centres is mandatory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Centre / Activity (IFMMS)</th>
<th>Activity / Employment Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>460 (Cost Activity)</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Employability Skills &amp; Career Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Specific Employability Skills / On the Job Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>National Employability Skills Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

113 Source: CSC Financial Coding Manual, Comptrollers Branch.
Cost-Effectiveness Methodology:

Cost-effectiveness was determined by calculating the ratio of program costs per unit to the difference between statistical coefficients as reported in the effectiveness section of the evaluation. The resulting cost-effectiveness equation is:

\[
\text{Cost-Effectiveness} = \frac{\text{UCT}}{\text{SCCG} - \text{SCTG}}
\]

UCT = Unit Cost of Treatment  
SCCG = Statistical Coefficient Comparison Group  
SCTG = Statistical Coefficient Treatment Group

For example:

Cost-effectiveness with regard to Rate of Institutional Incidents:

\[
= \frac{\$ 443.12}{0.47 (\text{CSC Employment}) - 0.36 (\text{Core Employment})}
\]

\[
= \frac{\$443.12}{0.11}
\]

This can be interpreted as investment of $443.12 contributing to 0.11 less institutional incidents.
### Appendix 11: Best Practices

**EEP Best Practice Initiatives as Identified in the Staff Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>EEP Initiative</th>
<th>Identified Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>Atlantic Institution</td>
<td>Roughneck Program</td>
<td>Meets identified labour market needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>St-Anne-des-Plaines</td>
<td>Construction initiatives specifically targeting Inuit offenders</td>
<td>A diversity of training and employability workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Macaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joliette</td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of employment opportunities available to inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leclerc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to do excellent work with maximum security offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donnaconna</td>
<td></td>
<td>External contract for the management, evaluation and follow-up of employability initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Frontenac Isabel McNeil House Beaver Creek</td>
<td>Farm Screenprinting Community Service Work Crew Community Partnerships with Local Businesses (e.g., IGA / Mr. Sub)</td>
<td>Reintegration / Job Placements upon release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyceville Pittsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Apprenticeships / Work Release</td>
<td>Ticket in electrical work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Kwikwexwelhp</td>
<td>Certifications / Apprenticeships / Work Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsqui Mission</td>
<td>Not identified Electrical Program / EEP as a daily item at management briefing</td>
<td>Ticket in electrical work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Head</td>
<td>Electrical Program / College certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Training / Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairies</td>
<td>Grand Cache</td>
<td>Welding Apprenticeships / Partnership with Alberta Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Third Party Training / Certification Community Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlighting Regional Best Practice Initiatives as Identified through CORCAN-NHQ and EEP Regional Managers

Atlantic Region

‘Best Practice’ – Pre Employment Floorman (Roughneck) Training

Atlantic Region – Community & Westmorland
In partnership with Maritime Drilling Schools (MDS), North Sydney, Nova Scotia

Introduction

The Atlantic Region, Pre-employment Floorman (Roughneck) Training initiative, commenced in January 2007, in partnership with Maritime Drilling Schools (MDS). This program is unique in that it provides continuity between the institutional and community environments and it provides an opportunity for the offender to obtain several different third party certifications. Furthermore, the structure and approach of the program offers the offenders an opportunity that represents a “real world” experience.

Development and Design

The program was developed and is delivered by MDS, an organization that is certified by Human Resources Development Canada as a designated educational institute. MDS is recognized by 16 organizations, including, but not limited to:

◊ International Association of Drilling Contractors WellCAP Well Control Accreditation
◊ Canadian Society of Safety Engineering
◊ The Association of Energy Engineers
◊ National Association of Safety Professionals
◊ Canadian Association of Drilling Contractors

The program includes a 20-day course of instruction and consists of drilling programs, hands-on rig training, and industry safety programs. Life skills and job readiness are also included as program components.

Implementation

This program commenced with a proposal from MDS, in which the school offered 3 parolees in the Sydney / Cape Breton area a 20-day Pre-employment Floorman (Roughneck) Training opportunity. The objectives of the training were:

◊ To allow parolees to gain transferable knowledge of drilling industries
◊ To allow parolees to explore their interests and abilities in the drilling industry
◊ To allow MDS to assess the skill level and potential of parolees to move forward in the drilling industry
◊ To assist parolees in finding long-term work and build a career in the drilling industry
After the completion of the training, MDS submitted a final report to CORCAN’s Manager of EEP, Atlantic Region. This report included:

◊ A brief summary of activities
◊ Names of participants
◊ Number of completion certificates issued to participating offenders
◊ Participant evaluation forms

Outcomes

To date, the program has only been offered in the community (at the training facility of MDS). Since last year (2007/2008), the training has been provided to a total of 9 offenders, with 3 additional offenders taking part in the program at the time of the writing of this document. All participants that have been involved with the program have found employment.

It is anticipated that 2 sessions will be offered at Westmorland Institution next fiscal year (2009/2010) and it is expected that 25 offenders will complete the program.

Conclusion

The program is viewed as a success by relevant stakeholders and has demonstrated its ability to provide transferable knowledge and skills. Furthermore, the partnership with MDS and the opportunity to obtain third party certification is an invaluable contribution to the numerous initiatives targeting those offenders exhibiting employment needs. Moreover, and perhaps most importantly, this program corresponds to anticipated labour market needs. Where feasible, it is recommended that similar initiatives be undertaken in regions throughout the country.
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\textbf{Quebec Region}

‘Best Practice’ – La Macaza Inuit Construction Project

\textit{Quebec Region – La Macaza  
In partnership with Association sectorielle paritaire-Construction (ASP-Construction)}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Introduction}
\end{center}

In the last fiscal year, CORCAN- Québec Region lead a construction project at La Macaza Institution with an institutional Inuit manpower. As a result, a group of 10 Inuit offenders, most of whom spoke only Inuktitut, and a few who spoke English or French, reported for work at the site. This project was aimed at participants acquiring knowledge in the construction field as well as developing their employability skills. The project consisted in replacing steam pipelines that connect the gymnasium to the three cell block areas.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Development and Design}
\end{center}

The participants received instruction on excavating for the pipeline, installing the forms and framework to build the concrete trench, installing the new pipes and making them operational, closing the trench, and restoring the landscape.
In preparation for their jobs, the Inuit workers received five days of training on general health and safety on construction sites in a certified training program offered by a third party, the *Association sectorielle paritaire-Construction* (ASP-Construction). The certificates earned are on record in the offenders’ files in the Offender Management System and help improve their employability. Each of the participants has been issued a card attesting to their certification by ASP-Construction.

**Implementation**

This construction project was initiated in 2006–07 by the Technical Services Division, Quebec Region. For some time now, periodic maintenance and repairs to the steam pipes have been insufficient for the proper operation of this aging network.

Aware of CORCAN’s vocation—to help prepare offenders for the labour market and to help them develop their employment skills before their release—management at CORCAN and La Macaza Institution approved the project.

Management at Sainte-Anne-Des-Plaines Institution made its local trainer available to give the training in English. The Aboriginal Initiatives Branch at National Headquarters covered the travel and accommodations expenses of an Inuktitut-English interpreter. La Macaza Institution purchased the training manuals provided to each of the participants. The Operations Manager at CORCAN Construction coordinated the work with the representatives of La Macaza Institution, and CORCAN covered the travel and overtime costs for the construction staff members and the trainer.
Outcomes

All 10 participants having completed training on general health and safety on construction sites have been issued a card attesting to their certification by ASP-Construction. They have acquired knowledge and experience in the field of construction over a 20 week period.

Conclusion

Teamwork by CORCAN, correctional operations, and programs staff members contributed to the achievement of this undertaking, which is already proving to be a great success. Through this project, the stakeholders are contributing to the successful reintegration of the Inuit offenders and to their development.
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Ontario Region

‘Best Practice’ – Horticultural Trades Orientation and Skills Training Program Pilot Project

Ontario Region – Grand Valley Institution for Women
In partnership with Landscape Ontario Horticultural Trades Association and the Canadian Nursery Landscape Association (CNLA)

Introduction

As part of the Employment and Employability programming at Grand Valley Institution for Women (GVIW), GVIW has developed a successful vocational skills training program: the Horticultural Trades Orientation and Skills Training Program which has just completed its second pilot year. This program has had many positive outcomes and received invaluable support provided through partnerships with Landscape Ontario Horticultural Trades Association, the Canadian Nursery Landscape Association (CNLA), and the support of a major industry leader providing groundskeeping services throughout North America. The program was established to introduce women inmates to non-traditional career choices in the landscape trades, and to provide students with the required skill sets, knowledge base, and experience to secure work release placements and employment upon release in the growing landscape maintenance service sector. Due to the program's success, GVIW is currently working toward educational accreditation (Certified Horticultural Technician, CHT) with the Canadian Nursery Landscape Association (CNLA), so that the CNLA may certify skill set achievement through a testing process and training hours successfully completed by students. The Certified Horticultural Technician (CHT) program is recognized by the landscape industry and provincial landscape associations throughout Canada and the United States.

Development and Design

The development, design, and delivery of the Horticultural Trades Orientation and Skills Training Programs in 2006 and 2007 occurred through a service contract with Horticultural Connections, Inc. This contractor worked closely with Landscape Ontario, the Canadian Nursery Landscape Association, industry leaders, and program management at GVIW to create an effective vocational skills training program that is highly responsive to women’s training and employment needs, and the current requirements of employers in the landscape maintenance service sector. The program and course content have been set up to meet core curriculum requirements for achieving high school equivalency credits for participants who have not yet completed grade 12. Participation in this program also prepares the participants to work toward achieving some of the stations of the Certified Horticultural Technician (CHT) designation. Another key element of this program is to provide follow-up support to the participant once released into the community, and to assist with further linkages to employment and / or related training in the landscape industry.

Implementation

The program is delivered in four core modules of 75 hours each, beginning in May and running until mid-November. Each module is six weeks in duration, two full days per week, and consists of 37.5 hours of classroom instruction and 37.5 hours of grounds maintenance practicum.
module curriculum materials used throughout the program are from the landscape industry. In order to allow for maximum offender access to horticulture programming, current and future programming requires a flexible entry system. Flexible entry allows women offenders to commence program participation at the most appropriate time in their sentence. The horticultural program is advertised throughout the institution, an application is submitted by each candidate, which is then followed by an interview. The Institutional Intervention Board reviews applications and recommendations and makes program assignment decisions.

Outcomes

Primary program outcomes are summarized below:

- In the years 2006 and 2007, fifteen inmates participated in the horticultural skills training program at GVIW. Most of them have completed their training modules with outstanding results.
- Eleven inmates out of fifteen have been released to date and have not re-offended.
- Six inmates have secured employment in the Landscape Trades since graduating from the program. All others are employed at other jobs, self employed or are back with their previous employers.
- Three inmates have successfully completed the 2006 paid work release placements with a groundskeeping company with excellent job performance reports and the opportunity for future employment with the same company upon their release. Each inmate was told by the owner that they would refer them to franchises in other locations in the area of their release destination.
- Three inmates received high school equivalency from their Horticulture modules and were able to graduate with their grade 12.
- The GVIW grounds have improved in appearance through the increased skill and knowledge development of grounds keeping staff and inmates participating in the horticultural skills training program and the work release program.

Conclusion

Here are a few impact statements from graduates of the Horticultural Skills Training Program:

“The horticulture program has impacted me by giving me a skill that I may use in getting ahead in the field of landscaping. It has opened doors for me that I would never have considered. I now have options”.

“It has been a great opportunity to advance myself. It is a long-term learning experience that is in great demand. For the facilitators to have faith, respect, and trust in me, who is stereotypically not trusted, has put me back on the track that I was meant to be on. Self-esteem, self-worth, and independence have restored my faith in myself. This program has shown me that there is so much to life and no matter where you are at on a scholarly level, that the sky is the limit when it comes to learning new things”.
“Personally, this program enhanced my knowledge of plants and procedures. I’m truly grateful for the work release opportunity offered to me and have gained health, wealth, and happiness”.

The pilot project will serve as the foundation for a sustainable horticulture skills training program for future years. Multi-year contracts will facilitate many exciting outcomes including: continuous program development; third party certification opportunities; expanding skill development and educational programs for women offenders in the landscape trades to meet demand for skilled workers in a growing industry, with a growing shortage of skilled labour; development of new industry partners; and possibly set the foundation for certification opportunities to federal penitentiaries in Ontario, and throughout Canada.
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Ontario Region

‘Best Practice’ – Community Service Volunteer Group (CSVG)

Introduction

Beaver Creek Institution has an active Community Service Volunteer Group (CSVG), and community CORCANCAN program. The program consists of a pool of 25 offenders who are approved for ETAs. The offenders start by working on various community projects ranging from clearing brush to new construction with CSVG, then some are chosen from the CSVG pool for CORCANCAN projects. This experience gives CSC an opportunity to place offenders in a structured environment within the community, which enables offenders to contribute to society in a meaningful way while learning employment skills. From CSVG to CORCANCAN, offenders develop skills that range from general labour to construction trades while working on projects for service organizations (CNIB, Snowmobile Club), community groups (Lindsay Gymnastics Club), and municipal governments (Township of Muskoka Lakes, Gravenhurst, Huntsville, Bracebridge, and Dorset). From CSVG and CORCANCAN, offenders go on to apply for Work Release (WR) placements where they are hired by local businesses for a sixty day period at entry level jobs for which employers have difficulty attracting workers. Once an offender has completed work releases, he is better prepared for Conditional Release.

Development and Design

The Best Practice Project started with the "Bush Gang", which was a group of five to six offenders serving life sentences, supervised by a Living Unit Officer. The offenders worked clearing brush and trees at various worksites for Parks Canada, municipal parks, and in district forests. The Warden, and AWCP at BCI at the time, approved the projects in the early 1990's. One of their major projects was clearing trees and brush in Arrowhead Park near Huntsville. In 1999, the "Bush Gang" became the “Community Service Work Crew”, expanding into more community based projects. Particularly:

• The demolition of warehouses in Huntsville and at the waterfront in Gravenhurst.
• The demolition and site preparation to refurbish the Dorset Museum
• Clearing 16 acres of trees to make way for soccer fields for the town of Bracebridge.
• Dam construction with Parks Canada in 2002.
• Planting trees for the town of Port Sydney.
• Major construction at Camp Northern Lights, raising a building, putting in a new foundation, replacing rotten timbers and painting the structure. CSVG also built 8 cabins with bunk beds which were pre-fabricated at BCI and put together on site.
• Refurbishing an old warehouse and constructing a new fully functioning gymnastics club for the town of Lindsay.

Over the next few years, the crew participated in several key projects in the Muskoka area, which lead to the further development and evolution of the CSVG. Particularly:
• Refurbishing the tour boat known as the Wanda III.
• In 2007, the Crew worked at Camp Dorset, laying tile floors, painting, and winterizing cabins. They also built a loading dock with canopy at the camp and were involved in refurbishing the interior and exterior of a tour boat.

As the offenders’ skills and development progressed, CORCAN would utilize the workers from the Community Service Crew. CORCAN currently has a contract with Camp Dorset to build several accommodations.

Implementation

Any good plan begins with a vision followed by an action plan and the people on the ground to make it happen. The Warden is instrumental in encouraging community service organizations to accept the assistance of offenders and in keeping community leaders informed of our engagement. It also takes a person who has the expertise, skills and abilities to implement the plan, and Beaver Creek is fortunate to have excellent staff to spearhead the projects. Staff started the initiative by taking on small projects like cleaning church yards in the spring and fall, putting up tents for special events, clearing brush along snowmobile trails and the TransCanada trail, and moved on to cutting down damaged trees after an ice storm in Algonquin Park. Through word of mouth, the good deeds of CSVG have led to more intense skill development jobs such as building docks and decks, raising buildings to reinforce foundations, and even new construction of accommodations for campers at CNIB and Camp Dorset. There are many other major projects in the wings waiting for the CSVG crew, but now it takes an institutional committee to review the applications and prioritize the requests.

Outcomes

From year to year the number of projects has increased opening up opportunities for more offenders to become involved. Last summer, four staff members became involved, heading two CORCAN and two CSVG crews. Through these Crews’ efforts, materials salvaged from one project were repurposed to another project. Floor boards removed from the CNIB project became a new floor the Gymnastics Club and some items were repurposed through Habitat to Humanity.

By contributing offender time to various projects, community service organizations have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars in labour costs. Unsafe structures were made safe, and new structures were put in place. The benefactors of these efforts are the patrons at Camp Dorset, Camp Northern Lights, the CNIB camp, and of course the offenders themselves. The good work performed by CSVG and CORCAN has opened the door to establishing Work Release jobs into the community for offenders. Through the positive achievements of the Crews, there has been a growing acceptance of offender involvement in the community.

Conclusion

The key to success is having the right people in place: to establish relations with the community; with the right skills sets to work along side the offenders and teach them; to have the tools to do the work; to have the ability to assess the offender's progress while doing meaningful work; and the outcome results in a benefit to the community. With these factors in place it becomes a win-win situation for offenders, the community, CSC and CORCAN. Good practices should be replicated.
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Appendix – Best Practices

Prairies Region

‘Best Practice’ – Information Communication Technology (ICT) Program

CORCAN – Prairies Region – Saskatchewan Penitentiary
In collaboration with Computers for Schools (CFS) and Industry Canada

Introduction

The Information Communication Technology (ICT) Program was developed in collaboration with Computers for Schools (CFS) and Industry Canada. The goal of the ICT Program is to refurbish computers, while at the same time giving program participants the opportunity to gain an accreditation in the field of computer refurbishment. All successful program participants receive an IT Essentials PC Hardware and Software CISCO third party certificate at the completion of the program. The refurbished computers are then donated back to local schools and non-profit organizations.

In the beginning stages of this program, we were required to develop a shop set-up, capable of functioning in an institutional environment. We had many “trial and error” moments but worked through these challenges in order to develop a successful model. In these efforts, the best practice application from Manitoba Corrections was often referred to, consequently proving quite useful. The ICT Program was largely modeled after provincial institutions in Manitoba Corrections as they were the first to implement this type of initiative. Depending on the location and placement of the shop, there are many dynamics to consider prior to implementation, including, but not limited to security, dust issues, humidity, air, and static discharge, etc.

Development and Design

The ICT Program model was developed from both trial and error and by application of standards for industry design. Developing CFS shops in public buildings do not present the same type of issues and challenges as opening them in a correctional facility. Industry Canada, and more specifically, their Highway Information Branch, assists in overseeing the initiative and CFS supplies the computers. In a penitentiary, safety and security of staff and offenders must be considered. With this priority in mind, all tools need to be inventoried and managed and shop supplies have to be able to work in an institution.

Instructor resources play a major role in the development of the program application. Updated information, including manuals, books, and training aids are essential. The nature and intensity of this material is selected based on the individual needs of the program participants. Computer technology is a constantly changing field and industry standards must be followed to ensure we present current and relevant instruction.

The cost of a first time set-up for the ICT Program is approximately $10,000; however, this may vary as a function of individual institutional requirements. For the current initiative, initial funding was provided by CORCAN, the institution, and Industry Canada.
Implementation

The goals and benefits of this best practice were:

1) The ability to take and modify the program to fit in a correctional environment;

2) Being flexible, within CFS standards, to adjust the program in finding what worked well and what did not work so well within an institutional environment;

3) Keeping all partners (i.e., Industry Canada, CFS, CORCAN & the Institution) involved; and

4) Our ability to keep the program as cost effective as possible.

Outcomes

In terms of cost-effectiveness, in comparison to other program costs, cost factors related to the ICT Program shop and the program itself, were considered reasonable. Saskatchewan Penitentiary had a trained facilitator; therefore, a contract facilitator was not necessary. Institutional application of the shop to meet security requirements (inventory control and acquisition), including the modification for instruction for the site/work space, was considered successful. Furthermore, the CFS Program served to develop important links and partnerships for CORCAN with CFS Saskatchewan and Industry Canada.

The program was delivered to offenders in medium security institutions. The program provided skills and knowledge to participants that can be applied in a community setting once released. The computer/technological field is a vast and growing industry. The skills developed in this program are a commodity offenders can use in acquiring meaningful employment in the community. Positive, steady, and meaningful employment is strongly linked to successful reintegration into society.

Conclusion

The results of this initiative are considered positive and meaningful. The Prairies Region is in the process of expanding the CFS Program to other institutions within, and outside of, the Prairies Region. In addition to Saskatchewan Penitentiary, the ICT program is currently running at Stan Daniels and negotiations are underway with CFS Alberta in partnership between CORCAN and Industry Canada to develop a program in a maximum security facility (Edmonton Institution). Finally, CSC has recently completed collaborative efforts with Keewatin Career Development Corporation (KCDC). These efforts have ensured that CSC instructors have CISCO certification, thereby permitting them to train, test, and issue CISCO certification of “IT Essentials: PC Hardware and Software” to offenders. This certification is considered the beginning of a “Tech Ticket”, consequently permitting offenders to branch into the tech field based on their interests.

Author & Contact:
Guy Lloyd
Supervisor, ICT Program
Correctional Services Canada
lloydgs@csc-scc.gc.ca
306-765-8305
Appendix – Best Practices

Prairies Region

‘Best Practice’ – Construction Worker Prep Course

Prairies Region – Saskatchewan Penitentiary and Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge (OOHL)
In collaboration with Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technology (SIIT)

Introduction

In the Prairies Region, specifically Alberta and Saskatchewan there is a large demand for skilled labour in the Construction Field due to the overwhelming increase in community development. To assist offenders in securing employment while on Conditional Release in these areas, the Correctional Service of Canada, CORCAN, Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technology (SIIT) and the Saskatchewan Trades Commission, partnered in the development and implementation of a 10 module introductory course in Construction Skills. This program provides the participants the fundamentals skills required for employment beyond the entry level of a general labourer. This in turn assists them in securing employment and therefore reducing the risk of them returning to the behaviours that led them to incarceration. The certification from the SIIT provides the employers with the confidence that the offenders have the proper training and skills for employment in their field, creating a win-win situation for all involved.

What was done differently in the development of this initiative was that stakeholders both from the institution, the educational facility, and the apprenticeship were brought to the table at the developmental stages. The training, as a result, is not only recognized by employers due to the third party certification by the recognized educational facility but it is also recognized and supported by the Saskatchewan Apprenticeship Board. This recognition then leads to additional credibility given to the quality of the training the offenders are receiving.

Development and Design

Contact was made with Construction Careers and SIIT by the manager of Employment and Employability. The Regional Director of CORCAN approached, and met, with Saskatchewan Trades and Apprenticeship Council and the partnership was developed.

Implementation

Communication and awareness to all parties and potential partners as to the mandate and purpose of CORCAN was the starting point. Tours of the institution and meetings with staff and offenders took place in order to dispel myths about institutions and offenders. During this phase it was realized by all parties that all had the same mandates and goals and commitment to increasing employment opportunities for Aboriginal offenders and that the classes and courses to be offered were already tailored to the Aboriginal population. As a result, there was no requirement to develop anything new with respect to curriculum and course content.
Outcomes

Many barriers to employment were ultimately reduced. The offenders were chosen based on certain criteria, some of the main ones being their aptitude and desire to enter into an apprenticeship program and to continue that path on release, and their upcoming release date, for prioritizing the participants.

Through the course of the program, other partners were involved in aiding in the practical skills component of the program. Examples; a full ready to move house was constructed with all materials supplied by an Aboriginal-owned business. The house was donated to a local Aboriginal Women’s group to sell to raise awareness for Missing Aboriginal Women in Saskatchewan. The offenders not only gained a sense of giving back to the community but fully committed to a quality house being delivered. There were construction projects completed at the institution which assisted the maintenance department at low cost. All of the hours in the practical skills component were certified toward their apprenticeship hours which added to the already achieved 250 hours for each successful course participant.

A large number of offenders were able to reduce their level of security during the program by actually being transferred to minimum security from medium security where the program was being held. They were able to demonstrate their level of commitment to the program. Attendance was extremely high and offenders were taught how to schedule their time according to real life work experience. Friday afternoons were set aside for passes and meeting with Parole Officers, etc. This minimized the negative effect of classroom interruption. Parole Officers and other departments approved of this concept and adjusted their schedules accordingly.

Graduations saw high attendance by institutional staff, including parole officers, partners, Aboriginal Elders, CORCAN staff and management as well as program staff, senior institutional Managers, and regional CORCAN managers.

Community employment coordinators have commented on how much easier it is to place offenders into meaningful jobs in the community.

Some offenders gained a basic knowledge of electrical and plumbing trades, and chose to pursue those paths, as opposed to carpentry.

Conclusion

The integrity funding will assist significantly in being able to conduct, and expand, these types of courses. Short term vocational courses that have the offenders registered to begin their apprenticeships with employers on release are a bonus and reduce systemic barriers to sustained employment.

The CSC must begin to assist in identifying the needs of offenders in employment and training areas to assist in ensuring that the money being spent on such programs is targeting the correct offenders at the most opportune point in their sentence.

Partnering with existing agencies and programs is a definite asset as the curriculums are already developed for difficult demographic populations with significant and unique employment requirements.
CORCAN needs to be challenged more by the other stakeholders in the institutions to ensure employment needs are met. CORCAN cannot, and does not, have the capacity to refer the offenders to all of the employment and training opportunities being offered for offenders.

Author & Contact:
Kathy Neil
Regional Manager, Employment & Employability, Prairies Region
Correctional Services Canada
neilkm@csc-scc.gc.ca
306-975-4119
Introduction

As part of the Employment and Employability programming at Rockwood Institution (RI) and in partnership with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), RI has successfully delivered the vocational skills training program: Housing Quality Initiative (HQI). The first session was completed in December 2007 with a second session underway starting in February 2008. This program has received very positive feedback and outcomes resulting in inmates finding work in the community upon release.

The CMHC’s Housing Quality Initiative is a set of training programs designed to support First Nations in improving the quality of the existing houses by providing skills to correct some of the most significant issues affecting residences on the reserve communities.

Development and Design

The training is delivered in modules utilizing both theoretical (classroom) and practical (workshop) exercises over a nine week period. The modules delivered at Rockwood Institution include the following:

1. Introduction to Ventilation Systems
2. Let’s Clear the Air
3. LCTA Home Assessment
4. Basic Home Maintenance
5. Building Series
6. Inspecting the Existing Dwelling
7. Mold Remediation

The participants earn up to six third party certificates issued by CMHC.

The benefit of modular training is the participants, depending on their availability, can earn all or only a portion of certificates. Participants unable to complete all modules while at the institution will be able to complete them in the community. CMHC has other modules that are available that offenders will have access to in the community.

Implementation

CMHC and RI management met for discussion on the Housing Quality Initiative. Once an agreement at the local level was reached, RHQ CORCAN, and CMHC reviewed the material. The review confirmed the program would provide skills and abilities which have the potential to assist in obtaining employment in a related field and would benefit individuals in the care and upkeep of
their own homes. RHQ CORCAN and CMHC established a Memorandum of Understanding for the delivery of the program.

Outcomes

Results of initial program:
- Program delivery began in October 2007; eleven inmates participated in the Housing Quality Initiative training program at Rockwood Institution.
- A total of fifty-five certificates were earned amongst the eleven participants. Three inmates were released before completion of all modules.
- Five inmates are still at Rockwood Institution, one inmate is back on Suspension status and five are currently on Parole.
- Of the five inmates on parole one is still searching for employment and four have become employed full time in maintenance/repair work. This is work directly related to the skills training provided for the in the program.

During the time the inmates participated in the nine weeks of classroom and practical skills training, under the supervision of the instructor, they constructed a one-sixth scale miniature house, hung doors in frames, learned to repair/tape drywall, assemble/install a toilet and sink, install roof shingles, construct and finish an exterior wall, fix leaky faucets, build stairs and completed a project to fix and paint a room in the Rockwood chapel.

Conclusion

A second session of HQI is underway at Rockwood and it will continue throughout 2008-2009 at this institution. The theory portion of the program will be piloted at Stony Mountain Medium Security Institution during this fiscal year.

Willow Cree Healing Lodge is implementing the HQI program at their site with the assistance from the Rockwood instructor. This is only the beginning of the expansion of this program as CMHC and CSC/CORCAN see the benefits of implementing this across the Prairies and potentially across the nation.
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Introduction

This year CORCAN Pacific has been offering CORE Construction training starting with a 6 week program for women at Fraser Valley Institution (June 2007) and then expanding the offering to men at maximum and medium security (December 2007). Launching this initiative with a group of incarcerated women was a non-traditional first step in an industry over-represented by male workers. Further, moving on to maximum security where the CORE training was run jointly with the National Employability Skills Program was a divergent but strategic action to balance the delivery of soft and hard skills training for inmates soon to be released.
Development and Design

The CORCAN Construction business activity has been very active at the Fraser Valley Women's Institution during various building phases at the site. Over time, this provided opportunities for women with an interest and aptitude to gain some basic knowledge and experience in construction. At the same time, the CORCAN Operations Manager was following up leads and developing relationships within the construction sector with an eye to ensure that third party certification of their training could be connected to our business activity where possible. The Vancouver Regional Construction Association hosts regular meetings for construction business networking and CORCAN connected to this group which had already been working closely with the provincial Industry Training Authority to develop modularized training which would support the demand for labour and skills development.


Implementation

Research and relationship development were the early steps in ensuring that offenders would receive access to widely recognized training and certification that would help them get job ready. The need for labourers in the construction industry had already been driving the community partners to work on developing strategic short-term training geared toward entry level job readiness so CORCAN Pacific was able to easily access a fortuitous match. Findings were presented at the Regional Offender Employment and Vocational Committee where institutional representatives are together monthly sharing information and developing best practices. Moving from decision to action in the launch of a pilot CORE Construction Training for women proved to be challenging. The women were somewhat reluctant to "sign on" even though they were actively involved in construction work at the site. Individuals' confidence turned out to be an underlying issue along with an underlying difficulty in visioning themselves working in the field of construction. It took some effort customizing the course to meet the institutional operational requirements but a group of 6 women completed the training successfully.
Outcomes

The six women who completed the pilot CORE Construction Training achieved third party certification in Forklift; Traffic Control; First Aid; Construction Safety (CSTS); Fall Protection; in addition to certified recognition from the Vancouver Regional Construction Association for their completion of the overall program. It is too soon to tell if they’ve used their skills for community work in the field of construction. That review will be conducted in June 2008. Anecdotal evidence from the graduates of the program suggests that their confidence regarding competency for this type of work and their overall confidence in pursuing employment upon release was greatly improved through the program.

The programs at Kent Institution (maximum security) and Mountain Institution (medium security) completed with six inmates succeeding in each program including the National Employability Skills (NESP). Previous feedback from inmate participants in NESP suggested that the program is lacking in practicality. The connection with CORE Construction Training proved to be an appropriate fit. Inmates only missed sessions for reasonable cause and demonstrated growth in both hard and soft skill competencies. The groups appeared more motivated and pleased with the outcome, while still expressing flexibility in relation to employment related release planning.

Conclusion

Given the success of the CORE Construction Training this year, research related to the longer term outcomes should be given a priority. The question remains: does the training provided have a positive impact on community-based employment outcomes and / or general reintegration results? It is possible that balancing hard skills training programs (including non-traditional skills development for women) and soft skills awareness will need to be a consideration as it appears to be a motivating factor especially for male offenders in higher security settings.

Where CORCAN has current operations representing community labour needs deemed to be in high demand, third party certification of the training should be offered whenever possible and the operational activity should be integrated into the training environment.
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