



MICROFICHE

RESEARCH BRANCH

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

410621-16901





A FIRST-YEAR EXAMINATION OF  
EDUCATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT  
TEMPORARY ABSENCE PROGRAMS

BY

JAMES J. HUG, Ph.D.  
Research Psychologist  
(Now Program Analysis Coordinator)

NCJRS

APR 20 1977

RESEARCH BRANCH

ACQUISITIONS

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES  
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

C. Thomas Surridge, Ph.D.  
Director of Research

Hon. C. J. S. Apps  
Minister

L. R. Hackl  
Deputy Minister

## PREFACE

This report is written in three broad sections. The text itself discusses all areas covered in the research: profile of accepted and rejected applicants, interviews with applicants, interviews with community sponsors, reactions of institutional staff and after-care officers. A series of tables provides additional statistical detail regarding profile of applicants, community interviews, and staff reactions. A brief summary is placed at the beginning of the report which selectively highlights material reported in the text and tables. The data contained in the summary is that considered most noteworthy by Research Branch personnel; these data are not necessarily the same as those facts which the reader might feel are most important.

Mrs. M. Currie, Mr. S. Loo, and Mrs. F. Smith, Research Branch, assisted in the collection and coding of data; Mrs. Smith's assistance was made possible by the interest in this project of Professor Richard G. Fox, Senior Research Associate, University of Toronto Centre of Criminology. Interviews of inmates and community participants were done by James D. Elliss and Associates, Ltd., Research Consultants, and were in many cases expedited by several after-care officers of this Department.

Mrs. V. Cole, Inmate Records, and Mrs. B. Lorion, Data Processing, were most generous in providing, respectively, inmate records and data processing facilities. Many senior officials of this Department gave most generously of their time in discussing and implementing various aspects of the research.

A final note of thanks is due the institutional and after-care personnel for completing questionnaires and forms, and to educators, employers, and inmates who so wholeheartedly cooperated with the interviewer.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
SUMMARY.....	2
PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS AND REJECTED APPLICANTS.....	4
Present Offence.....	6
Prior Offences.....	7
Institutional Factors.....	8
Differentiation between Accepted and Rejected Candidates.....	9
Performance in Program.....	11
SURVEY OF INMATE PARTICIPANTS AND REJECTED APPLICANTS.....	12
Reasons for Applying and Assistance Received.....	12
Acceptance by Schools, Employers, and Temporary Absence Committee.	14
Preparation and Counselling for Participation.....	15
Suitability of Course or Job.....	16
Relationships with Institutional Staff, Fellow Inmates, and Fellow Students/Employees.....	16
Jail Transfers.....	17
Problems Created.....	17
Travelling.....	17
Reasons Behind Continued Partici- pation or Removal From Program..	18
Benefits of Program.....	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

	<u>Page</u>
REACTIONS OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS AND EMPLOYERS.....	20
ATTITUDES AND EXPERIENCES OF INSTITUTIONAL STAFF AND AFTER-CARE OFFICERS.....	23
Attitudes of Institutional and After-Care Staff.....	24
Role of After-Care Officers....	25
Comments and Suggestions of Institutional Staff.....	26
TABLE 1 - Personal Background	
TABLE 2 - Relationship Between Previous Occupation and Temporary Absence Job/Course (Accepted Applicants)	
TABLE 3 - Present Offence	
TABLE 4 - Prior Offences	
TABLE 5 - Present and Prior Offences Combined	
TABLE 6 - Institutional History	
TABLE 7 - Performance Data	
TABLE 8 - Survey of Participating Schools/ Employers	
TABLE 9 - Institutional and After-Care Questionnaire	
TABLE 10 - Services Provided by After-Care Officers	

## INTRODUCTION

Revisions made to the Criminal Code of Canada during 1969 enabled the provinces to amend their regulations regarding correctional institutions so that inmates might begin their re-integration into society before being paroled or discharged. Beginning approximately September 1, 1969, inmates of Ontario correctional institutions were allowed "Temporary Absences" from their institutions for three broad purposes: (1) to seek paid employment in the community, (2) to pursue educational courses of an academic or vocational nature in community schools, and (3) to attend funerals, visit with seriously-ill members of their families, solve family problems, and for other rehabilitative purposes. Ultimately, applications are decided upon by a committee of senior Main Office staff, subject to the approval of the Deputy Minister.

The research was initiated shortly after the inception of the Temporary Absence Program, in accordance with the Department's Statement of Purpose which emphasizes the role of research in the evaluation of programs.

This report is concerned with describing applicants for education and employment leaves and with gaining some insight into the reactions of, and difficulties encountered by, accepted and rejected inmates, institutional and after-care staff, and participating community schools and employers to educational and employment aspects of the overall Temporary Absence Program.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Johnson (Crime and Delinquency, 1970, 16, 417-426) has surveyed work-release programs in the United States and reports that 28 States have instituted work-release programs, while only two jurisdictions report any provision for education leaves of absence.

## SUMMARY

The 175 inmates applying for education and employment leaves during the first seven months of operation of the Temporary Absence Program were fairly evenly divided between the two types of leave. Approximately half of the applicants for each program were accepted.

Although somewhat different criteria appear to be used in the selection of participants for education and employment leaves, there are also some common factors. Accepted applicants in either program tend to come from certain institutions (Table 6), have no institutional misconduct reports (Table 6), and have been given relatively less severe sentences, as gauged by the number of days assigned for each conviction (Table 3). Furthermore, they tend to be first incarcerates (Table 4), and their present or prior offences do not involve violation of liquor laws (Tables 4 and 5).

Accepted and rejected candidates for education leave can be further differentiated on the basis of the present offence being against the public order (Table 3). Specific categories of offences discriminate between accepted and rejected candidates for work release in the case of prior offences involving theft (Table 4), and sexual behaviour (Table 4).

The average length of participation to date (Table 7) has been approximately three months. Less than 10% of participants in either program have been withdrawn due to misconduct in the community or institution, or because they were fired or expelled (Table 7). Work releasees have earned roughly \$600 apiece, and the largest portion of these earnings went to the man's family, followed by the payment to the institution for meals and lodging, and the amount added to the participant's savings account (Table 7). Participants in work release were predominately employed in the same type of work that they had done previously (Table 2).

Summarizing the feedback from accepted and rejected inmates, approximately one-third returned to their previous course or job while on Temporary Absence. Only 18.5% were discouraged in applying, 74.1% were given some orientation to the program, and 85.1% felt that that amount of counselling or preparation was adequate. All participants interviewed felt that their job or course was at least partially suited to their needs and abilities. Improvement in their institutional life was



reported by 62.9% of participants and 81.4% reported no difficulty in their relationships with their fellow students or employees in the community. Specific problems were mentioned by 37.0%. Only 15.9% reported that the amount of travelling between the institution and the school or place of work was excessive. A desire to participate in Temporary Absence for as long as is possible was reported by 85.1% of participants, and 81.5% plan to continue with their Temporary Absence course or job after discharge. Finally, 94.5% of accepted and rejected applicants interviewed stated that the program is a good one for inmates and that it should be continued.

Participating schools and employers reported that their cooperation was primarily based on a desire to rehabilitate inmates in general, as opposed to helping a former student/employee or an acquaintance. Approximately 95% of employees and school officials understand the goals of the program, and the majority stated that inmates are as well motivated as non-inmates, that inmates have as much ability, and that their performance is equal to that of non-inmates (Table 8). Roughly half report that they have run into no difficulties of any kind (Table 8). Half would welcome more inmate students or employees in the future (Table 8).

Among institutional and after-care staff polled, there was a consensus that the objectives of the program were understood, that the program has rehabilitative value for at least some offenders, that it assists in the development of law-abiding behaviour, and that more inmates should be allowed to participate (Table 9). Roughly half of the institutional staff felt that the program has increased their work-load and has created difficulties in dealings with inmates. Some 80% of all after-care staff have been involved in the program to date and half of those reported no difficulties in coping with T.A.P. participants and procedures (Table 10).



PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS  
AND REJECTED APPLICANTS

Data from Main Office files were collected for the first 175 inmates to apply for education or employment leaves. This sample covered applications during the first seven months of the program's operation. (In compiling the sample, three female applicants were disregarded, as were six second applications from men whose first application was included in the study, six applicants for whom data was unavailable, and one inmate who withdrew his application.) Ninety-five of these first 175 applicants desired educational absences: 47 were accepted and 48 denied. Of the first 80 applications for work release, 43 were granted and 37 turned down.

Table 1 lists data for several personal-background variables, separately for accepted and rejected applicants for both education and work release. Only those data which appear consistently in Main Office files were included. The average applicant for education release is approximately 22 years old, while work-release applicants tend to be somewhat older, i.e. 30 years. On the average, applicants for both programs have completed Grade 10. Applicants for education release are typically single, while applicants for work release tend to be married. The typical applicant for either program resided in a large city prior to his incarceration. They tend to be moderate in their use of alcohol and report little usage of drugs. For the most part, they have not been wards of training schools.

The relationship between accepted applicants' last reported occupation and their Temporary Absence job or course is presented in Table 2. Manpower re-training courses tend to be used more frequently than any other educational program. It is interesting to note, however, that those whose last reported occupation was "student" invariably chose a course other than manpower re-training. All work release participants had worked prior to the present incarceration. A sizeable majority of those on work release (32, or 74.4%) were doing the same general type of work as they had previously.

Additional background data were obtained during interviews (these inmate interviews are described more fully in the next section), with some of the accepted and rejected applicants. During the three years immediately preceding the present offence, 19 of the 54 men interviewed (35.2%) lived at one address, 13 (24.1%) lived in only one city or town during this period, 10 (18.6%) moved to Ontario

from another province or country, nine (16.7%) moved from one city or town to another city or town within Ontario, and three (5.6%) reported no fixed address. Thus 32, or more than half of this group, resided in the same city or town for the three years immediately preceding the present offence.

A slight majority of this group (29, or 53.7%) were last residing in a single family house. Eighteen (33.3%) were living in apartment, flats, duplexes, etc., while the remainder were living in rooms, boarding houses, etc.

Seventeen (31.4%) were last residing with their parents, and another 17 were living with their spouses or common-law wives. Ten (18.6%) were living with relatives, five (9.3%) were living with friends, and finally five (9.3%) were living alone.

Along with the five (9.3%) who were living alone, eight (14.8%) were living with only one other person immediately before the present offence, 12 (22.2%) lived with two other people, while the remaining 29 (53.7%) lived with three or more other people.

Approximately half (26, or 48.1%) plan on living with the same person(s) after parole or discharge. Of the twenty (37.0%) who definitely plan against living with the same person or persons, only six gave as the reason their wanting to stay away from bad associates.

Twenty-five (46.3%) of those interviewed felt that all of their previous school courses in the community had been worthwhile. An additional 17 (31.5%) reported that some courses had been worthwhile while others had not been, and only two men (3.7%) stated that all of their school courses had been irrelevant.<sup>1</sup> The majority of those interviewed (31, or 57.4%) reported that they had enjoyed some or all of their school courses.

Approximately one-third (19, or 35.2%) stated that their last job will be open for them after discharge or parole, while 18 (33.3%) stated that they would not be able to return to their last job. The remaining 17 (31.5%) either did not know whether they could return to their last job,

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this paper, the reader might notice sets of percentages which total less than 100%. These apparent discrepancies resulted from non-responses, miscellaneous categories having small frequencies, etc.

or did not have a job waiting because they were students prior to their present conviction. A sizable majority of those who can return to their last job (14, or 73.7%) report that they will do so. Of the three (15.8%) who plan against returning to their last job but could in fact do so, two hope to take up other employment, while one plans on returning to school.

Forty-one (75.9%) reported having had work experience other than the job they held immediately before the present offence. Twenty-three (56.1%) reported working exclusively at unskilled or semi-skilled occupations. Four (9.8%) worked only in skilled trades or in a technical capacity, an additional four worked only in clerical or sales jobs, and two (4.9%) worked exclusively in a managerial capacity.

Of the eight men who were students immediately before the present offence, all eight stated that they would return to school after discharge or parole.

#### Present Offence

Detailed data regarding the nature and frequencies of convictions related to the present incarceration appear in Table 3, in a format similar to that of the Annual Report of the Minister of Correctional Services. These data are presented in two ways: first, in terms of the average number of counts on which the inmate was convicted in each category, and second, in terms of the percentage of inmates having any conviction in that category. For both sets of data, there is no separation into reformatory sentence, suspended sentence, probation, etc., all convictions are combined together.

It can be seen in Table 3 that both education and work applicants have relatively many convictions for (1) property offences other than theft or break and enter, Item 4, and (2) theft and attempted theft, Item 3. Candidates for educational programs also have frequent break and enter convictions, Item 2, while potential work release participants have frequent convictions for public-order offences not involving drugs, Item 8.

Applicants for education release have minimum definite sentences averaging 12-15 months (Item 12), but the length of sentence for work release applicants is somewhat shorter, i.e., approximately 9 months. The percentage of men having an indeterminate sentence (Item 13) is roughly twice as large for education applicants as for employment candidates. It is further interesting to note that a rather complicated derived score, Item 14, can discriminate between accepted and rejected applicants in either program. This item was constructed by adding together days-sentenced-to for all convictions, regardless of the type of sentence (probation, suspended sentence, etc.) and

regardless of whether the time is to be served concurrently or consecutively. It was included in order to differentiate between men having, for example, (1) one count of break and enter, 90 days, as opposed to (2) those having 3 counts break and enter, 90 days on each charge concurrent. Although both will probably spend the same number of days in custody, the latter man has perhaps been judged guilty of a more "serious" crime.

### Prior Offences

A categorization of prior offences is given in Table 4. Each category is further divided by type of sentence: no institutional time served (e.g., fines, probations, suspended sentences, etc.) versus reformatory or penitentiary sentences. Approximately 25% of all applicants had no prior conviction whatsoever, and roughly 40% were first incarcerates. Commonly-occurring prior convictions include those for (1) break and enter, Item 2, (2) theft, Item 3, (3) property offences other than theft or break and enter, Item 4, and finally, (4) offences against the public order excepting those involving drugs, Item 8.

Comparing the number of items which discriminate between accepted and rejected candidates, it would appear that institutional and Main Office selection boards place more emphasis on specific types of prior offences than on the present offence. In Table 4, prior offences, four of the 11 specific offence categories are "discriminative" (as indicated by rectangles around the data for that item in the table), while only one category of present offence, Table 3, differentiates between accepted and rejected candidates. Furthermore, prior offences resulting in time served in penitentiary or reformatory seem to be weighted more heavily in deciding the suitability of an applicant than are prior convictions not resulting in time served. Thus in Table 4, accepted and rejected candidates could not be differentiated on the basis of fines, probations, etc., in any of the 11 offence categories, but this discrimination could be made in five of the categories using penitentiary or reformatory terms.



Convictions relating to the present and all prior offences have been combined in Table 5 for three classes of offences specifically asked about on the application form for Temporary Absence. It can be noted that approximately 20% of rejected applicants for work release have been convicted of at least one sexual offence, but less than 5% in each of the other three categories have been convicted for this type of offence. Drug offences are present in approximately 20% of all education applicants, but in less than 5% of employment applicants. The difference in the relative frequency of drug and sexual offences between education and employment applicants might result from the older age of employment applicants, who have had a longer period of time in which to engage in illicit sexual activity, and the younger age of education applicants, who might be more affected by the current tendency for young people to use drugs. Convictions for liquor offences discriminate between accepted and rejected candidates for either program; on an overall basis, an average of approximately 20% of all applicants having been convicted on liquor offences.

The final item of Table 5 lists the number of applicants who fall into any of these special categories. Perhaps surprisingly, roughly one-third of all applicants for education leave are sexual, drug, and/or liquor offenders; furthermore, accepted and rejected applicants for this program cannot be differentiated on the basis of being convicted for at least one of these three offences. In the case of work release, a rather small percentage (i.e., 9.3%) of accepted applicants have been convicted of at least one of the three offences, while this is the case for almost half (40.5%) of rejected work-program applicants.

#### Institutional Factors

At this point, it might be noted that approximately two weeks intervened, on the average, between the date on which the application was submitted by the inmate until the final decision had been made by the Deputy Minister or his designate. While this might appear to be a rather lengthy delay, it should be borne in mind

that each application was considered by at least two committees, sitting in often quite widely-separated locations, after the suitability of the course or job had been evaluated. In addition, the writer is aware of no instance in which the job or course was given to someone else because of the time required to reach a decision. Furthermore, provisions existed for expediting the application process in cases of urgency.

Data relating to institutional adjustment are presented in Table 6. Institutions having an especially high rate of accepted candidates for educational leaves are Brampton O.T.C. and the jails. Similarly, the Guelph and Mimico reformatories, along with jails, have relatively many accepted applicants for work release.

#### Differentiation Between Accepted and Rejected Candidates

A total of 13 items from personal background, present offence, prior offences, and institutional history variables, can be used to differentiate between accepted and rejected education-release applicants, as can 16 such items in the case of work release.

Items which discriminate between accepted and rejected candidates for education release are:

1. Age at leaving school (Table 1, Item 1)
2. Highest grade completed (Table 1, Item 2)
3. Type of education applied for (Table 1, Item 10)
4. Institution admitted to (Table 6, Item 1)

5. Number of misconduct reports during present incarceration (Table 6, Item 4)
6. Present offence - number of days "assigned" on all convictions (Table 3, Item 14)
7. Present offence - public order excluding drug offences (Table 3, Item 8)
8. Prior offence, time served - public order excluding drug offences (Table 4, Item 8)
9. Prior offence, any convictions - public order excluding drug offences (Table 4, Item 8)
10. Any conviction for liquor offences (Table 5, Item 3)
11. Prior offence, time served - liquor offence (Table 4, Item 9)
12. Prior offence, any convictions - liquor offence (Table 4, Item 9)
13. Any prior convictions resulting in time served (Table 4, Item 12)

Corresponding items for work release are:

1. History of training school (Table 1, Item 3)
2. Use of alcohol (Table 1, Item 4)
3. Type of work applied for (Table 1, Item 11)
4. Institution admitted to (Table 6, Item 1)
5. Number of misconduct reports during present incarceration (Table 6, Item 4)
6. Number of misconduct reports during present and prior incarcerations (Table 6, Item 7)
7. Number of months served in D.C.S. institutions, present and all prior incarcerations (Table 6, Item 9)
8. Present offence - number of days "assigned" on all convictions (Table 3, Item 14)

9. Any conviction for liquor offence (Table 5, Item 3)
10. Prior offence, any convictions - liquor offences (Table 4, Item 9)
11. Any conviction for sexual offence (Table 5, Item 1)
12. Prior offence, time served - sexual offence (Table 4, Item 5)
13. Prior offence, any conviction - sexual offence (Table 4, Item 5)
14. Prior offence, time served - theft and attempted theft (Table 4, Item 3)
15. Prior offence, any convictions - theft and attempted theft (Table 4, Item 3)
16. Any prior convictions resulting in time served (Table 4, Item 12)

These predictive variables have been combined so that the accept versus reject decision for the first 175 applicants can be statistically predicted with approximately 70% accuracy, instead of the 50% achievable by the use of the base rate of 50% accepted - 50% rejected. The details of this procedure will shortly be available in a separate report.

#### Performance in Program

Data concerning the performance of inmates while actually participating in education or employment leave are listed in Table 7. The totals in Table 7, as well as other figures presented in this section, do not include three inmate-students (6.4%) and six inmate-employees (13.9%) who declined to participate after being accepted, who were paroled before they could participate, whose job failed, etc.

Most education releases (36, or 81.8%) were not transferred to another jail or adult institution in order to facilitate their participation. However, in the case of inmate-employees, approximately half (18, or 48.6%) were transferred to bring them closer to their place of work. In all but one case, the job or course was full-time.

It can be seen in Table 7 that only five of these 81 participants (6.2%) misconducted themselves or were fired or expelled. It is also interesting to note that by participating for approximately 2 months, the average inmate-employee adds over \$100 to his savings and provides approximately \$200 for the use of his family from his net (after statutory deductions) earnings of roughly \$600.



## SURVEY OF INMATE PARTICIPANTS AND REJECTED APPLICANTS

Interviews with 54 of the first 124 applicants for education and work release took place during the fifth through seventh months of operation of the Temporary Absence program. These interviews were conducted by a member of a private research firm, who was working under contract to the Research Branch of this Department.

The highly-structured interview lasted for approximately one hour and emphasized inmates' feelings and attitudes about the Temporary Absence program. Some background information, unavailable in Main Office files, was also gathered. All inmates interviewed were promised strict confidentiality.

Interviews with men who were still incarcerated were conducted at the institution, while interviews with participants and rejected applicants who had already been paroled were conducted at a place suggested by the parolee, as arranged through his after-care officer. No attempt was made to interview men who had already been discharged on completion of sentence.

The sample of 54 men (43.5%) from the pool of 124 cannot be considered random, for in addition to not interviewing those who had been discharged outright, it was decided to exclude the few (less than 5%) applicants from the Vanier Centre, and to exclude the few (less than 5%) applicants located in institutions north of Sudbury. Furthermore, not all men who met the necessary specifications could be interviewed before all funds allocated for this project had been utilized. While, strictly speaking, the sample of applicants interviewed cannot in any way be considered random, it is, hopefully, at least somewhat representative of the first 124 applicants for education and work release.

### Reasons for Applying and Assistance Received

When asked why they had applied for Temporary Absence, 15 of the 54 men interviewed stated that they wished to improve their financial situation or that of their family. Twelve (22.2%) applied in order to learn a trade, 10 (18.5%) wished to attend school or finish high school, 10 reported a desire to rehabilitate themselves or to "make good use of their time in the institution", four (7.4%) applied in order to increase their chances of receiving parole or to make their life in the institution more pleasant, while one person wanted merely to find out "what the program was all about".

Forty-three (79.7%) claimed that applying for Temporary Absence was entirely their own idea and that it had not been suggested by someone else.

When asked whether anyone had encouraged them in their application, slightly less than half of all applicants (23, or 42.8%) reported that they were encouraged by institutional staff. Eleven applicants (20.4%) were specifically encouraged by institutional teachers.

Of those receiving encouragement from outside of the institution, 11 (20.4%) were encouraged by non-family members, eight (14.8%) by family or relatives, while in six cases (11.1%) encouragement was received from both family members and some third party. Approximately half (28, or 51.9%) were not encouraged by family, relatives, friends, previous employees, or community-school teachers, etc. Twelve men (48.0%) reported receiving the most external encouragement from non-family members other than personal friends, while 11 (44.0%) were most encouraged by their family.

The vast majority (44 or 81.5%) reported receiving no explicit discouragement from institutional staff or inmates in their application. Five (9.3%) stated that they were discouraged by other inmates, while three (5.6%) were discouraged by administrative staff or correctional officers. The 10 (18.5%) men who were discouraged, but who applied nonetheless, reported being discouraged in a variety of ways, which included other inmates telling them that they would not be allowed to participate, disparaging remarks by correctional officers, other inmates reporting that they would be subject to many temptations, reports from fellow inmates that "the Temporary Absence program is a farce and would not work out", and directions from the institutional administration asking "trouble makers" and "bad students" not to apply.

Only two men (3.7%) reported receiving any discouragement from someone not connected with the institution. The number of potential applicants who were discouraged and who therefore did not apply can, of course, only be speculated about. It is also interesting to note that of the 12 men who reported being discouraged from within or without the institution, five (41.7%) were ultimately granted Temporary Absence.

In 18 cases (33.3%), the Temporary Absence course or job applied for was one that the inmate had held, or participated in, previously. Fourteen men (25.9%) heard about their specific course or job opportunity (as opposed to the general availability of Temporary Absence to all inmates) from institutional personnel, nine (16.7%) received this information from fellow inmates, five (9.3%) found out from others already participating in that course or job, while four (7.4%) received this information from newspapers or relatives.

Twenty-six (48.1%) received assistance from professional or educational institutional staff in finding a specific course or job, five (9.3%) received this type of assistance from correctional officers, four (7.4%) received this from administrative staff, and one man reported being assisted by a fellow inmate. Eighteen (33.3%) reported receiving no assistance in locating a specific course or job from institutional staff.

Thirty-two men (59.3%) reported receiving no help in finding a course or job from people not connected with the institution. Eleven (25.4%) received this type of assistance from someone other than a family member or employer, six (11.1%) were helped by the employer himself, and three (5.6%) by their own family.

Acceptance by Schools, Employers and Temporary Absence Committee

Nine (33.3%) of 27 men accepted for Temporary Absence were working for, or studying with, their Temporary Absence employer or school prior to the commission of the present offence, while sixteen (59.2%) were not.

Eight (29.6%) claimed that their acceptance by the school or employer was based on their previous work or educational record, six (22.2%) felt that people "were kind" or that "people wanted to help", four (14.8%) stated that they had no idea as to why they were accepted by the school or employer, three (11.1%) stated that their acceptance was based on personal friendship, and three felt that they were accepted because of recommendations by institutional personnel.

Nine (33.3%) stated that the job or educational opportunity was afforded to themselves only and was not advertised to others.

Fifteen (55.5%) of those accepted for the program felt that the participation of schools and employers was based on a desire to help inmates in general, while eight (29.6%) stated that this participation was based on community people wishing to assist them personally.

Sixteen (59.2%) were first informed that they had been accepted for Temporary Absence by educational staff, four (14.8%) by correctional officers, and three (11.1%) by administrative staff.

Of the rejected applicants, seven (25.9%) were informed of their rejection by administrative staff, seven by educational staff, and one (3.7%) by a correctional officer. Ten (37.0%) claimed that they had not yet been told officially (almost invariably, the interviews took place at least one month after the application had been received at Main Office). It is quite possible for an applicant to "know" that he had been rejected, or to assume this, without any explicit statement from institutional staff. For example, some educational programs, scheduled to start on a certain date, are applied for by several inmates at the same institution. If "X" and "Y" applied and "X" begins the course on the appointed date, it should be fairly obvious to "Y" that his application for that particular course had been rejected.

When asked what reason had been given for their being rejected, eight (29.6%) stated that it was on account of their records, and especially for offences involving alcoholic beverages, drugs, and assault. Four (14.8%) stated that they were told that the job was not "good enough for him".

When asked for the "real reason" behind their rejection, ten (37.0%) stated that it was a result of their prior records, and especially for escapes and offences involving alcoholic beverages, drugs, and assault. Five (18.5%) stated that it was due to factors such as irresponsible behaviour, not having enough education, having been refused parole previously, not having spent a long enough time in the institution, etc. An additional five claimed it was due to some external reason, such as the job no longer being available, because the specific course applied for was not appropriate, etc. Four (14.8%) did not care to speculate as to the "real reason" behind their rejection.

Twenty of those rejected (74.0%) claimed that they got along "very well" or "good" with institutional staff, and seventeen (62.9%) stated that their relationships with other inmates were "very good" or "good".

#### Preparation and Counselling for Participation

Seven of the 27 participants interviewed (25.9%) reported receiving no instructions or counselling from institutional staff as to what problems they might encounter while participating in the program. Eleven (40.7%) were simply told that they should value the Temporary Absence opportunity and not break any regulations, while four (14.8%) reported being told to expect different types of problems on the outside, such as fellow students and workers realizing that they were inmates, people reacting in a hostile manner toward them, and that they would have difficulty in adjusting to community life since they were out for only a part of the day, etc.

The 11 participants (40.8%) who were counselled by someone not connected with the institution (family, employer, community-school teacher, etc.) were told such things as not to let too many people know that they were inmates, to be patient with the course or job, to be confident in what they were doing and that they would then be treated in the same manner as anybody else, that they should not be tempted to skip school or work, that they should take it easy with fellow students and workers, etc.

Twenty of the participants (74.1%) were told specifically by institutional staff that they were expected to succeed and that they should take advantage of this opportunity. A large majority (23, or 85.1%) were told that their performance in the Temporary Absence program could affect the chances of other inmates being allowed to participate in Temporary Absence.

Twenty-three (85.1%) felt that the amount of counselling and preparation that they had, or had not, been given before starting on Temporary Absence was adequate from their standpoint. A smaller number (15, or 55.6%) felt that the institutional staff did enough to prepare other inmates at their institutions who were not participating in Temporary Absence; for example, this could be a request of non-participating inmates to avoid asking participants to smuggle in contraband, etc.



### Suitability of Course or Job

All 27 participants felt that their Temporary Absence courses or jobs were suited to their needs. Twelve (44.4%) felt that the Temporary Absence course or job fully utilized their skills and abilities, while an additional nine (33.3%) felt that their skills and abilities were partially utilized. No participant stated that his Temporary Absence course or job in no way utilized his talents.

Nineteen (70.3%) felt that the course or job gave them enough responsibility. No participant stated that his teacher or supervisor expected too much of him.

Of the 10 participants engaged in work release, five (50%) felt that the pay was adequate. An additional three (30%) stated that it was not as much as it had been previously, or that it could be better.

### Relationships with Institutional Staff, Fellow Inmates, and Fellow Students/Employees

When asked if participation in Temporary Absence had made their lives in the institution more pleasant, 17 (62.9%) felt that it had, while only one (3.7%) stated outright that participation in Temporary Absence had made his life in the institution more difficult.

Only one person (3.7%) believed that his relationships with fellow inmates had improved since he began to participate in Temporary Absence. Five (18.5%) reported that relationships with fellow inmates had deteriorated. The remainder were unable to answer or were no longer in the same institution as they had been prior to applying for Temporary Absence.

Six (22.2%) reported that they were getting along better with institutional staff since participating. The majority of participants (15, or 55.5%) reported no change, while the remainder were unable to answer. The reasons given for the improvement in relationships with institutional staff included that they were treated better by institutional staff since starting on Temporary Absence, that staff realized that they are not the type of inmate who acts up and as a consequence treat participants as "one of themselves", that more respect now exists between themselves and correctional officers because participants are working, etc.

Twenty-two men (81.4%) reported having no difficulty in getting along with fellow students or employees. Nine (33.3%) reported that all of their fellow students or employees were aware of their being an inmate of a correctional institution, while an additional five (18.5%) stated that most of their fellow students or employees were aware of this. Twenty-two of the twenty-seven (81.4%) did not think it wise to make their fellow students or employees more aware of their inmate status.

Sixteen (59.2%) reported that all of their teachers or supervisors were aware of their being inmates. Six (22.2%) reported that some teachers or supervisors were aware of this. Twelve (44.4%) stated that teachers or supervisors should not be made more aware of their status as inmates, while an additional seven (25.9%) had no opinion.

### Jail Transfers

Six men were transferred to a jail while participating in Temporary Absence. Five (83.3%) felt that life in a jail was not as "comfortable" as in the previous industrial farm, reformatory, or training center, because the jail had "less facilities". Four of the six (66.7%) reported that they got along better with staff at their previous institution than with jail staff. When asked whether they felt all Temporary Absence participants should be transferred to the nearest jail, somewhat surprisingly in light of their comments noted above, five of the six men transferred (83.3%) stated that participants should be transferred to jails, as long as this meant that they would be nearer to the school or place of work.

### Problems Created

Sixteen participants (59.2%) felt that they received enough attention at the institution after their return from school or work each day. Ten (37.0%) stated that special problems had resulted from their returning daily to a correctional institution after school or work. The type of problem mentioned here included not being able to participate in extra-curricular activities in the community school, being unable to work longer hours in the case of self-employed participants and those employed as salesmen, not enough time to study, difficulty in getting the necessary food and clothing upon return to the institution, too much time spent in travelling, etc. Fifty percent of the ten men reporting problems stated that their teachers or supervisors were aware of these. Five of these 10 participants reported that their teachers or supervisors were aware of the participant's difficulties.

### Travelling

Seven men attended school in Sudbury, four in Brampton, two each in Toronto and Smiths Falls, and one in Guelph. Four men interviewed were working in Toronto, three in Hamilton, and one each in Guelph, Kingston and Orangeville. Twenty-four of the twenty-seven participants (88.9%) considered transportation arrangements to be adequate.

Thirteen (48.1%) spent less than one-half hour travelling each way, ten (37.0%) spent 30-60 minutes, while two men (7.4%) spent in excess of one hour travelling each way. Twenty-three, or 85.1%, did not think that the amount of travelling was excessive.

#### Reasons Behind Continued Participation or Removal from Program

Seven men (25.9%) felt that the reason for their being allowed to continue in the Temporary Absence Program was because they were setting a good example for other inmates. Five (18.5%) felt that they were allowed to continue because they had been making satisfactory progress in school or on the job, and two (7.4%) felt that the reason was "to test the Temporary Absence program".

Seven (27.9%) stated that they were withdrawn after participating for awhile. When asked why they had been withdrawn from the program, four of the seven (57.1%) stated that they had been given no explanation, while two (28.6%) stated that they had violated certain regulations.

#### Benefits of Program

Fifteen (55.6%) reported that they would like to participate in Temporary Absence until they are paroled or discharged. An additional eight (29.6%) stated that they wished to continue as long as possible, or until the course was finished.

Twenty-two (81.5%) stated that they intended to continue the Temporary Absence job or course after discharge. Among the reasons given were a desire to learn a trade, because the job was a good one and the employer had helped inmates, to finish high school, etc.

When asked how their participation would help them in a year from now, twelve (44.4%) replied that the program would assist them in a vocational or academic course, five (18.5%) felt that they would be helped in refraining from further criminal activity, in changing their attitudes in a positive direction, or by making them more responsible, and four (14.8%) stated that it would assist them in getting a better job.

Of all inmates interviewed, both accepted and rejected, 51 (94.5%) felt that the Temporary Absence program was a good one from the inmate's standpoint. Among the reasons cited were that it helps give the inmate a sense of responsibility, helps him get parole more easily, assists in his rehabilitation, gives him a sense of self-respect, etc. Fifty-one (94.5%) also stated that the program should be continued.

When asked how they would like to see the program changed, 12 (22.2%) stated that no change was necessary, an additional 12 stated that more trust should be given the inmate and that he should be treated more like a civilian, ten (18.5%) stated that there should be more participants, and five (9.3%) stated that participants should be treated differently in the institution with regard to meals, lodging, etc.



## REACTIONS OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS AND EMPLOYERS

Nineteen interviews were conducted with school officials and 11 with employers. The 30 community participants interviewed were involved with one or more of the first 124 applicants for education and work release. Similarly to inmate interviews, discussions with community participants occurred during the fifth through seventh months of operation of the Temporary Absence program and almost invariably at least one month after the application had been received at Main Office. These interviews were conducted by the same outside interviewer.

School officials interviewed were those whom the inmate had indicated (on the Temporary Absence application form) as the person in charge of the course. Employer interviews were held with the inmate's immediate supervisor, as indicated on the application form. These interviews took place only after the inmate had been interviewed and only with the inmate's consent. All inmates consented to having their employer or school official contacted.

All community participants interviewed were promised complete confidentiality. No employer or school official refused to be interviewed, and quite to the contrary, most officials interviewed displayed a genuine desire to cooperate.

As was the case with inmate interviews, it cannot be claimed that the 30 community participants contacted (46.0%) are a random sample from the pool of 124. Once again, no attempt was made to contact employers or school officials involved with participants from the Vanier Centre, nor was any attempt made to contact officials supervising applicants from north of Sudbury. The total number of interviews completed, i.e. 30, was determined only by the funds available for this project, and it is again hoped that they are at least somewhat representative of all employers and school officials involved with the first 124 applicants. This claim, of course, cannot be substantiated, since the interviews had to be arranged with the total funds available in mind, and consequently, to conform to the most convenient travel schedule for the interviewer.

The first portion of the interview consisted of a highly-structured questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of the statements listed in Table 8 to which the respondent indicated strong agreement, slight agreement, no opinion/ neutrality, slight disagreement, and finally strong disagreement. For analysis, it was decided to separate employers and school officials, since their reactions and problems might be quite different, and to collapse the two agreement categories along with the two categories of disagreement.

Two-dimensional  $\chi^2$  tests were conducted on each item; the first factor was school official vs. employer and the second was the response categories of agreement, neutrality, or disagreement. These  $\chi^2$  tests were performed in order to determine whether the pattern of agreement-neutrality-disagreement differed between school officials and employers. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 8, along with the percentage of respondents in either category who agreed or disagreed with the statement.

Examination of Table 8 will indicate that both employers and school officials are rather unanimous in their belief that inmates are as well motivated as non-inmate students or employees, that they perform as well, and that they possess as much ability. Their opinions regarding the idea of Temporary Absence tend also to be unambiguous. For example, they see Temporary Absence as being a more humane and dignified form of treatment, as being fair to society, and as having rehabilitative value. Almost without exception, they understand what the program is set out to accomplish. Differences of opinion between schools and employers centered around a much stronger conviction on the part of school officials that inmate students create fewer problems for teachers, than do non-inmates, and the unanimous desire of school personnel to have more inmate-students if possible. School officials were also less suspicious about the sincerity of inmates' desires to participate in Temporary Absence.

Nine inmates (42.9%) attended schools having less than 40 students total, while the remaining 12 (57.1%) were in schools having between 1200 and 1500 students. Seven of the 12 employers contacted (58.3%) reported having 25 or fewer employees and the other five (41.7%) employers contacted had between 50 - 140 employees.

Sixteen of 28 (57.1%) school officials and employers mentioned that the Temporary Absence program has created no difficulties for them.

Five (17.9%) stated that the inmates considered themselves as being treated differently by not being allowed the same privileges as their fellow students and by suffering rejection on the part of their fellow students. Four (14.3%) stated that the regulations imposed by the institution concerning hours of work, how the cheque is to be sent, etc., are proving difficult. Two (7.1%) reported that the inmate participants were having a bad influence on the student body, and one (3.6%) stated that the inmate was unable to get along with others.

When asked how these difficulties might be solved, seven of the 12 community participants (58.3%) mentioning specific problems did not offer an opinion. Three (25.1%) said that the regulations should be modified in terms of hours of work, amount of travel, the inmate being able to drive his own car, etc. One person (8.3%) stated that inmates should be taught

to trust and not to fear, and one person stated that people in the community who are involved in the Temporary Absence program should be made more understanding and cooperative.

The vast majority of community participants (21, or 75.0%) stated that their participation was based on a desire to help inmates in general, to see them succeed, and to see them use their potential to its fullest. Three (10.7%) expressed a desire to help an acquaintance or a member of their own family, two (7.1%) stated that the reason for their participating was that the inmate had worked or studied with them previously, and two (7.1%) stated that "everybody has the right to an education".

Thirteen of the employers and school officials contacted (46.4%) could not suggest any ways in which the program might be improved. Three (10.7%) stated that better arrangements should be made at the institution with regard to meals, clothing, and sleeping facilities, two (7.1%) stated that no changes were necessary, and an additional two stated that more inmates should be allowed to participate in Temporary Absence.

ATTITUDES AND EXPERIENCES  
OF INSTITUTIONAL STAFF  
AND  
AFTER-CARE OFFICERS

Questionnaires were sent to 374 staff in all 10 adult male institutions during the sixth month of operation of the Temporary Absence Program. These were sent to all administrative staff (superintendents, deputy superintendents, and assistant superintendents), all professional staff (psychologists, psychometrists, chaplains, social workers, psychiatrists, medical officers, nurses), all educational personnel (teachers, trade instructors, recreational officers), and a sampling from the ranks of correctional officers: questionnaires were sent to all men in the upper ranks of the correctional officer series (levels 5, 6, and 7), to a random 50% of Correctional Officer 4's, and to a random 12.5% of Correctional Officer 3's. Questionnaires were returned by 322 staff (86.1%); the percentage of not-returned questionnaires includes those sent to personnel who, at the time of mailing, were no longer with this Department.

Staff were given the following instructions:

"We are interested in your general feelings about the new Temporary Absence Program, which allows inmates to leave the institution for the purposes of education, employment, on the job training, or for humanitarian reasons. We would like your general reactions to this program instead of any specific feelings you might have about certain inmates from your institution who have participated in this program. Thank you for your cooperation.

Please place one check mark in the appropriate category for each question. Use NO OPINION only if you have no feelings about the statement, or if you agree and disagree equally."

Questionnaires were also sent to all 109 after-care officers and supervisors attached to institutional and field offices throughout the Department, regardless of their having participated in the Temporary Absence Program; replies were received from 91 (83.4%) after-care staff. Instructions were similar to those given institutional staff. In addition, after-care officers and supervisors were requested to indicate their specific experiences and difficulties with the Program.



### Attitudes of Institutional and After-Care Staff

The first portion of both questionnaires consisted of a series of statements, listed in Table 9, to which the respondent indicated strong agreement, slight agreement, no opinion/ neutrality, slight disagreement, or strong disagreement.

Examining Table 9, there is apparently a consensus among staff (as indicated by at least 75% agreement or by at least 75% disagreement) that the purpose of the program is understood, that it is consistent with the Department's Statement of Purpose, that it is humanitarian and increases the dignity of the participating inmate, that it is not unfair to society, that it provides models for other inmates to emulate, and that it has rehabilitative value for at least some offenders. On the other hand, staff opinion is rather equally divided concerning the sincerity of applicants' motivation, the adequacy of preparation and counselling, jealousy or hostility on the part of non-participating inmates, improvement of staff attitudes, and institutional problems created by this program.

In the first analysis, questionnaires were separated according to institution. For each item, responses were classified as (a) pro-T.A.P., regardless of "strong" or "slight" feelings, (b) neutral attitudes, the "no opinion" category, and (c) anti-T.A.P. attitudes, regardless of "strong" or "slight" responses. For each of the ten institutions, the percentage of responses falling into each of the three categories was averaged across items in order to obtain an overall measure of positive versus negative attitudes toward the Temporary Absence Program. Staff at Rideau expressed the highest proportion of pro-T.A.P. attitudes (69.5% pro-T.A.P. attitudes, 20.3% anti-T.A.P. attitudes) and were followed in order by Thunder Bay (68.6% pro, 15.9% anti), Mimico (67.2% pro, 21.1% anti), Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic (66.4% pro, 20.8% anti), Brampton (65.7% pro, 26.6% anti), Burtch (65.4% pro, 18.6% anti), Burwash (64.3% pro, 21.5% anti), Guelph (61.9% pro, 20.2% anti), Monteith (61.6% pro, 18.9% anti), and Millbrook (60.3% pro, 22.6% anti). There were no differences among the 10 institutions in the percentage of pro-T.A.P. attitudes ( $p < .05$ , as determined by  $\chi^2$  test).

A second analysis of these data used the same three response classes and averaging-across-items, but sorted responses according to five categories of staff. The percentage of pro-T.A.P. attitudes was highest among administrative staff (73.6% pro, 17.3% anti) and was followed in order by professional staff, (67.9% pro, 11.5% anti), after-care officers (66.4% pro, 16.9% anti), correctional officers (65.4% pro, 21.6% anti), and education staff (63.5% pro, 20.1% anti). The relative number of pro-T.A.P. attitudes did not differ significantly ( $\chi^2, p > .05$ ) among the five staff categories.

A final analysis of these data determined the extent to which pro-T.A.P. attitudes were related to the number of applicants from each institution, taking into account the "size" of each institution. The percentages of pro-T.A.P. attitudes, listed previously for the 10 institutions, were compared to the ratio of the number of applicants for Temporary Absence to the number of 1968-69 yearly admissions for that institution. These data indicated

a tendency for the relative number of applicants to be high when attitudes were especially pro-T.A.P., however this trend did not exceed that attributable to chance factors ( $\rho > .05$ ).

### Role of After-Care Officers

After-care officers were requested to indicate all services that they had provided for Temporary Absence applicants or participants to date. These services are summarized in Table 10. Approximately 80% of all after-care officers throughout the Department have had some role in the Temporary Absence Program.

Table 10 indicates that the most frequently provided services are the preliminary community investigations, arranging interviews between inmates and community participants and getting the necessary agreements signed, participating in institutional selection committees, and supervising or counselling participants both prior to and after their parole/discharge.

When asked to comment on any difficulties they have encountered in their involvement with the Temporary Absence Program, 36 of the 72 officers having some involvement (50.0%) did not indicate any difficulties.

Eight of the officers having some direct role in the program (11.2%) commented about the over-all Temporary Absence regulations. Three (4.2%) stated that the "cumbersome Temporary Absence Program policy" could limit job opportunities for inmates, two (2.8%) stated that after-care officers should be relieved of Temporary Absence cases, on account of their already heavy case loads, and that institutions should supervise their own participants, two (2.8%) stated that participants should be given special privileges inside of the institution with regard to meal hours, laundry facilities, maintenance of their cars, etc., and one (1.4%) stated that the Temporary Absence Program should be a part of the overall release plan for each inmate.

Seven officers (9.8%) commented about the preparation of participants. Three (4.2%) stated that staff, the public, and inmates should be better educated about the Temporary Absence Program, two (2.8%) stated that skilled, full-time personnel should handle the Temporary Absence Program and that more counselling was needed, and two (2.8%) stated that only those jobs which have a high degree of rehabilitative value should be used for Temporary Absence participants.

A total of 20 after-care officers (27.8%) commented on the application process. Ten (13.9%) stated that better liaison and coordination between the institution and after-care office was necessary, so that the after-care officer would have more correct information about the prospective participant, eight (11.1%) stated that there should be fewer participants resulting from more proper screening criteria, and two (2.8%) stated there should be more participants and that better planning was required for those who do not qualify for Temporary Absence under the current regulations.

Finally, one officer stated that the Temporary Absence Program increases an inmate's chance of being rehabilitated and that it is a good program.

### Comments and Suggestions of Institutional Staff

Of the 322 institutional staff who returned the questionnaire, 133 (41.3%) made additional comments and suggestions, as had been requested.

Among those commenting on the number of participants, 21 (15.8%) stated that there should be fewer participants, because the screening should be stricter, or because Temporary Absence "takes work away from the unemployed", etc. On the other hand, 17 (12.8%) stated that there should be more participants.

Fifteen (11.3%) commented on the selection of specific inmates, i.e. stating that first incarcerates should be given preference, along with married inmates and those having relatively long sentences.

Included among the comments concerning the preliminary phases of participation, 15 (11.3%) stated that more orientation of participants was necessary, along with attempts to change the attitudes of staff, and the public in general, about inmates. Seven (5.3%) stated that greater liaison with community resources was necessary.

Concerning specific Temporary Absence procedures, eight (6.0%) stated that the selection boards should be enlarged to include all staff members having cognizance of a particular applicant. Six (4.5%) stated that participants should be allowed more time out of the institution, or that outright parole should be used in lieu of their nightly return to custody. Two (1.5%) stated that there should be a special Temporary Absence branch created within the institution, and one person (0.8%) stated that earnings of Temporary Absence participants should be returned to the public as a form of restitution.

Looking at the effects of the Temporary Absence Program, 23 (17.3%) stated that Temporary Absence improved inmates' attitudes and their feelings of trust and responsibility. Five (3.8%) stated that Temporary Absence results in more work for staff, objections by staff, and, as a consequence, leaves less time for their other duties. Four (3.0%) stated that Temporary Absence creates a desire among inmates to spend more time away from the institution, three (2.2%) stated that the program lessens tension between inmates and staff, and three stated that staff desired more knowledge about the Temporary Absence program.

TABLE 1

## Personal Background

(Sources: Main Office file, especially D.C.S. Record Sheet.  
Items which differ statistically,  $p < .05$ , between accepted  
and rejected candidates are enclosed in boxes.)

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
1. Mean age at which left school	17.0	16.1	16.6	16.3
2. Mean highest grade completed	10.3	9.4	10.4	9.7
3. Ward of training school				
Yes	9	15	2	9
No	33	32	38	27
No information	5	1	3	1
4. Use of alcohol				
Temperate	25	24	19	14
Intemperate	11	12	11	19
Abstainer	11	12	13	4
5. History of drug usage				
Yes	8	10	1	5
No	37	37	42	31
No information	2	1	0	1
6. Marital status				
Single	36	34	8	12
Married	7	12	35	22
Divorced	1	0	1	1
Widower	0	0	0	0
Common-law	3	2	0	2
7. Size of last city resided in				
Over 100,000	20	24	30	25
50,000 - 99,999	1	2	2	1
10,000 - 49,999	13	10	1	5
Below 10,000	13	12	10	5
No information	0	0	0	1



TABLE 1 - Continued

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
8. Last occupation				
Student	14	11	0	1
Unskilled labour	16	18	12	16
Skilled labour, technical	10	13	13	14
Clerical, sales	5	4	12	2
Managerial	0	0	5	3
Professional	1	0	1	1
Other than listed above	1	0	0	0
9. Mean age in years	21.7	23.3	32.1	29.5
10. Type of education applied for				
Grade 11	5	0		
Grade 12	7	2		
Grade 13	3	3		
Community College	4	2		
Technical School	5	1		
University year 1	1	5		
University year 2	0	1		
University year 3	2	0		
University year 4	0	0		
Manpower retraining	20	34		
11. Type of work applied for				
Unskilled labour			19	0
Skilled labour, technical			10	20
Clerical, sales			11	13
Managerial			2	3
Professional			1	1

TABLE 2

Relationship Between Previous Occupation  
and Temporary Absence Job/Course (Accepted Applicants)

(Source: D.C.S. Record Sheet and Temporary Absence Program  
Application Form.)

Part 1 - Work Release

<u>T.A. Job</u>	<u>Last Occupation</u>						<u>Total</u>
	<u>Stu- dent</u>	<u>Un- skilled</u>	<u>Trade/ tech- nical</u>	<u>Cleri- cal/ sales</u>	<u>Mana- gerial</u>	<u>Profes- sional</u>	
Unskilled	0	11	3	4	1	0	19
Trade/ technical	0	0	10	0	0	0	10
Clerical/ sales	0	1	0	8	2	0	11
Managerial	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Professional	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	0	12	13	12	5	1	43

Part 2 - Education Release

Grade 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade 11	2	2	1	0	0	0	5
Grade 12	3	2	1	0	0	0	6
Grade 13	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Community College	2	0	0	1	0	1	4
Technical School	1	2	1	1	0	0	5
University	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Manpower Re-training	0	10	7	3	0	0	20
Total	14	16	10	5	0	1	46

(Note: For one participant taking Grade 12 under T.A., no  
information about his last occupation was available.)

TABLE 3

## Present Offence

(Sources: Main Office file, especially D.C.S. Record Sheet and R.C.M.P. report. Items which differ statistically,  $p < .05$ , between accepted and rejected candidates are enclosed in boxes.)

(NOTE: The first 11 items are with reference to the Annual Report of the Minister of Correctional Services, 1968-69)

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
1. Convictions for offences against the person, excluding sexual assaults (Category A)				
Mean number of counts	.06	.17	.09	.15
Percentage having convictions in this category	4.3	14.6	9.3	16.2
2. Convictions for break and enter, and/or for break, enter and theft (Category B)				
Mean number of counts	.62	.90	.05	.19
Percentage having convictions in this category	36.2	43.7	4.7	8.1
3. Convictions for theft and/or attempted theft (Category B)				
Mean number of counts	.36	.38	.35	.31
Percentage having convictions in this category	17.0	22.9	20.9	21.6
4. Convictions for offences against property other than break and enter; break, enter, and theft; and attempted theft (Category B)				
Mean number of counts	1.81	.88	1.00	1.62
Percentage having convictions in this category	40.4	31.2	55.8	43.2
5. Convictions for sexual assault, indecent assault, incest, indecent exposure, and/or other indecent act (Categories A and C)				
Mean number of counts	.06	0	.02	.03
Percentage having convictions in this category	4.3	0	2.3	2.7

TABLE 3 - Continued

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
6. Convictions for offences against public morals other than sexual offences (Category C)				
Mean number of counts	0	0	.09	0
Percentage having convictions in this category	0	0	4.7	0
7. Convictions for drug offences (Category D)				
Mean number of counts	.21	.19	.02	.02
Percentage having convictions in this category	12.8	14.6	2.3	2.7
8. Convictions for offences against the public order other than drug offences (Category D)				
Mean number of counts	.06	.31	.22	.29
Percentage having convictions in this category	6.4	20.8	16.3	18.9
9. Convictions for liquor offences (Category E)				
Mean number of counts	.13	.10	.07	.10
Percentage having convictions in this category	6.4	8.3	4.7	8.1
10. Convictions for traffic offences (Category F)				
Mean number of counts	.19	.08	.21	.17
Percentage having convictions in this category	12.8	6.2	11.0	10.8
11. Convictions for offences not listed above (Category G)				
Mean number of counts	0	.04	.04	0
Percentage having convictions in this category	0	4.2	2.3	0
12. Mean number of definite days to be served after statutory and earned remission	384.8	434.2	265.0	255.0
13. Percentage having indefinite sentences	51.1	62.5	27.9	27.0



TABLE 3 - Continued

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
14. Mean number of <u>definite</u> days assigned for all convictions: adding together charges and counts and ignoring consecutive vs. concurrent sentences	854.7	875.5	430.9	744.9
15. Mean number of <u>indefinite</u> days assigned for all convictions: adding together charges and counts and ignoring consecutive vs. concurrent sentences	312.8	298.7	103.2	148.3
16. Percentage having outstanding charges related to present offence				
Yes	0	0	0	0
No	0	0	0	0

TABLE 4

## Prior Offences

(Sources: Main Office file, especially D.C.S. Record Sheet and R.C.M.P. report. Items which differ statistically,  $p < .05$ , between accepted and rejected candidates are enclosed in boxes.)

(NOTE: The first 11 items are with reference to the Annual Report of the Minister of Correctional Services, 1968-69)

1. Convictions for offences against the person, excluding sexual assaults (Category A)

Percentage having fines, suspended sentences and/or probations

Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
Accepted	Rejected	Accepted	Rejected
4.3	8.3	4.7	2.7

Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries

8.5	16.7	9.3	21.6
-----	------	-----	------

Percentage having no previous convictions

87.2	77.1	88.4	78.4
------	------	------	------

2. Convictions for break and enter, and/or for break, enter and theft (Category B)

Percentage having fines, suspended sentences and/or probations

19.1	16.7	11.6	8.1
------	------	------	-----

Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries

21.3	22.9	23.2	27.0
------	------	------	------

Percentage having no previous convictions

66.0	66.7	69.8	70.3
------	------	------	------

3. Convictions for theft and/or attempted theft (Category B)

Percentage having fines, suspended sentences and/or probations

19.1	20.8	18.6	32.4
------	------	------	------

Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries

31.9	45.8	18.6	40.5
------	------	------	------

Percentage having no previous convictions

61.7	43.7	72.1	43.2
------	------	------	------

TABLE 4 - Continued

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
4. Convictions for offences against property other than break and enter; break, enter, and theft; theft; and attempted theft (Category B)				
Percentage having fines, suspended sentences and/or probations	17.0	14.6	16.3	21.6
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	23.4	35.4	27.9	43.2
Percentage having no previous convictions	66.0	52.1	58.1	45.9
5. Convictions for sexual assault, indecent assault, incest, indecent exposure, and/or other indecent act (Categories A and C)				
Percentage having fines, suspended sentences and/or probations	0	0	0	0
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	0	2.1	2.3	16.2
Percentage having no previous convictions	100.0	97.9	97.7	83.8
6. Convictions for offences against public morals other than sexual offences (Category C)				
Percentage having fines, suspended sentences and/or probations	0	0	0	0
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	0	4.2	0	8.1
Percentage having no previous convictions	100.0	95.8	100.0	91.9

TABLE 4 - Continued

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
7. Convictions for drug offences (Category D)				
Percentage having fines, suspended sentences and/or probations	2.1	2.1	0	0
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	2.1	8.3	0	2.7
Percentage having no previous convictions	95.7	89.6	100.0	97.3
8. Convictions for offences against the public order other than drug offences (Category D)				
Percentage having fines, sus- pended sentences and/or probations	6.4	12.5	9.3	5.4
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	19.1	39.6	20.9	29.7
Percentage having no previous convictions	78.7	58.3	72.1	64.9
9. Convictions for liquor offences (Category E)				
Percentage having fines, sus- pended sentences and/or probations	0	4.2	0	5.4
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	4.3	18.7	2.3	13.5
Percentage having no previous convictions	95.7	77.1	97.7	81.0

TABLE 4 - Continued

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
10. Convictions for traffic offences (Category F)				
Percentage having fines, suspended sentences and/or probations	2.1	6.3	2.3	0
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	12.8	20.8	4.7	16.2
Percentage having no previous convictions	87.2	75.0	93.0	83.8
11. Convictions for offences not listed above (Category G)				
Percentage having fines, sus- pended sentences and/or probations	0	0	0	0
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	0	4.2	0	2.7
Percentage having no previous convictions	100.0	95.8	100.0	97.3
12. Any conviction prior to the present offence				
Percentage having fines, sus- pended sentences and/or probations	48.9	52.1	55.8	54.1
Percentage sentenced to D.C.S. institutions or to federal penitentiaries	51.1	72.9	44.2	70.3
Percentage having no previous convictions	29.8	16.7	37.2	21.6



TABLE 5

Present and Prior  
Offences Combined

(Sources: Main Office file, especially D.C.S. Record Sheet and R.C.M.P. report. Items which differ statistically,  $p < .05$ , between accepted and rejected candidates are enclosed in boxes.)

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
1. Percentage having any conviction for a sexual offence	4.2	2.1	4.6	18.9
2. Percentage having any conviction for a drug offence	14.9	20.8	2.3	5.4
3. Percentage having any conviction for a liquor offence	10.6	29.2	4.6	24.3
4. Number and percentage having any conviction for sexual, drug, or liquor offence	13 27.6%	22 45.8%	4 9.3%	15 40.5%

TABLE 6

## Institutional History

(Sources: Main Office file especially D.C.S. Record Sheet.  
Items which differ statistically,  $p < .05$ , between accepted  
and rejected candidates are enclosed in boxes.)

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
1. Institution admitted to after sentence (O.R. Guelph admissions later transferred to O.T.C. Brampton and Burtch are indicated as "Brampton" and "Burtch")				
Brampton O.T.C.	8	4	0	1
Burtch O.T.C. & I.F.	0	0	2	7
Burwash Reformatory	18	32	4	8
Guelph Reformatory	2	5	3	5
Thunder Bay O.T.C. & I.F.	1	1	0	0
Millbrook Reformatory	1	0	1	5
Mimico Reformatory	2	1	21	9
Monteith O.T.C. & I.F.	0	1	1	0
Rideau O.T.C. & I.F.	2	3	1	1
A.G. Brown Clinics	0	0	0	0
Provincial Jails	13	1	10	1
2. Present incarceration, percent having escape attempts before Temporary Absence application	0	0	0	0
3. Present incarceration, percent having escapes (actual evasions of custody) before Temporary Absence application	0	6.2	0	2.7
4. Present incarceration, mean number of misconduct reports (other than escapes and attempted escapes) before Temporary Absence application.	.12	.45	.03	.31

TABLE 6 - Continued

	Education Applicants		Employment Applicants	
	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted	Accep- ted	Rejec- ted
5. Present and any prior incarcerations, percentage having escape attempts	0	2.1	0	0
6. Present and any prior incarcerations, percentage having escapes (actual evasions of custody)	8.5	12.5	9.3	10.8
7. Present and any prior incarcerations, mean number of misconduct reports (other than escapes or attempted escapes)	.91	1.81	.45	2.19
8. Present and any prior incarcerations, percentage having parole violations	10.6	14.6	7.0	16.2
9. Number of months served in D.C.S. institutions, combining any prior incarcerations with the minimum number of months to be served for the present offence	6.7	11.4	4.8	15.3

TABLE 7

## Performance Data

(Source: Questionnaires sent to jails and adult institutions during July, 1970.)

	Edu- cation	Employ- ment	Total
1. Mode of transportation			
Institution vehicle	17	0	17
Personal vehicle	0	6	6
Public vehicle	16	16	32
Ride from friend or relative	1	6	7
Ride from fellow student or employee	0	7	7
Other	10	2	12
2. Termination status			
Still participating as of July, 1970	17	5	22
Participated until discharge/parole	24	30	54
Withdrawn - misconduct in community	1	1	2
Withdrawn - misconduct in institution	2	0	2
Fired/expelled	0	1	1
Strike/job or course completed	0	0	0
Withdrew voluntarily	0	0	0
3. Mean length of participation (Weeks)	13.8	8.9	11.5
4. Mean expense to Department not recovered from participant	\$15.45	\$0	\$8.40
5. Average distribution of earnings/man			
Institution for meals and lodging		\$154.96	(27.8%)
Participant, for expenses		\$ 68.74	(12.3%)
Participant's family		\$209.62	(37.6%)
Participant's savings account		\$113.55	(20.4%)
Participant, for payment of debts		\$ 10.33	( 1.9%)
6. Mean total earnings after statutory deductions:		\$557.20	

TABLE 8

## Survey of Participating Schools/Employers

Item		Per- centage Agreeing	Per- centage Dis- agreeing	
1.	"On the whole, I feel that inmate students (employees) perform as well as non-inmates."	100.0 81.8	0.0 9.1	Schools Employers
2.	"The inmate student (employee) usually possesses as much ability as the non-inmate."	100.0 72.7	0.0 9.1	Schools Employers
3.	"The inmate student (employee) is generally as well motivated as the non-inmate."	100.0 72.7	0.0 0.0	Schools Employers
*4.	"The inmate student (employee) usually creates fewer problems for teachers (employers)." (School personnel were more willing to express an opinion and were more positive on this question.)	73.7 27.3	15.8 18.2	Schools Employers
*5.	"In the future, I would like to have more inmate students (employees) if this is possible." (Employers were not as positive in this instance.)	100.0 27.3	0.0 27.3	Schools Employers
6.	"The Temporary Absence program increases the dignity of the offender."	100.0 81.8	0.0 9.1	Schools Employers
7.	"The Temporary Absence program has definite rehabilitative value for all offenders."	89.5 54.5	0.0 9.1	Schools Employers
8.	"This program is not fair to society; the offender is getting off easy without sufficient penalty."	0.0 9.1	100.0 72.7	Schools Employers
9.	"This program develops in the offender behaviour which is essentially law-abiding, instead of law-breaking."	100.0 90.9	0.0 0.0	Schools Employers



TABLE 8 - Continued

Item	Percentage Agreeing	Percentage Disagreeing	
10. "I think participants in this program provide a model for other inmates: participants provide an incentive for other inmates to behave in such a way so that they too can participate in this program."	52.6 81.8	0.0 0.0	Schools Employers
11. "I understand what the Temporary Absence program is set out to accomplish."	89.5 100.0	0.0 0.0	Schools Employers
12. "I feel that this new program is a more humanitarian form of rehabilitation for the offender."	89.5 90.9	10.5 0.0	Schools Employers
*13. "I feel that there are only a very few inmates who have any real desire to participate in education (employment) absence." (School personnel responded more positively here.)	0.0 36.4	84.2 18.2	Schools Employers
14. "I believe that the average inmate applies for this program because he appreciates its possible rehabilitative value."	94.7 81.8	0.0 0.0	Schools Employers
*15. "The presence of inmate students (employees) has raised the morale of his fellow students (employees)." (School personnel were less opinionated here.)	0.0 36.4	0.0 27.3	Schools Employers
*16. "The presence of inmate students (employees) has raised the morale of his teachers (supervisors)." (Employers were more opinionated and more positive than school personnel on this question.)	0.0 36.4	0.0 9.1	Schools Employers

(Note: Percentage agreement includes "strongly agree" and "slightly agree" responses; percentage disagreement includes "slightly disagree" and "strongly disagree" responses. Starred (\*) items differ significantly ( $p < .05$ ) between schools and employers; parenthetical comment after item describes the difference.)

TABLE 9

## Institutional and After-Care Staff Questionnaire

Item	Percentage Agreeing	Percentage Disagreeing
1. "The Temporary Absence program increases the dignity of the offender."	86.2	3.9
2. "The Temporary Absence program has definite rehabilitative value for all offenders."	30.5	63.2
3. "The Temporary Absence program has definite rehabilitative value for some offenders."	94.9	2.9
4. "The Temporary Absence program has definite rehabilitative value for a few offenders."	74.6	18.4
5. "This program is not fair to society: the offender is getting off too easily without sufficient penalty."	12.6	78.2
6. "This program develops in the offender behaviour which is essentially law-abiding instead of law-breaking."	82.3	5.3
7. "I think participants in this program provide a model for other inmates: participants provide an incentive for other inmates to behave in such a way so that they too can participate in this program."	88.6	6.8
8. "I feel that this program should be accelerated, since not enough eligible inmates are participating"	62.7	16.9
9. "I understand what the Temporary Absence program is set out to accomplish."	85.7	2.2
10. "The Temporary Absence program has created special problems for the institution in terms of additional work for staff, difficulty in dealing with inmates, etc." (This question was not asked of after-care officers.)	41.9	41.9
11. "Since the initiation of the Temporary Absence program around September 1, 1969, there has been an improvement in the attitudes of institutional staff toward their duties." (This question was not asked of after-care officers).	23.9	22.0

TABLE 9 - Continued

Item	Percentage Agreeing	Percentage Disagreeing
12. "I feel that this new program is a more humanitarian form of rehabilitation for the offender."	92.5	1.2
13. "The fact that some but not all inmates are able to participate in this program does result in hostility or jealousy on the part of the inmates who cannot participate."	43.1	40.2
14. "I feel that there are only a very few inmates who have any real desire to participate in education absence, employment absence or on the job training."	48.7	42.9
15. "I believe that the average inmate applies for this program because he appreciates its possible rehabilitative value."	58.8	29.5
16. "I feel that the average inmate applies for this program because he is interested in avoiding his duties within this institution or in getting away from the institution."	47.7	41.2
17. "The amount of counselling and/or preparation given the inmate before he begins to participate in the program is sufficient."	24.2	30.3
18. "Rejection of an inmate for this program after he has filled out an application form will lessen the chances of his being rehabilitated."	21.3	62.2
19. "Rejection of an inmate for this program after he has filled out an application form will make his attitudes more law-abiding and less law-breaking."	9.9	63.4
20. "Rejection of an inmate for this program after he has filled out an application form is likely to result in his becoming a behaviour problem in the institution."	28.1	52.1
21. "Rejection of an inmate for this program after he has filled out an application form is likely to result in his stirring-up trouble among his fellow inmates."	23.7	59.3

TABLE 9 - Continued

Item	Percentage Agreeing	Percentage Disagreeing
22. "Rejection of an inmate for this program after he has filled out an application form is likely to affect the attitudes of the institutional staff in a negative way." (This question was not asked of after-care officers).	10.2	71.1
(Note: Percentage agreement includes "strongly agree" and "slightly agree" responses; percentage disagreement includes "slightly disagree" and "strongly disagree" responses. Data includes all institutions and staff categories).		

TABLE 10

## Services Provided by After-Care Officers

Service	Number pro- viding service	Percentage of officers providing service
1. Conducted preliminary community investigation prior to decision on application.	57	62.6
2. Expedited participation by getting employment contract signed.	29	31.9
3. Expedited participation by setting up interview with prospective employer or educator.	28	30.8
4. Participated as a member of institutional screening committee.	22	24.2
5. Supervised and/or counselled inmates while they were still participating in the T.A.P. - that is, before parole or discharge.	21	23.1
6. Supervised and/or counselled former T.A.P. participants after they have been parolled or discharged.	21	23.1
7. Expedited participation by arranging for transportation to the job or work site.	19	20.9
8. Seeking an appropriate course for applicants who wish to continue their education, but did not know which school was the most appropriate.	14	15.4
9. Endeavouring to arrange employment for applicants who didn't know where to look.	11	12.1
10. Expedited participation by arranging for the payment of tuition, the purchase of books, tools, clothing, etc.	10	11.0
11. Investigated reports of misconduct in the community while the inmate was on the T.A.P.	8	8.8



TABLE 10 - Continued

Service	Number pro- viding service	Percentage of officers providing service
12. Expedited participation by getting necessary documents such as insurance and driver's license, etc.	7	7.7
13. Cooperated with other after-care officers.	6	6.6
14. Took inmates for interviews with prospective employers or to make an appointment for an employment interview.	3	3.3
15. Assisted inmate's family.	2	2.2
16. Arranged working hours for inmates.	1	1.1
17. (Not involved in the Temporary Absence program to date).	(19)	(21.4)