



THE COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDER PROGRAM:  
THE BRITISH COLUMBIA EXPERIENCE

Volume 1 – Background and Description  
of Initial Cases

45953

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL  
CORRECTIONS BRANCH



THE COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDER PROGRAM: -  
THE BRITISH COLUMBIA EXPERIENCE

NCJRS

MAR 29 1978

ACQUISITIONS

Program Evaluation & Data Systems,  
Corrections Branch,  
Ministry of the Attorney-General

VOLUME I - BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION  
OF INITIAL CASES

Corrections Branch  
Ministry of the Attorney-General  
Province of British Columbia  
Victoria, British Columbia  
July 1977

British Columbia Cataloguing in Publication Data

British Columbia. Corrections Branch.  
Program Evaluation and Data Systems.  
The Community Service Order Program.

"Dennis M. Hartman, Director, Program  
Evaluation & Data Systems, gratefully acknowledges the research and editorial content of this report by Anne D. Kirkaldy, Apocalypse Enterprises Inc."

Includes bibliographical references.

Contents.- V.1. Background and description of initial cases.

1. British Columbia. Corrections Branch.  
Community Service Order Program. 2. Corrections - British Columbia. I. Kirkaldy, Anne D. II. Title.

HV9309B7B7 365.6'09711

Dennis M. Hartman, Director, Program Evaluation & Data Systems, gratefully acknowledges the research and editorial content of this report by Anne D. Kirkaldy, Apocalypse Enterprises Inc.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	xi
 CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION .....	 1
CHAPTER II : THE COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM IN BRITAIN .....	3
1. Introduction .....	4
2. The Operation Of The Program .....	5
3. An Evaluation Of The Program .....	8
 CHAPTER III : THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM IN BRITISH COLUMBIA .....	 11
1. The Informal Programs .....	12
2. The Official Beginning .....	15
3. The Pilot Project .....	16
4. The Guidelines For The Operation Of The Program ...	17
5. A First Evaluation And Further Recommendations ....	19
6. The Program Expands .....	21
 CHAPTER IV : A STATISTICAL DESCRIPTION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA'S COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDER PROGRAM .....	 23
1. Introduction .....	24
2. Personal Information About The Participant .....	25
3. Offence Data .....	25
4. Location Data .....	25
5. Admission Procedure .....	25
6. Work Data .....	26
7. Completion Of The Work Order .....	26
 CHAPTER V : A PROVINCIAL OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM .....	 27
1. Introduction .....	28
2. Who Is In The Program? .....	29
3. What Offences Do They Commit? .....	33
4. How Are Admissions To The Program Made? .....	35
5. What Kind Of Work Are They Assigned? .....	36
6. How Do They Fare? .....	40
7. Summary Of The Provincial Statistics .....	43
 CHAPTER VI : A REGIONAL PICTURE OF THE PROGRAM .....	 45
1. Introduction .....	46
2. Regional Distribution .....	47
3. Court Location Distribution For Each Region .....	48
4. Who Is In The Program In Each Region? .....	51
5. What Offences Do They Commit? .....	56
6. How Is Admission To The Program Made? .....	61
7. What Kind Of Work Are They Assigned?.....	64
8. How Do They Fare? .....	72
9. Summary Of The Regional Statistics .....	76

	Page
CHAPTER VII : A COMPARISON OF THE JUVENILE AND ADULT PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM .....	89
1. Introduction .....	90
2. Characteristics Of Juveniles/Adults .....	91
3. What Offences Do Juveniles/Adults Commit? .....	93
4. How Are Juvenile/Adult Admissions To The Program Made? .....	96
5. What Kind Of Work Are Juveniles/Adults Assigned? ...	98
6. How Do Juveniles/Adults Fare On The Program? .....	103
7. Summary Of The Juvenile/Adult Statistics .....	106
FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE .....	109

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Until only a few decades ago, correctional procedures were no more extensive than the simple banishment of offenders to closed institutions. The gross inadequacy and problems created by this limited approach have been recognized for some time. The "out of sight, out of mind" philosophy upon which this imprisonment is based presents difficulties because most institutionalized offenders ultimately return to the community. The financial costs of custody for personnel, services, and equipment are high and continue to soar. But perhaps of much greater importance are the social costs and lost opportunity costs of removing the individual from his family, community, and employment possibilities. Continuing high rates of recidivism, and the adverse consequences of institutionalization are sources of further dissatisfaction with the traditional lengthy prison sentence.

As a result of these extensive problems, attempts to devise alternatives to institutional sentences have been initiated in recent years. In the British Columbia Correctional system, these alternatives have taken the form of community correctional centers, community based residential centers, various probation and attendance programs, as well as the Community Service Order Program.

This B.C. program is based on a similar program which has been operating successfully in Britain since 1972. The British Community Work Service program was established as an alternative to short prison terms for adult offenders. Volunteer community organizations provide tasks for the work service, and the probation officer reports to the court on the suitability of the offender for the program and on the availability of these tasks. The court issues either a standard probation order with a clause for community service, or a special community work service order. The court specifies the number of hours of service (from 20 to 240) to be performed, and specifies a period not exceeding twelve months for completion of the tasks assigned.

The offender is then ordered by the court to report to a probation office. During his work order, he is supervised by a probation officer or by the volunteer agency. If the offender breaches the service order, he is first warned; if the breach continues, he may be fined, or returned to court where the order is revoked and he is resentenced.

The British program has met with general approval from the public, the probation service, and offenders themselves. It is felt that the program has fewer financial and social costs than imprisonment, that the offender makes reparation to the community for the offence he committed by performing a service for the community, and that there is some resocialization taking place between the offender and the community.

The concept of community service was first introduced in British Columbia by various (generally small) courts and probation offices as an informal program for young offenders, either with a formal probation order or as part of a voluntary diversion program. With growth, a major difficulty encountered in these informal programs became the lack of organization and manpower. The judges and probation officers did not always have adequate time to find suitable tasks in the community or to administrate the programs on a full-time basis.

During the years 1970 to 1974, the B.C. Corrections Association Biennial Institute, the B.C. Task Force on Correctional Services and Facilities, and the Five Year Plan of the Corrections Branch all identified the need for a formalized community service program in the province.

In November 1974, Mr. S. Rocksborough-Smith presented a report to the Justice Development Commission describing the British program and making recommendations for applying this experience to the B.C. Correctional System. With the aid of this report, a committee recommendation was made that a pilot project be set up in nine centers in the province, to be implemented with the cooperation of probation officers, Justice Council



coordinators, and community volunteer groups. A Community Service Supervisor was hired for each of the centers, and during the months of December 1974 and January 1975, the pilot program was formally implemented in these centers.

In February, the Community Work Service Study Committee met to clear up some of the initial difficulties encountered by the pilot project, and to institute an initial monitoring/assessment form which was to be completed by the Community Service Supervisor or Probation Officer at the end of each Community Service Order.

By the end of 1975, a policy statement had been issued to formalize guidelines for the operation of the program. The guidelines are largely the same as those of the British program; however, a major difference is that the B.C. program involves both adult and juvenile offenders. Juvenile admissions to the program may be made by the court formally issuing one of the two kinds of probation orders, or informally by a probation officer enquiry procedure. Also, in the B.C. program service to the victim of the offence occurs in some cases. The length of the service order is a maximum of 200 hours within a six-month period for adults, and a maximum of 100 hours within a three-month period for juveniles.

After the first year of its operation, two major recommendations affecting the program were made, largely based on the general acceptance of the program by the community and the courts. One of these recommendations, which has since been implemented, was to formally expand the program throughout the province. The other recommendation was to change federal and provincial legislation to enable community service to exist as a separate disposition under the Criminal Code and the Juvenile Delinquents Act. This second recommendation has not yet been implemented, but action to finalize the legal status of the Community Service Order program is presently under review.

This report includes a statistical description of the first 1,459 admissions to the B.C. Community Service Order program. These admissions include all completed cases up to the end of May 1976. This statistical information has been derived from a computerized file of the coded monitoring/assessment forms which are sent to the Program Evaluation and Data Systems Section of the Corrections Branch.

A second volume of the report, to be issued at a later date, will investigate the additional 3,000 cases of the program which occurred during the period June 1976 to June 1977.

The Community Service Order monitoring/assessment forms contain descriptive information on: characteristics of the offenders, the offence, the location, the admission procedure, the types of work assigned, and completion of the work order.

The first set of statistical information in the report gives a provincial overview of the program. Juvenile cases account for 55.7 percent; adults account for the remaining 44.3 percent. Eighty-eight percent of the cases are male; 11.5 percent are female. Native Indians account for 9.0 percent of the total cases in the program.

The most common offences for which admissions are made are "Theft Under \$200" and "Break and Enter".

About one-third of the participants are admitted by a probation officer enquiry; most of these are by a verbal rather than a written agreement. Of the two-thirds admitted by the court, most are by a standard probation order rather than a special community service probation order.

Almost all of the program participants are assigned work for the community rather than for the victim. Supervision of two-thirds of

the work orders is performed by community volunteer groups. Half of the orders are for work in a community or service agency; another 36.1 percent are for work on community recreation facilities and park development. The average number of hours assigned per work order is 31.7.

Almost all (93.3 percent) of the work orders are completed. Comments on the effectiveness of the program are positive on 77.5 percent of the forms.

The second part of the statistical analysis contained in this report is a regional breakdown of all program participants. The Vancouver Island region accounts for 46.0 percent of these participants. The characteristics of the program in this region are almost the same as the provincial average, except that there are fewer "Mischief" offences, fewer cases admitted by written agreement, and fewer supervised by the victim and assigned service for the victim.

The Vancouver region accounts for 5.1 percent of the program participants. The characteristics in this region differ from the provincial average, particularly in that there are fewer juveniles, fewer Native Indians, more "Causing a Disturbance" and "Public Mischief" offences, fewer cases admitted by a Probation Officer Enquiry, fewer supervised by the victim and assigned service for the victim, more hours assigned per order, and fewer positive comments.

The Interior region accounts for 7.6 percent of the program participants. The program characteristics differ from the provincial average in that there are more juveniles, more males, fewer Native Indians, more "Theft Under \$200" offences, fewer cases admitted by a Probation Officer Enquiry, and more supervised by the victim but fewer assigned service for the victim.

The South Fraser region accounts for 25.0 percent of the program

participants. The characteristics in this region differ from the provincial average in that there are more juveniles, fewer Native Indians, more "Mischief" and "Breach of Government Liquor Act" offences, more cases admitted by a Probation Officer Enquiry, more supervised by the victim and assigned service for the victim, more completed work orders, and more with positive comments.

The Northern region accounts for 9.2 percent of the program participants. The characteristics differ from the provincial average in that there are fewer juveniles, many more Native Indians, more "Possession of Stolen Property" and "Breach of Narcotics Control Act for Possession" offences, fewer cases admitted by a Probation Officer Enquiry, none supervised by the victim, fewer hours assigned per order, and more negative comments.

The North Fraser region accounts for the remaining 7.1 percent of the program participants. The program characteristics differ from the provincial average in that there are more juveniles, fewer Native Indians, fewer "Mischief" offences, more cases admitted by a Probation Officer Enquiry, none supervised by the victim, fewer hours assigned per order, and fewer completed work orders.

The third part of the statistical analysis of the report deals with the differences between juvenile and adult program participants. The two groups are similar in most respects, except that there is a higher percentage of juveniles than of adults with "Theft Over \$200" and "Break and Enter" offences. Also, 57.5 percent of the juvenile cases are admitted by a Probation Officer Enquiry, and 90.4 percent of the adult cases are admitted by the court.

# LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>		Page
1	Program Participants by Juveniles/Adults and Age Group.....	30
2	Program Participants by Sex.....	31
3	Program Participants by Racial Origin.....	32
4	Program Participants by Offence.....	33
5	Program Participants by Multiple Counts/Offences.....	34
6	Program Participants by Type of Admission.....	35
7	Program Participants by Type of Supervision.....	36
8	Program Participants by Type of Service.....	37
9	Program Participants by Work Description.....	38
10	Program Participants by Assigned Work Hours.....	39
11	Program Participants by Completion of the Work Order.....	40
12	Program Participants by Type of Further Action.....	41
13	Program Participants by Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program.....	42
14	Program Participants by Region.....	47
15	Program Participants in the Vancouver Island Region by Court Location.....	48
16	Program Participants in the Vancouver Region by Court Location.....	49
17	Program Participants in the Interior Region by Court Location.....	49
18	Program Participants in the South Fraser Region by Court Location.....	50
19	Program Participants in the Northern Region by Court Location.....	50
20	Program Participants in the North Fraser Region by Court Location.....	50
21	Program Participants by Region, by Juveniles/Adults and Age Group.....	53
22	Program Participants by Region and by Sex.....	54

<u>TABLE</u>		Page
23	Program Participants by Region and by Racial Origin.....	55
24	Program Participants by Region and by Offence.....	58
25	Program Participants by Region and Multiple Counts/Offences.....	60
26	Program Participants by Region and by Type of Admission.....	63
27	Program Participants by Region and by Type of Supervision.....	65
28	Program Participants by Region and by Type of Service.....	66
29	Program Participants by Region and by Work Description.....	69
30	Program Participants by Region and by Assigned Work Hours.....	71
31	Program Participants by Region and by Completion of Work Order.....	72
32	Program Participants by Region and by Type of Further Action.....	73
33	Program Participants by Region and by Comments on Effectiveness.....	75
34	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Sex.....	91
35	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Racial Origin.....	92
36	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Offence.....	94
37	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Multiple Counts/Offences.....	95
38	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Type of Admission.....	97
39	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Type of Supervision.....	98
40	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Type of Service.....	99
41	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Work Description.....	100

TABLE

		Page
42	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Assigned Work Hours.....	102
43	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Completion of the Work Order.....	103
44	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Type of Further Action.....	104
45	Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program.....	105





## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

During this past decade, the correctional concept of community work service as an alternative to institutional sentences has been utilized in the establishment of programs which are now an integral part of the corrections systems in several parts of the world.

The two main purposes of this report are to provide background information on the development of the Community Service Order program in British Columbia, and to describe the operation of this program in terms of the first 1,500 work service orders which occurred in the first year and a half of its existence.

Chapter II provides a description of the British Community Service program, which has formed the basis of much of the program content here in British Columbia.

Chapter III outlines the historical development of the Community Service Order program in British Columbia, from the time when it was first used on an informal basis in a few locations, to its present status as an important program of the Corrections Branch which is operating throughout the province.

An explanation of the data elements used for the statistical description of the program is included in Chapter IV.

Chapters V and VI describe the program at the provincial and regional levels while Chapter VII compares juvenile and adult participants in the program.

A second volume of this report is being planned to address other issues related to the program, such as the degree to which it is fulfilling the stated objectives. In addition, the second volume will provide a description of the recent operation of the program as it has expanded throughout the province.



## CHAPTER II

### THE COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM IN BRITAIN

	Page
I. Introduction	4
II. The Operation Of The Program	5
III. An Evaluation Of The Program	8

## The Community Service Program In Britain<sup>1</sup>

### I. INTRODUCTION

The community service program as a correctional alternative has been used on an informal basis by the courts in many countries<sup>2</sup>. A community service program has been operating in Britain since 1972. As it is this British experience that has formed the basis of much of the program content here in British Columbia, it is interesting to note some of the details of their program.

The Home Secretary's Advisory Council on the Penal System in Britain was set up to investigate alternatives to imprisonment, and in a 1970 report they suggested a method by which a community service program could be established. Some of their recommendations were included in changes to the Criminal Justice Act of 1972, and as a result of this act the program was begun with the establishment of six pilot projects. Early in 1974, after these projects had been in operation for a year, they were evaluated. The following description of this British experience with community service is derived from that evaluation.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> The information on the operation of the British program is from several sources, including; Community Service Orders, S. Rocksborough-Smith, October 1974, a report to the Justice Development Commission; "Continuing Service In England", H.S. Bergman, in Federal Probation, March 1975; "The Offender And The Community", John Harding, Social Work Today, November 14, 1974; and Non-Custodial and Semi-Custodial Penalties, Report of the Advisory Council on the Penal System, 1970.

<sup>2</sup> Two examples of these informal programs are those established in Saskatchewan and California, see Fine Option Program, a fact sheet from the Corrections Division, Department of Social Services of Saskatchewan, and "Convicted Offenders Become Community Helpers", Sylvia Sullivan, Judicature, March 1973.

## II. THE OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM

The principle of the British community service program is to set up an alternative to short prison terms, in the form of part-time service to the community. The program is implemented by cooperation among the courts, the probation service, and community volunteer agencies.

The offenders involved in the program are adults, with about 70 percent between 18 and 25 years of age. Offenders are selected who are capable and cooperative, and do not have any severe problems related to emotional stability, alcohol, or drug addiction. These offenders are chosen by the probation officer in charge of the case, who submits a report on the offender to the court.

To make the program run smoothly, there must be a sufficient supply of suitable tasks available in the community. Most of these are provided by volunteer community organizations. There is a wide variety of tasks involved in the program, some of which are for individuals, while others are for projects. Some of the tasks included are: helping to run a Youth Club or Day-Care Center, doing gardening and odd jobs for the elderly and handicapped, assisting staff and patients in hospitals, bookkeeping and typing for community organizations, as well as helping to run swim and games programs for the handicapped. Most of these tasks are performed by the offenders working with regular community volunteers, although some of the tasks are performed by offenders only (under supervision). To avoid any difficulties with organized labour, doubtful tasks are discussed with the unions.

Once the court has been assured by a probation officer's report that the offender is suitable for community service work, and that there is a variety of tasks available in the community, the court then issues a community work order. Initially, when the program was being designed,

it was recognized that the court orders could take the form of either a standard probation order with an additional clause for community service, or they could be a new type of order for community service only. The standard probation order provides a means of supervision as well as established breach procedures in the case of an order not being satisfactorily completed. The special community service order has the distinct advantage of readily distinguishing the program as a new procedure, and reducing confusion on the part of the offender as to what is expected of him. It also provides for situations in which the formal supervision and guidance of a standard probation order are not required. Since it was felt that both types of court orders have advantages, it was decided that the court should issue either type of order, depending upon the requirements of the particular case at hand.

The court order specifies the number of hours of work to be completed, which can be from 40 to 240 hours. It also specifies the maximum period in which the order is to be done, but this cannot exceed twelve months.

After a court order has been issued, the offender is referred from the court to the probation office, where he is assigned to a specific task. There is usually some choice of tasks, and an attempt is made to match the offender with work that is particularly suited to his talents and needs. It is not the intention of the British program to devise work so that the punishment fits the crime; the offender is perceived as providing a service in the community rather than doing penance related to his crime.

During the course of the work order, the offender is supervised, either by the probation officer, or by the routine supervision of the volunteer agency. Weekly reports on each offender are made by the supervisors and recorded in the probation office. In some areas a special community service center has been established which replaces the probation office as a meeting and record-keeping place for the program.

If the offender does not show up for his work assignment or if he is not performing in a satisfactory manner, he is first given a warning. If this breach of the community service order continues, he may be fined or returned to court where the community service order is revoked and he is resentenced for the original offence. In the pilot projects set up in Britain it has been found that a 20 percent per week non-attendance rate exists. It was felt that these breaches were mainly due to the immaturity of the offenders placed in the program.

### III. AN EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

The reception of the community service program on the part of the offenders, the probation service, and the public has been monitored. There has been a very favourable response from the offenders: they feel that they are useful and have been given some responsibility; they are able to use their native skills and talents; and in some instances they have developed relationships with other community members. Some of the offenders are committed to the community work to such a degree that they even continue working after the formal order is completed. The probation service is also enthusiastic about the program. As well, public response has been positive, perhaps due, in part, to the wide and favourable publicity this program has received in the newspapers, radio, and television.

The advantages of the program as it is used in Britain are numerous. The first of these advantages are related to costs. The financial costs of the program are considerably less than the costs for the alternative of imprisonment. Perhaps of greater significance is the fact that the community service program precludes the social costs of imprisonment: the offender does not undergo the adverse consequences of institutionalization, and his ties with the family and community are maintained and perhaps even strengthened. Not only are the costs of imprisonment avoided, but positive constructive work in the community is accomplished.

Additional advantages to the community service program are related to rehabilitation and resocialization. The program has a rehabilitative effect in that there is real reparation for the offences committed in the community. There is a resocialization between the offender and the community; as the work service is carried out, both come to view each other in a more favourable light. In this way, the program is able to initiate or restore some relationship between the offender and his community.



Although Britain's community work service program has been well received by all parties concerned and has definite advantages, certain problems have also been recognized. First, some of the offenders involved in the program do recidivate in a few weeks. A second problem is that some magistrates and volunteer agencies have reservations about the program. A third difficulty arises from the fact that the program is a relatively new correctional concept, and not enough information about its effects has been gathered to thoroughly understand its full impact.



## CHAPTER III

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

	Page
I. The Informal Programs	12
II. The Official Beginning	15
III. The Pilot Project	16
IV. The Guidelines For The Operation Of The Program	17
V. A First Evaluation And Further Recommendations	19
VI. The Program Expands	21

The Development Of The Community Service Program  
In British Columbia

I. THE INFORMAL PROGRAMS

Before an official community service program was established in B.C., the concept of community service was used informally by some courts and probation officers in the province<sup>1</sup>. It was used for young offenders, either with a probation order, or as part of a voluntary diversion program. Many jobs were available in the communities for these programs; the programs ran smoothly; the communities in which they operated responded favourably. These programs included work service such as community hall repairs, gardening for senior citizens, and clean-up campaigns in public places. A major problem limiting these programs was the lack of organization; the judges who assigned the community work service did not have the time themselves to do the necessary organizing involved with finding suitable work and providing supervision. In one area a probation officer was actually assigned to organize the community service work, and with this, the beginning of a community service program could be seen to be emerging in the province.

An interesting example of these early programs is the project undertaken in Nanaimo<sup>2</sup>. In the initial stages, two approaches to community work service were attempted. The first of these involved the use of probation officers to find suitable work and to supervise the program.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> This general information on the initial use of the community service concept is from Community Service Orders, S. Rocksborough-Smith, October 1974, a report to the Justice Development Commission.

<sup>2</sup> The information on the Nanaimo program is from correspondence between the Corrections Branch and three Nanaimo Probation Officers, R.A. Kissinger, D.R. Gerhardt, and D.A. Smuntan.

Because of their heavy workload the officers were unable to fulfill adequately this additional role. The second approach used supervision by private organizations. This was unsatisfactory; as an example, one of the offenders on the program stole from the supervisors.

It was decided that, to enable the program to run smoothly, a "Community Work Service Supervisor" was required. Funds were not available from the Corrections Service at that time, but aid was found in the form of a Special Needs worker from the local Human Resources office<sup>1</sup> who would coordinate the program as long as it was aimed at juveniles. In September 1974 the program was launched, with the new supervisor providing the tasks and the supervision. The probation officers recommended the number of hours of service, set up the first contact between the supervisor and the offender, acted as liaison officers between the community and the supervisor, and took action in cases where the participants were not performing as required.

The Nanaimo program ran for about six months with this organizational scheme. It worked very well and received good support from the community. Faced with the probability of losing the support from the Department of Human Resources, and wanting to expand the program to include adults as well as juveniles, the probation officers who were involved appealed to the Corrections Branch for aid. After considerable effort the program was continued when Nanaimo became one of the areas where the official Community Service Order pilot project was launched.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note that this first Community Work Service Supervisor, Mr. Stan Hyatt, has continued his work with the Corrections Branch and is now a Probation Officer in Prince George.

Another one of the early programs operated in Creston<sup>1</sup>. In pre-sentence reports, the probation office recommended community service for several young offenders. The court agreed to this and the offenders were assigned to work service by a court order. The work orders provided service for old age pensioners' homes, local community halls, and in some cases, for the victim of the offence. Supervision was provided by community agencies.

The program met with good response from the community, due in part to extensive favourable publicity from local newspapers. Several judges also indicated their approval of the community work service scheme. The only difficulty with the program was, as in Nanaimo, a lack of manpower for coordination and supervision.

Creston was not one of the designated pilot project areas for the official Community Service Order program, but when this program was expanded throughout the province<sup>2</sup>, Creston became an official C.S.O. center.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> J.L.R. Carriou, a Probation Officer in Creston, provided this information.

<sup>2</sup> See Page 21.

## II. THE OFFICIAL BEGINNING<sup>1</sup>

The development of community service as a sentencing alternative in the province was proposed as early as June 1970 at the B.C. Corrections Association Biennial Institute. The Association continued its discussions on this proposal over the next few years.

In February 1973 the B.C. Task Force on Correctional Services and Facilities recommended that a broad program of community service for adults and for juveniles be developed<sup>2</sup>. The Five Year Plan of the Corrections Branch<sup>3</sup> issued in February 1974 identified community work service as one of the programs which was being developed by the Branch as an alternative to issuing fines or sentencing to imprisonment.

Another step in the development of the program was a request by the Justice Development Commission that Mr. S. Rocksborough-Smith prepare a report describing the use of the program in Britain and recommending ways in which it could be applied to B.C. In November 1974 this report was presented at a meeting initiated by the Commission. This meeting endorsed the concept of community service and recommended that the program be developed on a pilot basis by the Community Corrections Division of the Attorney-General's Ministry. It was suggested that probation officers and Justice Council Coordinators should help to implement such a program, and that Justice Councils and volunteer groups should help to find suitable community projects in which to involve offenders.

\* \* \*

- 1 Some of the material on the history of Community Service in B.C. is from Community Service: A Correctional Alternative, September 1975, a report prepared by Dennis Kent and Dennis Hartman of the Corrections Branch.
- 2 Task Force On Correctional Services And Facilities, Ministry of the Attorney-General, February 1973, pp. 59-60, 137.
- 3 A Five Year Plan In Corrections, Ministry of the Attorney-General, Corrections Branch, February 1974, p. 6.

### III. THE PILOT PROJECT

The concept finally became a reality. A Community Service Supervisor was hired on a fee-for-service basis<sup>1</sup> for each of the nine pilot areas: Courtenay/Campbell River, New Westminster/Port Coquitlam, Nanaimo, Victoria, Vancouver, Abbotsford, Vernon, Prince George, and Prince Rupert. The pilot project was initiated in these areas during the months of December 1974 and January 1975.

An early assessment of the pilot project was made at a meeting of the Community Work Service Study Committee held in February 1975. Probation officers in each of the pilot project areas presented reports on how the program functioned in their respective areas. There were few difficulties in the program. Certain areas were discussed and some details were clarified. At this time, Dennis Hartman introduced an initial monitoring/assessment form, which was to be filled out at the completion of each work order by the offender's direct supervisor, and sent to the Program Evaluation and Data Systems section for analysis. At this meeting the form was modified and established as the standard method of reporting. There are four types of information categories on this assessment form: personal characteristics of the offender; the manner in which the offender was admitted to the program; the type of supervision; the type of work and whether or not it was completed satisfactorily.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> Community Service Supervisor positions are now being changed from a fee-for-service basis to permanent public service appointments.



#### IV. THE GUIDELINES FOR THE OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM

Staff workshops were held as the pilot project progressed. From these workshops and from the experience gained during the first several months of the program, a set of guidelines for community service gradually evolved. They were presented in a policy statement issued at the end of 1975<sup>1</sup>, and they provide a good description of the way in which the community service order program operates in B.C. In many respects it is the same as the British program upon which it is based, but there are some important differences between the two programs.

The first area covered by these guidelines is a statement of general principles. The community should be compensated for the offence through the work the offender performs as a result of his court order. From the offender's point of view, he is gaining a stake in the community by contributing to its well-being, and in restoring the mutual respect that was lost when he committed his offence. By having a stake in the community as well as respect from members of the community, the offender should (ideally) be less likely to commit subsequent offences.

As in the British program, the form taken by the community service order is to be a new type of probation order or an additional condition of a standard probation order. The community service is considered as an alternative to short prison terms.

Supervision of the offender can be carried out by a service club or other volunteer agency, by the Community Service Supervisor, or by the victim of the offence. Supervision by the victim is an innovative difference introduced in the British Columbia program.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> Policy Statement On Community Service Order Program, A.K.B. Sheridan, Executive Director of Community Services, December 12, 1975.

The selection of participants is to be based on a report by the probation officer regarding the offender's suitability and willingness to participate. This selection procedure is similar to that of the British program. However, in order to be eligible for the British program, offenders must be adults, while in British Columbia, provision is made for both adult and juvenile offenders.

The Probation Officer's role in the program is to increase court and community awareness of the program, to refer offenders to the program and report to the court on their suitability, to divert juveniles to the program through pre-court investigations, and to supervise Community Service Supervisors.

The role of the Community Service Supervisor is to locate suitable projects and arrange supervision of the offender's work.

The role of the victim in the program, in some cases, is to provide work for an order issued as a result of the offences committed, and if appropriate to supervise such tasks. The victim plays no direct role in the British program.

The role of the community is to provide tasks through volunteer agencies and in some cases to provide supervision.

The projects preferred are those in which the offender works with community volunteers rather than on his own (under some type of supervision).

The length of service order is a maximum of 200 hours within a six-month period for adults, and a maximum of 100 hours within a three-month period for juveniles. This differs from the stipulated length of 240 hours maximum during a twelve-month period in the British program.

V. A FIRST EVALUATION AND FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

After the Community Service Program pilot project had been operating for nine months, a preliminary evaluation was done in the autumn of 1975. In the program, 332 individuals participated during this period and 90 percent of these fully completed their service orders. Everyone involved in the program seemed pleased with its progress. Within the communities, the volunteer groups were very helpful in providing projects and supervision. As in the British experience, cooperation between the unions and the community service administrators prevented any major difficulties about the program being used to displace regular employees. Offenders felt worthwhile and involved as they helped others in their community.

One aspect of the program which was changed as a result of this evaluation was the element of restitution. Initially, the program was to provide restitution to the community, but since restitution involves an actual cash element, and the cash value of community service orders is difficult to assess, the element of restitution was eventually replaced by a more general concept of compensation. The program work is seen as a method of compensating the community for the damage which the offender has done by breaking the community's rules.

Additional recommendations<sup>1</sup> followed the pilot project evaluation. The program was to be expanded to all parts of the province. More Native Indians were also to be brought into the program (only 8 percent of the pilot project participants were Native Indians), especially as an alternative to fine in default sentences.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> These recommendations are from Community Services: A Correctional Alternative, p. 8.

Another recommendation dealt with the legal status of community service orders. At the present time community service for adults is authorized as a condition of a probation order under Section 663 (2)(h) of the Criminal Code:

(that the accused shall).....comply with such other reasonable conditions as the court considers desirable for securing the good conduct of the accused....

For Juveniles, the program conforms to Section 21 (g) of the Juvenile Delinquents Act:

(the court may).....impose upon the delinquent such further or other conditions as may be deemed advisable.

It has been recommended that provincial and federal legislation be drafted which would allow community service to be a separate disposition. These proposed changes in the program's legal status are based on the British legislation in the Criminal Justice Act of 1972<sup>1</sup>.

1

A more detailed discussion on the legal aspects of community service orders can be found in Briefing Paper: Development Of The Community Service Order In British Columbia, A. Thorvaldson, Ministry of the Attorney-General, February 1977.

VI. THE PROGRAM EXPANDS

As a result of these recommendations, the Correctional management Committee did expand the program to all major centers in the province. Specific objectives for the expanded program were set out for the fiscal year 1976/1977<sup>1</sup>: to reduce the number of short (three-month and less) prison sentences, especially for the fine in default prisoners; to reduce the number of probation orders over six-months for adults; to reduce the number of probation orders over three-months for juveniles; and to increase the feeling in the community that the justice system is dealing correctly with delinquents.

<sup>1</sup> An evaluation of the extent to which these objectives have been met will be included in Volume II of this report.



## CHAPTER IV

### A STATISTICAL DESCRIPTION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA'S COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDER PROGRAM

	Page
I. Introduction	24
II. Personal Information About the Participant	25
III. Offence Data	25
IV. Location Data	25
V. Admission Procedure	25
VI. Work Data	26
VII. Completion of the Work Order	26

A Statistical Description of British Columbia's  
Community Service Order Program

I. INTRODUCTION

At the end of each community service order, an assessment form is filled in by the probation officer or community service supervisor who has been in charge of that case. These forms are sent in to the Program Evaluation and Data Systems Section of the Corrections Branch in Victoria.

Brief statistical summaries of these assessment forms were compiled each month and appeared in the Corrections Branch Newsletter released by Information Services.

In May 1976 it was decided that all of the information contained on these forms was to be coded and placed on a computerized file. This procedure was implemented, and an analysis was done of the approximately 1,500 forms received from December 1, 1974 to May 31, 1976. The following statistical description of the Community Service Order program is a result of this initial analysis.

A second volume of this report, to be issued at a later date, will analyze the forms which have been sent in after May 31, 1976. There have been an additional 3,000 program completions from June 1, 1976 to May 31, 1977.

As there are some limitations to the form presently in use, a revised form is being devised.



II. PERSONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE PARTICIPANT

Age Group: Each participant is placed in an age group.

Juvenile/Adult: Each participant is classified as being either a juvenile or an adult.

Sex: The sex of each participant is coded.

Racial Origin: The racial origin of each participant is coded as either Native Indian or non-Native.

III. OFFENCE DATA

Offence: The offence of each participant in the program is coded. Those offences which account for less than one percent of the total are grouped together in an "other" category. Only one offence is coded for each admission. If there is more than one offence listed on the form, the one with the most counts is coded, or, if they have the same number of counts, the most serious is coded.

Multiple Counts/Offences: The total number of all counts of all offences listed is recorded.

IV. LOCATION DATA

Court Location: The court location at which the offender is admitted to the program is coded.

Region: Each admission is placed in one of the six Corrections Region codes, according to the court location.

V. ADMISSION PROCEDURE

Admission: Each participant is admitted by a Probation Officer Enquiry or by a Court Order.

Authority: Each admission by the Probation Officer Enquiry procedure is coded as being authorized by either a verbal or a written agreement. Each admission by the Court is coded as being authorized by a special probation order specifically for community service, or by a standard probation order with an additional clause for community service.

VI. WORK DATA

Type of Supervision: Each participant is coded as being supervised by the victim, by a community group, or by a probation officer or community service supervisor.

Type of Service: Each task is classified as being either for the victim or for the community.

Work Description: There are several categories into which the work is classified, e.g. park development, community recreation facility, etc.

Assigned Work Hours: The number of hours of work assigned in the service order is recorded and grouped.

VII. COMPLETION OF THE WORK ORDER

Completion: A yes or no is given as to whether or not the work order is completed.

Reasons for Incompletion: The reasons for work orders not being completed are classified as being the fault of the offender, or not the fault of the offender.

Types of Further Action: Further action on the order is coded as None, Returned to Court, or Breach of the Order.

Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program: Comments on the effectiveness of the program are coded as positive, negative, inconclusive or irrelevant.

Date: The date on which the form is completed in the field is coded.

## CHAPTER V

### A PROVINCIAL OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

	Page
I. Introduction	28
II. Who Is In The Program?	29
1. Juveniles/Adults and Age Group	29
2. Sex	31
3. Racial Origin	32
III. What Offences Do They Commit?	33
1. Offence	33
2. Multiple Counts/Offences	34
IV. How Are Admissions To The Program Made?	35
V. What Kind Of Work Are They Assigned?	36
1. Type of Supervision	36
2. Type of Service	37
3. Work Description	38
4. Assigned Work Hours	39
VI. How Do They Fare?	40
1. Completion of the Work Order	40
2. Type of Further Action	41
3. Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program	42
VII. Summary Of The Provincial Statistics	43

## A Provincial Overview of the Program

### I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter gives a provincial overview of the program. It describes the characteristics of participants in the program, what type of offences the participants have committed, how people are admitted to the program, what kind of work they are assigned, and how they fare.

At the end of the chapter is a summary of the provincial statistics.

## II. WHO IS IN THE PROGRAM?

The participants in the program can be described in terms of their age, sex, and racial origin.

### 1. Juveniles/Adults and Age Groups

Table I below shows how many participants are juveniles, how many are adults, and gives the age of the participants. Just over half (55.7%) of the total (1,459) are juveniles, and 44.3 percent are adults.

The most common age groups are those from 14 to 21 years. All together, participants in these groups account for 83.0 percent of the total.

It is interesting to compare this C.S.O. population with the total probation population of the Corrections System. In 1975, 39.0 percent of probation admissions were juveniles and 61.0 percent were adults. There are proportionately more juveniles admitted to the C.S.O. program than would be expected from examining these probation figures.

Of the total admissions to probation, 65.7 percent were in the age groups of 14 to 21 years.

TABLE 1

Program Participants by Juveniles/Adults and Age Group

AGE GROUP	Count	Percent
JUVENILES	812	55.7
9 Years	1	0.1
10 Years	1	0.1
11 Years	8	0.5
12 Years	27	1.9
13 Years	55	3.8
14 Years	164	11.2
15 Years	229	15.7
16 Years	321	22.0
Unknown	6	0.4
ADULTS	647	44.3
17 - 21 Years	498	34.1
22 - 24 Years	50	3.4
25 - 29 Years	40	2.7
30 - 34 Years	14	1.0
35 - 39 Years	11	0.8
40 - 49 Years	15	1.0
50 Years & Over	15	1.0
Unknown	4	0.3
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

2. Sex

Table 2 describes the participants by sex: 88.5 percent are males, 11.5 percent females. This is very close to the distribution by sex in the total admissions to probation; in 1975, 87.9 percent were males and 12.1 percent were females. There are slightly fewer females in the C.S.O. Program than would be expected from these probation figures.

Table 2

Program Participants by Sex

SEX	Count	Percent
Male	1,291	88.5
Female	168	11.5
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

3. Racial Origin

Table 3 shows the racial origin of the participants. This breakdown of racial origins describes a participant as Native Indian or non-Native. Native Indians account for 9.0 percent of the total. This is lower than would be expected from the probation figures, as 11.3 percent of admissions to probation in 1975 were Native Indians.

Table 3                      Program Participants by Racial Origin

RACIAL ORIGIN	Count	Percent
Native Indian	131	9.0
Non-Native	1,312	89.9
Unknown	16	1.1
TOTAL	1,459	100.0



### III. WHAT OFFENCES DO THEY COMMIT?

#### 1. Offence

The assessment forms give information about the type of offence which was committed by the people admitted to the program. If there is more than one offence given, it is coded as the offence with the most counts. For example, if the offence is listed on the form as 2 counts of "Mischief" and one count of "Theft Over \$200", it is coded as "Mischief". If there are equal counts of each offence it is coded as the first one listed, or the most serious offence. For example, 2 counts of "Break & Enter" and 2 counts of "Theft Under \$200" is coded as "Break & Enter".

Table 4 shows how many are admitted with each offence. The most common offences are "Theft Under \$200" and "Break & Enter", which together account for almost half (49.6 percent) of the admissions. The offences in the "Other Offences" category each account for less than 1.0 percent of the total.

This offence data is similar to the breakdown for probation admissions in 1975. Theft and related offences in this group also constitute the largest offence group, 44.7 percent of the total admissions.

TABLE 4. Program Participants by Offence

OFFENCE	COUNT	PERCENT
Causing a Disturbance -----	21	1.4
Public Mischief -----	28	1.9
Impaired Driving -----	29	2.0
Theft Over \$200 -----	79	5.4
Theft Under \$200 -----	398	27.3
Break & Enter -----	326	22.3
Possession of Stolen Property -----	57	3.9
Mischief -----	124	8.5
Breach of Narcotics Control Act for Possession -----	98	6.7
Breach of Government Liquor Act -----	54	3.7
Breach of Motor Vehicles Act -----	20	1.4
Other Offences -----	207	14.2
Unknown -----	18	1.2
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

## 2. Multiple Counts/Offences

From the assessment forms, there is also information about multiple counts or multiple offences. Table 5 below shows that almost all participants (86.4 percent) in the program are admitted with one count of one offence. For 7.3 percent of the participants, there are 2 counts of the same offence or 1 count each of 2 different offences. The higher multiple offence categories do not account for very many of the cases.

TABLE 5. Program Participants by  
Multiple Counts/Offences

MULTIPLE COUNTS/OFFENCES	COUNT	PERCENT
1 count of 1 offence	1,261	86.4
2 offences or 2 counts	106	7.3
3 offences or 3 counts	40	2.7
4 offences or 4 counts	9	0.6
5 offences or 5 counts	10	0.7
6 or more offences or counts	15	1.0
unknown	18	1.2
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

IV. HOW ARE ADMISSIONS TO THE PROGRAM MADE?

Table 6 shows how participants are admitted to the program. There are 36.2 percent of the total 1,459 admitted by a probation officer enquiry (POE). Most of these are admitted by a verbal rather than a written agreement. The other 63.8 percent are admitted by a court order. Most of these are admitted by a standard probation order rather than by a special probation order specifically for Community Service.

TABLE 6. Program Participants by  
Type of Admission

TYPE OF ADMISSION	COUNT	PERCENT
BY PROBATION OFFICER ENQUIRY	528	36.2
Verbal Agreement	393	26.9
Written Agreement	130	8.9
Unknown	5	0.3
BY COURT	931	63.8
Community Service Probation Order	59	4.0
Standard Probation Order	869	59.6
Unknown	3	0.2
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

V. WHAT KIND OF WORK ARE THEY ASSIGNED?

The type of work that is assigned to people on the program can be described by four characteristics: who supervises the work; who the work service is for; what the actual tasks are; and how many hours of work are assigned.

1. Type of Supervision

Table 7 describes the supervision of the work orders. A volunteer group from the community supervises most (65.9 percent) of the admissions. The remainder of the admissions are supervised by the victim, by a group and a community service supervisor, or by a group and the victim.

TABLE 7. Program Participants by  
Type of Supervision

TYPE OF SUPERVISION	COUNT	PERCENT
By Victim	49	3.4
By Volunteer Group	962	65.9
By C.S. Supervisor or Probation Officer	321	22.0
By Victim and Group	4	0.3
By Group and C.S. Supervisor or Probation Officer	115	7.9
Unknown	8	0.5
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

2. Type of Service

Table 8 shows that most of the participants are assigned work that is done for the community (94.7 percent). Work orders which are done for the victim of offences account for only 4.4 percent of all cases.

TABLE 8. Program Participants by  
Type of Service

TYPE OF SERVICE	COUNT	PERCENT
Service for Victim	64	4.4
Service for Community	1,382	94.7
Victim and Community	7	0.5
Unknown	6	0.4
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

### 3. Work Description

What type of tasks do these people on the program do for their community service work orders? Table 9 helps to answer this question. About half (52.4 percent) of the participants do work on projects for community and service agencies, in old folks' homes and day care centers, for example. Another 18.1 percent work in community recreational facilities such as community halls. A further 18.0 percent work in community parks. The remainder work at various other types of tasks. The "program assistance" category includes more specialized work involving the technical skills or expertise of the persons on the program. The "repair damage" category includes most of the work done for victims of offences, or other work done to repair damage resulting from the offence. There are a few cases in which the offender paid restitution to the victim of the offence.

TABLE 9.                    Program Participants by  
                                 Work Description

WORK DESCRIPTION	COUNT	PERCENT
Community Recreation Facility	264	18.1
Community and Service Agencies	764	52.4
Park Development and Manual Labour	262	18.0
Program Assistance	63	4.3
Repair Damage resulting from the Offence	20	1.4
For Victim but not directly related to Offence	59	4.0
Pay Restitution	6	0.4
Unknown	21	1.4
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

4. Assigned Work Hours

Table 10 below shows the number of work hours assigned to each participant in the program. Most of the assignments are for 20 hours of work or less; 24.0 percent of the work orders are for 1-10 hours, and 21.7 percent are for 11-20 hours. Few of the work orders are for more than 50 hours.

TABLE 10. Program Participants by  
Assigned Work Hours

ASSIGNED WORK HOURS	COUNT	PERCENT
1 - 10 hours	350	24.0
11 - 20 hours	316	21.7
21 - 30 hours	207	14.2
31 - 40 hours	197	13.5
41 - 50 hours	157	10.8
51 - 60 hours	47	3.2
61 - 70 hours	7	0.5
71 - 80 hours	34	2.3
81 - 90 hours	9	0.6
91 - 100 hours	87	6.0
101 - 199 hours	19	1.3
200 hours & over	8	0.5
Unknown	21	1.4
TOTAL	1,459	100.0
AVERAGE HOURS ASSIGNED PER ORDER	31.7	

## VI. HOW DO THEY FARE?

On the assessment forms, information is provided on whether or not the work orders are completed and what further action is taken. Also on the forms are comments about the program, made by the probation officer or community service supervisor.

### 1. Completion of the Work Order

Table 11 shows that 93.3 percent of the work orders given are completed. Only 98 of the orders are not completed; reasons for the incompletion are given. About half (50 of these 98) of the incomplete orders are not the fault of the person on the program. In some cases, too many hours of work are assigned in a given time period, making completion of the order impossible. In other cases, the person on the program becomes ill and cannot complete the hours. The other half of the incomplete work orders are the fault of the person on the program. In most of these cases this simply means that he or she refused to complete the work order.

TABLE 11. Program Participants by  
Completion of the Work Order

COMPLETION OF THE WORK ORDER	COUNT	PERCENT
YES (Completed)	1,361	93.3
NO (Not complete):	98	6.7
)No Fault of the Offender	50	3.4
REASON )Fault of the Offender	46	3.2
)Unknown	2	0.1
TOTAL	1,459	100.0



2. Type of Further Action

Table 12 below shows that for 90 percent of the participants no further action is taken after the community service program. Another 1.5 percent are referred back to the Court, and 1.2 percent are charged with a breach of the work order.

The fact that on 7.3 percent of the forms this space is not completed indicates that the probation officers and community service supervisors may not have understood what information is required. The revised assessment form will attempt to correct this situation.

TABLE 12                      Admissions to the Program by the  
                                    Type of Further Action

TYPE OF FURTHER ACTION	COUNT	PERCENT
Breach	17	1.2
Court	22	1.5
None	1,313	90.0
Unknown	107	7.3
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

3. Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program

Table 13 below indicates what type of comments are given by probation officer or community service supervisor.

On 77.5 percent of the forms the comments about the program are positive, that is , they indicate that the work is done in a satisfactory manner or that the program is satisfactory. In 6.2 percent of cases, the comments are negative, indicating that the work is not done well, or that the program is not satisfactory. Inconclusive comments appear on 6.4 percent of the forms: these are cases in which both negative and positive comments are given. Four percent of the forms give irrelevant information in the comments section. This section of the form will be rewritten on the revised assessment form.

TABLE 13. Program Participants by Comments  
on the Effectiveness of the Program

COMMENTS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM	COUNT	PERCENT
Negative	91	6.2
Irrelevant	58	4.0
Inconclusive	94	6.4
Positive	1,130	77.5
None	86	5.9
TOTAL	1,459	100.0

## VII. SUMMARY OF THE PROVINCIAL STATISTICS

1. Juveniles/Adults: Juveniles account for 55.7 percent of participants in the C.S.O. program; adults account for the remaining 44.3 percent.
2. Age Group: Participants in the age groups of 14 to 21 years account for 83.0 percent.
3. Sex: 88.5 percent of the participants are male; 11.5 percent are female.
4. Racial Origin: Native Indians account for 9.0 percent of all participants.
5. Offence: "Theft Under \$200" and "Break & Enter" offences account for 49.6 percent of all cases.
6. Multiple Counts/Offences: Only 12.4 percent of program participants have multiple offences or multiple counts of offences.
7. Type of Admission: 36.2 percent of the admissions to the program are by probation officer enquiry; most of these are via a verbal agreement rather than a written agreement. The other 63.8 percent are admitted by the court, most of these are via a standard probation order rather than a special community service probation order.
8. Type of Service: Almost all (94.7 percent) of the participants are assigned to work for the community rather than for the victim.
9. Type of Supervision: Supervision of 65.9 percent of the work orders is done by community volunteer groups; 22.0 percent is by the community service supervisor or probation officer.

10. Work Description: Approximately half (52.4 percent) of the work orders are assigned work in a community or service agency; another 36.1 percent of the orders are for work on community recreation facilities, and park development or manual labour.

11. Assigned Work Hours: Most of the participants (84.2 percent) are assigned orders of 50 hours or less. The average order is for 31.7 hours.

12. Completion of the Work Order: 93.3 percent of the work orders are completed. Of the 6.7 percent that are not completed, half of these are incomplete through no fault of the offender.

13. Type of Further Action: 90.0 percent of the orders require no further action.

14. Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program: The comments on the effectiveness of the program are of a positive nature in 77.5 percent of all cases.

## CHAPTER VI

### A REGIONAL PICTURE OF THE PROGRAM

	Page
I. Introduction	46
II. Regional Distribution	47
III. Court Location Distribution For Each Region	48
IV. Who Is In The Program In Each Region?	51
1. Juveniles/Adults and Age Group	51
2. Sex	54
3. Racial Origin	55
V. What Offences Do They Commit?	56
1. Offence	56
2. Multiple Counts/Offences	59
VI. How Is Admission To The Program Made?	61
VII. What Kind Of Work Are They Assigned?	64
1. Type of Supervision	64
2. Type of Service	66
3. Work Description	67
4. Assigned Work Hours	70
VIII. How Do They Fare?	72
1. Completion of the Work Order	72
2. Type of Further Action	73
3. Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program	74
IX. Summary of the Regional Statistics	76
1. Vancouver Island	76
2. Vancouver	78
3. Interior	80
4. South Fraser	82
5. Northern	84
6. North Fraser	86

## A REGIONAL PICTURE OF THE PROGRAM

### I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a description of the data by the six Corrections regions in the province: Vancouver Island, Vancouver, Interior, South Fraser, Northern and North Fraser.

It should be noted that by May of 1976 the program had just begun in some regions.

This regional picture includes a description of the data by court locations, by who is in the program, the offences for which they are admitted, how they are admitted, what kind of work they are assigned, and how they fare. The basis of the analysis is a comparison of each of the regions with the provincial average.

The summary at the end of the chapter gives the highlights of the program in each region.

## II. REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Table 14 shows the distribution of the program participants among the six Corrections regions.

Almost half of the admissions are in the Vancouver Island region, and another 25 percent are in the South Fraser region. The other four regions each have between 5 and 10 percent of the total.

It is interesting to compare the regional distribution of the C.S.O. program with the regional distribution of the total probation admissions in 1975, which appears in the last column of the table. The Northern and North Fraser regions have the proportion of C.S.O. participants that would be expected on the basis of the proportion of probation admissions which occur in those regions. The Vancouver and Interior regions should have a higher proportion of the C.S.O. admissions, and the Island and South Fraser regions should reflect a lower proportion of the C.S.O. admissions. Some of these discrepancies reflect the degree to which the program had been developed in these regions up to May 1976.

TABLE 14. Program Participants by Region

CORRECTIONS REGION	C.S.O. PROGRAM ADMISSIONS		ALL PROBATION ADMISSIONS IN 1975
	COUNT	PERCENT	PERCENT
Vancouver Island	672	46.0	20.0
Vancouver	74	5.1	18.7
Interior	111	7.6	23.0
South Fraser	365	25.0	17.9
Northern	134	9.2	10.6
North Fraser	103	7.1	9.9
PROVINCIAL TOTAL	1,459	100.0	100.0

### III. COURT LOCATION DISTRIBUTION FOR EACH REGION

Tables 15 to 20 list the court locations where admissions to the program occur. There is a table for each region. These tables give an indication of where the program was operating by May 1976.

In the Vancouver Island region, Victoria accounts for over half the participants. Nanaimo and Courtenay/Campbell River account for the other half.

Almost all (91.9 percent) of the program participants in the Vancouver region are in the court location of Vancouver.

In the Interior region, Vernon, Creston, Kimberley and Cranbrook together account for 74.7 percent of the program participants.

Chilliwack accounts for half the participants in the South Fraser region, while Mission and Matsqui account for an additional 35.9 percent.

In the Northern region, Prince Rupert accounts for 87.3 percent of the participants in the program.

New Westminster, Coquitlam, and Burnaby together account for 82.5 percent of the North Fraser region's program participants.

TABLE 15. Program Participants in the Vancouver Island Region  
by Court Location

COURT LOCATION	COUNT	PERCENT
Victoria	356	53.0
Courtenay/Campbell River	164	24.4
Nanaimo	152	22.6
REGIONAL TOTAL	672	100.0



TABLE 16. Program Participants in the Vancouver Region  
by Court Location

COURT LOCATION	COUNT	PERCENT
Vancouver	68	91.9
West Vancouver	5	6.8
North Vancouver	1	1.4
REGIONAL TOTAL	74	100.0

TABLE 17. Program Participants in the Interior Region  
by Court Location

COURT LOCATION	COUNT	PERCENT
Cranbrook	12	10.8
Creston	25	22.5
Fernie	8	7.2
Golden	6	5.4
Invermere	2	1.8
Kelowna	4	3.6
Kimberley	18	16.2
Merritt	1	0.9
Penticton	1	0.9
Salmo	1	0.9
Vernon	28	25.2
100 Mile House	4	3.6
Williams Lake	1	0.9
REGIONAL TOTAL	111	100.0

TABLE 18. Program Participants in the South Fraser Region  
by Court Location

COURT LOCATION	COUNT	PERCENT
Abbotsford	20	5.5
Chilliwack	187	51.2
Langley	21	5.8
Matsqui	58	15.9
Mission	73	20.0
Surrey	6	1.6
REGIONAL TOTAL	365	100.0

TABLE 19. Program Participants in the Northern Region  
by Court Location

COURT LOCATION	COUNT	PERCENT
Fort St. James	1	0.7
Prince George	16	11.9
Prince Rupert	117	87.3
REGIONAL TOTAL	134	100.0

TABLE 20. Program Participants in the North Fraser Region  
by Court Location

COURT LOCATION	COUNT	PERCENT
Burnaby	16	15.5
Coquitlam	27	26.2
Maple Ridge	12	11.6
New Westminster	42	40.8
Port Coquitlam	6	5.8
REGIONAL TOTAL	103	100.0

#### IV. WHO IS IN THE PROGRAM IN EACH REGION?

##### 1. Juveniles/Adults and Age Group

Table 21 shows the regional distribution for juveniles and adults. The provincial average shows that 55.7 percent of all admissions to the program are juveniles. Juveniles comprise a higher proportion than this in the Interior, South Fraser, and North Fraser regions, and a lower proportion than this in the Vancouver and Northern regions. The Vancouver region particularly has almost no juveniles in the program (as of June 1, 1976).

It follows that the Interior, South Fraser, and North Fraser regions also have a lower proportion of adults than the provincial average of 44.3 percent. The Vancouver and Northern regions have a higher proportion than this provincial average.

There is more detailed description of the juvenile and adult program participants in the next chapter.

Table 21 also gives the breakdown for each age group. For the 11 to 13-year olds, there are more than the provincial average in the South Fraser and North Fraser regions, and fewer in the Vancouver, Interior, and Northern regions. For the 14 and 15-year olds, there are more than the provincial average in the Island and North Fraser regions, and fewer in the Vancouver region. For 16-year olds, there are more than the provincial average in the Interior and South Fraser regions, and fewer in the Vancouver, Northern, and North Fraser regions.

In the 17 to 21-year group, there are more than the provincial average in the Vancouver and Northern regions, and fewer in the Island and North Fraser regions. In the 22 to 24-year group, there are more than the provincial average in the Island and Vancouver regions, and

fewer in the South Fraser and North Fraser regions. In the 25 to 29-year group, there are more than the provincial average in the Vancouver region, and fewer in the Interior, South Fraser, and North Fraser regions. There are more than the provincial average in the Vancouver region for the 30 to 39-year and the 50-years-and-over groups. Other than this over-representation in the Vancouver region, the distribution is quite close to the provincial average for all regions in the age groups of 30-years-and-over.

TABLE 21

## Program Participants by Region and by Juveniles/Adults and Age Group

AGE GROUP	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
JUVENILES		388 47.8 57.7	3 0.4 4.0	69 8.5 62.2	227 28.0 62.2	57 7.0 42.5	68 8.4 66.0	812 55.7
9 Years	1 100.0 0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 0.1
10 Years	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 100.0 1.0	1 0.1
11 Years	—	—	—	—	7 87.5 1.9	—	1 12.5 1.0	8 0.5
12 Years	13 48.1 1.9	—	1 3.7 0.9	10 37.0 2.7	—	3 11.1 2.9	—	27 1.9
13 Years	26 47.3 3.9	—	2 3.6 1.8	19 34.5 5.2	3 5.5 2.2	5 9.1 4.9	—	55 3.8
14 Years	87 53.0 12.9	—	11 6.7 9.9	37 22.6 10.1	15 9.1 11.2	14 8.5 13.6	—	164 11.2
15 Years	116 50.7 17.3	1 0.4 1.4	17 7.4 15.3	54 23.6 14.8	18 7.9 13.4	23 10.0 22.3	—	229 15.7
16 Years	144 44.8 21.4	1 0.3 1.4	38 11.8 34.2	99 30.8 27.1	21 6.5 15.7	18 5.6 17.5	—	321 22.0
Unknown	1 16.7 0.1	1 16.7 1.4	—	1 16.7 0.3	—	3 50.0 2.9	—	6 0.4
ADULTS		284 43.9 42.3	71 11.0 95.9	42 6.5 37.8	138 21.3 37.8	77 11.9 57.5	35 5.4 34.0	647 44.3
17 - 21 Years	197 39.6 29.3	43 8.6 58.1	37 7.4 33.3	127 25.5 34.8	66 13.2 49.2	28 5.6 27.2	—	498 34.1
22 - 24 Years	31 62.0 4.6	4 8.0 5.4	4 8.0 3.6	5 10.0 1.4	4 8.0 3.0	2 4.0 1.9	—	50 3.4
25 - 29 Years	23 57.5 3.4	10 25.0 13.5	—	2 5.0 0.5	4 10.0 3.0	2 2.5 1.0	—	40 2.7
30 - 34 Years	10 71.4 1.5	2 14.3 2.7	—	1 7.1 0.3	1 7.1 0.7	—	—	14 1.0
35 - 39 Years	3 27.3 0.4	5 45.5 6.8	—	2 18.2 0.5	—	1 9.1 1.0	—	11 0.8
40 - 49 Years	11 73.3 1.6	1 6.7 1.4	—	—	2 13.3 1.5	1 6.7 1.0	—	15 1.0
50 Years & Over	9 60.0 1.3	5 33.3 6.8	1 6.7 0.9	—	—	—	—	15 1.0
Unknown	1 —	25.0 1.4	—	1 25.0 0.3	—	2 50.0 1.9	—	4 0.3
TOTAL		672 46.0	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.0	1459

## 2. Sex

Table 22 gives a regional sex breakdown. For the province as a whole there are 88.5 percent male participants in the program and 11.5 percent female. There are more males and fewer females than the provincial average in the Interior, South Fraser, and North Fraser regions. There are fewer males and more females than the provincial average in the Vancouver and Island regions.

TABLE 22. Program Participants by Region and by Sex

SEX	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
Male		579 44.8 <u>86.2</u>	62 4.8 <u>83.8</u>	104 8.1 <u>93.7</u>	334 25.9 <u>91.5</u>	122 9.5 <u>91.0</u>	90 7.0 87.4	1291 <u>88.5</u>
Female		73 55.4 <u>13.8</u>	12 7.1 <u>16.2</u>	7 4.2 <u>6.3</u>	31 18.5 <u>8.5</u>	12 7.1 <u>9.0</u>	13 7.7 12.6	168 <u>11.5</u>
TOTAL		672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1459

### 3. Racial Origin

Table 23 gives a regional breakdown by racial origin.

Nine percent of the program participants in the province are Native Indians. There are more than this provincial average in the Northern region. There are fewer than this provincial average in the Vancouver, Interior, South Fraser, and North Fraser regions.

TABLE 23. Program Participants by  
Region and by Racial Origin

RACIAL ORIGIN	Count Row % Col.%	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
Native Indian		55	2	6	15	50	3	131
		42.0	1.5	4.6	11.5	38.2	2.3	9.0
		8.2	<u>2.7</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>37.3</u>	<u>2.9</u>	
Other		615	72	103	346	84	92	1312
		46.9	5.5	7.8	26.4	6.4	7.0	89.9
		91.5	97.3	92.8	94.8	62.7	89.3	
Unknown		2	—	2	4	—	8	16
		12.5		12.5	25.0		50.0	1.1
		0.3		1.8	1.1		7.8	
TOTAL		672	74	111	365	134	103	1,459
		46.1	5.1	7.6	25.0	9.2	7.1	

V. WHAT OFFENCES DO THEY COMMIT?

1. Offence:

Table 24 gives a regional breakdown by offence for the 1,459 participants.

"Causing a Disturbance" accounts for 1.4 percent of the provincial cases. The percentage is greater in the Vancouver region and lesser in the Interior region.

"Public Mischief" accounts for 1.9 percent of the participants in the province. The percentage is greater in the Vancouver region. There are no admissions with this offence in the Northern and North Fraser regions.

"Impaired Driving" accounts for 2.0 percent of the cases in the province. There are no admissions with this offence in the Vancouver, Interior, and North Fraser regions.

"Theft Over \$200" accounts for 5.4 percent of the program participants in the province. The percentage is greater in the North Fraser region and lesser in the Vancouver and South Fraser regions.

"Theft Under \$200" accounts for 27.3 percent of the cases in the province. The percentage is greater in the Interior region and lesser in the South Fraser and Northern regions.

"Break & Enter" accounts for 22.3 percent of the program participants in the province. The percentage is lower in the Vancouver region.

"Possession of Stolen Property" accounts for 3.9 percent of the cases in the province. There is a higher percentage in the Northern region.



"Mischief" accounts for 8.5 percent of the program participants in the province. There is a higher percentage in the South Fraser region. There is a lesser percentage in the Island, Northern, and North Fraser regions.

"Breach of the N.C.A. (Narcotic Control Act) for Possession" accounts for 6.7 percent of the program participants in the province. The percentage is higher in the Northern and North Fraser regions and lesser in the Vancouver and Interior regions.

"Breach of the G.L.A. (Government Liquor Act)" accounts for 3.7 percent of the program participants in the province. The percentage is higher in the South Fraser and North Fraser regions and lower in the Vancouver and Interior regions.

"Breach of M.V.A. (Motor Vehicle Act)" accounts for 1.4 percent of the cases in the province. The percentage is lower in the South Fraser region, and there are no cases with this offence in the Vancouver region.

TABLE 24

Program Participants By Region And By Offence

OFFENCE	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
Causing a Disturbance	12 57.1 1.8	3 14.3 4.1	—	3 14.3 0.8	2 9.5 1.5	1 4.8 1.0	21 1.4	
Public Mischief	13 46.4 1.9	7 25.0 9.5	3 10.7 2.7	5 17.9 1.4	—	—	28 1.9	
Impaired Driving	22 75.9 3.3	—	—	3 10.3 0.8	4 13.8 3.0	—	29 2.0	
Theft Over \$200	43 54.4 6.4	2 2.5 2.7	6 7.6 5.4	9 11.4 2.5	5 6.3 3.7	14 17.7 13.6	79 5.4	
Theft Under \$200	205 51.5 30.5	21 5.3 28.4	45 11.3 40.5	70 17.6 19.2	29 7.3 21.6	28 7.0 27.2	398 27.3	
Break & Enter	157 48.2 23.4	8 2.5 10.8	26 8.0 23.4	83 25.5 22.7	32 9.8 23.9	20 6.1 19.4	326 22.3	
Possession of Stolen Property	19 33.3 2.8	3 5.3 4.1	3 5.3 2.7	14 24.6 3.8	15 26.3 11.2	3 5.3 2.9	57 3.9	
Mischief	29 23.4 4.3	6 4.8 8.1	6 4.8 5.4	73 58.9 20.0	5 4.0 3.7	5 4.0 4.9	124 8.5	
Breach Narcotics Control Act - Possession	41 41.8 6.1	2 2.0 2.7	2 2.0 1.8	30 30.6 8.2	12 12.2 9.0	11 11.2 10.7	98 6.7	
Breach Government Liquor Act	21 38.9 3.1	1 1.9 1.4	1 1.9 0.9	19 35.2 5.2	6 11.1 4.5	6 11.1 5.8	54 3.7	
Breach Motor Vehicles Act	14 70.0 2.1	—	1 5.0 0.9	2 10.0 0.5	1 5.0 0.7	2 10.0 1.9	20 1.4	
All Other Offences	87 42.0 12.9	21 10.1 28.4	18 8.7 16.2	50 24.2 13.7	21 10.1 15.7	10 4.8 9.7	207 14.2	
Unknown	9 50.0 1.3	—	—	4 22.2 1.1	2 11.1 1.5	3 16.7 2.9	18 1.2	
TOTAL	672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1459	

## 2. Multiple Counts/Offences

Table 25 gives a regional breakdown by multiple counts and offences.

There are 86.4 percent of the program participants in the province with one count of one offence. The percentage is greater in the Northern region and lower in the North Fraser region.

Those participants in the province with two counts of one offence or one count each of two different offences account for 7.3 percent. The percentage is greater in the Vancouver and North Fraser regions and lesser in the Northern region.

Participants with a total of three counts in the province account for 2.7 percent. The percentage is greater in the North Fraser region and lesser in the Northern region.

Participants with a total of four counts in the province account for 0.6 percent. There are no admissions with four counts in the Vancouver and Northern regions.

Participants with a total of five counts in the province account for 0.7 percent. All regions are quite close to this provincial average.

Program participants with a total of six or more counts in the province account for 1.0 percent. The percentage is higher in the South Fraser and North Fraser regions. There are no participants in this group in the Northern region.

TABLE 25

Program Participants by Region  
and by Multiple Counts/Offences

MULTIPLE COUNTS/ OFFENCES	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
1 count of 1 offence		591 46.9 87.9	63 5.0 85.1	99 7.9 89.2	313 24.8 85.8	125 9.0 93.3	70 5.6 68.0	1261 86.4
2 counts/offences		40 37.7 6.0	7 6.6 9.5	6 5.7 5.4	33 31.1 9.0	5 4.7 3.7	15 14.2 14.6	106 7.3
3 counts/offences		19 47.5 2.8	2 5.0 2.7	3 7.5 2.7	4 10.0 1.1	1 2.5 0.7	11 27.5 10.7	40 2.7
4 counts/offences		5 55.6 0.7	— — —	1 11.1 0.9	2 22.2 0.5	— — —	1 11.1 1.0	9 0.6
5 counts/offences		4 40.0 0.6	1 10.0 1.4	1 10.0 0.9	2 20.0 0.5	1 10.0 0.7	1 10.0 1.0	10 0.7
6 or more counts/offences		4 26.7 0.6	1 6.7 1.4	1 6.7 0.9	7 46.7 1.9	— — —	2 13.3 1.9	15 1.0
Unknown		9 50.0 1.3	— — —	— — —	4 22.2 1.1	2 11.1 1.5	3 16.7 2.9	18 1.2
TOTAL		672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1459

## VI. HOW IS ADMISSION TO THE PROGRAM MADE?

Table 26 gives a regional breakdown by type of admission.

In the province as a whole, 36.2 percent of the participants in the program are admitted by a P.O.E. (Probation Officer Enquiry). The percentage is greater in the South Fraser and North Fraser regions and is lesser in the Vancouver, Interior, and Northern regions.

Any admission to the program by a P.O.E. is through either a verbal agreement or a written agreement. In the province as a whole, 26.9 percent of admissions are by a verbal agreement. The percentage is greater in the South Fraser region and lesser in the Vancouver, Northern and North Fraser regions.

In the province as a whole 8.9 percent of all admissions are by written agreement. The percentage is greater in the South Fraser and North Fraser regions and lesser in the Island region. There are no admissions by written agreement in the Vancouver, Interior and Northern regions.

In the province as a whole, the other 63.8 percent of the admissions are by a probation order. The percentage is greater in the Vancouver, Interior, and Northern regions, and lesser in the South Fraser and North Fraser regions.

A probation order by which an admission to the program is made can be of one of two types, either a special community service probation order or a standard probation order. In the province as a whole, 4.0 percent of all admissions to the program are by a special community service probation order. The percentage is greater in the Interior and South Fraser regions and lesser in the North Fraser region.

In the province as a whole, 59.6 percent of the admissions to the program are by a standard probation order. The percentage is greater in the Vancouver and Northern regions and lesser in the South Fraser and North Fraser regions.

TABLE 26

Program Participants by Region and by Type of Admission

TYPE OF ADMISSION	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
By Probation Officer Enquiry	216 40.9 32.1	4 0.8 5.4	30 5.7 27.0	219 41.5 60.0	8 1.5 6.0	51 9.6 49.5	528 36.2	
Verbal Agreement	185 47.1 27.5	4 1.0 5.4	30 7.6 27.0	145 36.9 39.7	8 2.0 6.0	21 5.3 20.4	393 26.9	
Written Agreement	27 20.8 4.0	— — —	— — —	73 56.2 20.0	— — —	30 23.1 29.1	130 8.9	
Unknown	2 50.0 0.3	— — —	— — —	1 25.0 0.3	— — —	1 25.0 1.0	4 0.3	
By Court	456 49.0 67.9	70 7.5 94.6	81 8.7 73.0	146 15.7 40.0	126 13.5 94.0	52 5.6 50.5	931 63.8	
Community Service Probation Order	20 33.9 3.0	3 5.1 4.1	6 10.2 5.4	22 37.3 6.0	6 10.2 4.5	2 3.4 1.9	59 4.0	
Standard Probation Order	436 50.2 64.9	67 7.7 90.5	75 8.6 67.6	122 14.0 33.4	120 13.8 89.6	49 5.6 47.6	869 59.6	
Unknown	2 50.0 0.3	— — —	— — —	2 50.0 0.5	— — —	— — —	4 0.3	
TOTAL	672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1459	

## VII. WHAT KIND OF WORK ARE THEY ASSIGNED?

### 1. Type of Supervision

Table 27 gives a regional breakdown of program participants by type of supervision. There is considerable regional variation in supervision.

In the province as a whole, 3.4 percent of all cases are supervised by the victim. The percentage is greater in the Interior and South Fraser regions and lesser in the Island and Vancouver regions. There are no cases supervised by the victim in the Northern and North Fraser regions.

In the province as a whole, 65.9 percent of all participants are supervised by a volunteer group. The percentage is greater in the Vancouver region and lesser in the Northern and North Fraser regions.

In the province as a whole, 22.0 percent of all cases are supervised by the community service supervisor or probation officer. The percentage is greater in the Northern and North Fraser regions and lesser in the Vancouver, Interior, and South Fraser regions.

In the Province as a whole, only 0.3 percent of all participants are supervised by the victim together with a volunteer group. There are no participants with this type of supervision in the Island, Vancouver, Interior or North Fraser regions.

In the province as a whole, 7.0 percent of all cases are supervised by a volunteer group together with the C.S. supervisor or probation officer. The percentage is greater in Vancouver, Interior and Northern regions and lesser in the Island and North Fraser regions.



TABLE 27

Program Participants by Region  
and by Type of Supervision

TYPE OF SUPERVISION	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
By Victim	14 28.6 <u>2.1</u>	1 2.0 <u>1.4</u>	13 26.5 <u>11.7</u>	21 42.9 <u>5.8</u>	—	—	49 <u>3.4</u>	
By Volunteer Group	503 52.3 74.9	59 6.1 <u>79.7</u>	65 6.8 58.6	259 26.9 71.0	39 4.1 <u>29.1</u>	37 3.8 <u>35.9</u>	962 <u>65.9</u>	
By Community Service Supervisor or Probation Officer	123 38.3 18.3	5 1.6 <u>6.8</u>	10 3.1 <u>9.0</u>	46 14.3 <u>12.6</u>	76 23.7 <u>56.7</u>	61 19.0 <u>59.2</u>	321 <u>22.0</u>	
By Victim and Group	—	—	—	3 75.0 0.8	1 25.0 0.7	—	4 <u>0.3</u>	
By Group and C.S. Supervisor or Probation Officer	25 21.7 3.7	9 7.8 <u>12.2</u>	23 20.0 <u>20.7</u>	36 31.3 9.9	18 15.7 <u>13.4</u>	4 3.5 <u>3.9</u>	115 <u>7.9</u>	
Unknown	7 87.5 1.0	—	—	—	—	1 12.5 1.0	8 0.5	
TOTAL	672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1459	

## 2. Type of Work Service

Table 28 gives a regional breakdown by type of service.

In the province as a whole, 4.4 percent of the participants in the program do service for the victim. The percentage is greater in the Interior and South Fraser regions, and lesser in the Island and Vancouver regions.

Almost all (94.7 percent) participants in the program in the province as a whole do service for the community. This percentage is about the same in every region.

In the province as a whole, 0.5 percent of all cases do service for the victim and for the community. The percentage is greater in the Northern region. There is no service for the victim and community in the Island, Vancouver, Interior, and North Fraser regions.

TABLE 28. Admissions to the Program by  
Region and by Type of Service

TYPE OF SERVICE	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
Service to Victim		15 23.4 <u>2.2</u>	1 1.6 <u>1.4</u>	14 21.9 <u>12.6</u>	25 39.1 <u>6.8</u>	4 6.3 3.0	5 7.8 4.9	64 <u>4.4</u>
Service to Community		651 47.1 96.9	73 5.3 98.6	97 7.0 87.4	337 24.4 92.3	126 9.1 94.0	98 7.1 95.1	1,382 94.7
Service to both Victim & Community		—	—	—	3 42.9 0.8	4 57.1 <u>3.0</u>	—	7 <u>0.5</u>
Unknown		6 100.0 0.0	—	—	—	—	—	6 0.4
TOTAL		672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1,459

### 3. Work Description

Table 29 gives a regional breakdown by a detailed description of the work. There is a wide regional variation in these categories.

"Work for a community recreation facility" is assigned to 18.1 percent of the program participants in the province. The percentage is greater in the Interior and South Fraser regions and lesser in the Island, Vancouver, and North Fraser regions.

"Work for community and service agencies" accounts for about half (52.4 percent) of the cases in the province. The percentage is greater in the Island, Vancouver and North Fraser regions and lesser in the Interior and South Fraser regions.

"Park development and manual labour" work is assigned to 18.0 percent of the program participants in the province. The percentage is greater in the South Fraser and Northern regions and lesser in the Vancouver and North Fraser regions.

"Technical and program assistance" work is assigned to a relatively small number of cases, only 4.3 percent in the province. The percentage is greater in Vancouver, Interior and North Fraser regions and lesser in the South Fraser region.

"Repairing damage done as a result of the offence" was assigned to only 1.4 percent of the program participants in the province. The percentage is greater in the South Fraser region and lesser in the Island region. There are no participants in this group in the other four regions.

Four percent of the cases in the province are assigned to "Work for the victim, but not directly related to the offence". The percentage is greater in the Interior, South Fraser and Northern

regions and lesser in the Island and Vancouver regions.

There are only six (0.4 percent) cases in the program who are assigned to "Pay restitution". These occur in the Island and Interior regions.

TABLE 29

Program Participants by Region and by Work Description

WORK DESCRIPTION	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
Community Recreation Facility	65 24.6 9.7	5 1.9 6.8	34 12.9 30.6	128 48.5 35.1	25 9.5 18.7	7 2.7 6.8	264 18.1	
Community & Service Agencies	442 57.9 65.8	50 6.5 67.6	34 4.5 30.6	105 13.7 28.8	64 8.4 47.8	69 9.0 67.0	764 52.4	
Park Development & Manual Labour	110 42.0 16.4	4 1.5 5.4	20 7.6 18.0	84 32.1 23.0	31 11.8 23.1	13 5.0 12.6	262 18.0	
Program or Technical Assistance	23 36.5 3.4	14 22.2 18.9	9 14.3 8.1	4 6.3 1.1	5 7.9 3.7	8 12.7 7.8	63 4.3	
Repair Damage Resulting from Offence	1 5.0 0.1	— — —	— — —	19 95.0 5.2	— — —	— — —	20 1.4	
Work for Victim but not directly related to Offence	10 16.9 1.5	1 1.7 1.4	12 20.3 10.8	23 39.0 6.3	8 13.6 6.0	5 8.5 4.9	59 4.0	
Pay Restitution	4 66.7 0.6	— — —	2 33.3 1.8	— — —	— — —	— — —	6 0.4	
Unknown	17 81.0 2.5	— — —	— — —	2 9.5 0.5	1 4.8 0.7	1 4.8 1.0	21 1.4	
TOTAL	672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1459	

#### 4. Assigned Work Hours

Table 30 gives the regional distribution of participants in the program by the number of hours of work which is assigned.

In the province as a whole, 24.0 percent is assigned 1 to 10 hours of work. The percentage is greater in the Northern region and lesser in the Vancouver region.

The participants which are assigned 11 to 20 hours of work account for 21.7 percent in the province. The percentage is greater in the South Fraser, Northern and North Fraser regions and lesser in the Vancouver region.

There is 14.2 percent of the cases in the province assigned 21 to 30 hours, and this percentage is the same in all regions.

In the province as a whole, there is 13.5 percent of all cases which are assigned 31 to 40 hours of work. The percentage is greater in the North Fraser region and lesser in the Vancouver and Northern regions.

There are 41 to 50 hours assigned to 10.8 percent of the participants in the province. The percentage is greater in the Vancouver and Interior regions and lesser in the North Fraser region.

There is only 14.4 percent of all cases in the province assigned more than 50 hours of work. It is interesting to note that 25.7 percent of the cases in the Vancouver region are assigned 91 to 100 hours, whereas the provincial average in this category is only 6.0 percent.

In the last row of Table 30 are the average number of work hours for each region and for the province. The Vancouver region has a much higher number (58.0 hours) than the provincial average of 31.7 hours. The average work hours in the Northern and North Fraser regions are lower than this provincial figure.

TABLE 30

## Program Participants by Region and by Assigned Work Hours

ASSIGNED WORK HOURS	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
01 - 10 Hours		117 42.0 21.9	4 1.1 5.4	31 8.9 27.9	95 27.1 26.0	53 15.1 39.6	20 5.7 19.4	350 24.0
11 - 20 Hours		113 35.8 16.8	4 1.3 5.4	20 6.3 18.0	111 35.1 30.4	37 11.7 27.6	31 9.8 30.1	316 21.7
21 - 30 Hours		109 52.7 16.2	12 5.8 16.2	14 6.8 12.6	44 21.3 12.1	15 7.2 11.2	13 6.3 12.6	207 14.2
31 - 40 Hours		111 56.3 16.5	4 2.0 5.4	14 7.1 12.6	34 17.3 9.3	8 4.1 6.0	26 13.2 25.2	197 13.5
41 - 50 Hours		60 38.2 8.9	22 14.0 29.7	22 14.0 19.8	34 21.7 9.3	12 7.6 9.0	7 4.5 6.8	157 10.8
51 - 60 Hours		30 63.8 4.5	1 2.1 1.4	3 6.4 2.7	10 21.3 2.7	2 4.3 1.5	1 2.1 1.0	47 3.2
61 - 70 Hours		5 71.4 0.7	— — —	— — —	1 14.3 0.3	1 14.3 0.7	— — —	7 0.5
71 - 80 Hours		19 55.9 2.8	4 11.8 5.4	2 5.9 1.8	4 11.8 1.1	1 2.9 0.7	4 11.8 3.9	34 2.3
81 - 90 Hours		8 88.9 1.2	— — —	— — —	1 11.1 0.3	— — —	— — —	9 0.6
91 - 100 Hours		39 44.8 5.8	19 21.8 25.7	5 5.7 4.5	22 25.3 6.0	1 1.1 0.7	1 1.1 1.0	87 6.0
101 - 199 Hours		10 52.6 1.5	2 10.5 2.7	— — —	5 26.3 1.4	2 10.5 1.5	— — —	19 1.3
200 Hours & Over		3 37.5 0.4	1 12.5 1.4	— — —	4 50.0 1.1	— — —	— — —	8 0.5
Unknown		18 85.7 2.7	1 4.8 1.4	— — —	— — —	2 9.5 1.5	— — —	21 1.4
TOTAL		672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1459
Average Hours Assigned Per Order		33.7	58.0	28.2	29.8	20.6	23.9	31.7

# VIII. HOW DO THEY FARE?

## 1. Completion of the Work Order

Table 31 gives a regional breakdown by completion of the number of hours of work assigned.

In the Province as a whole, 93.3 percent of the work orders are completed. This proportion is somewhat higher in the South Fraser region and somewhat lower in the Island and North Fraser regions.

Of the 6.7 percent of the orders which are not completed in the province, about half of these are incomplete through no fault of the offender and the other half are incomplete due to the fault of the offender. This distribution is about the same in all regions.

TABLE 31. Program Participants by Region  
and by Completion of the Work Order

WERE THE WORK HOURS COMPLETED		Count Row % Col.%	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
YES (Complete)			608 44.7 <u>90.5</u>	71 5.2 95.9	105 7.7 94.6	358 26.3 <u>98.1</u>	127 9.3 94.8	92 6.8 <u>89.3</u>	1,361 <u>93.3</u>
NO (Not Complete)			64 65.3 9.5	3 3.1 4.0	6 6.1 5.4	7 7.1 1.9	7 7.1 5.2	11 11.2 10.7	98 <u>6.7</u>
REASON FOR NOT COMPLETE	No Fault of Offender	31 62.0 4.6	1 2.0 1.4	4 8.0 3.6	4 8.0 1.1	4 8.0 3.0	6 12.0 5.8	50 <u>3.4</u>	
		Fault of Offender	33 71.7 4.9	2 4.3 2.7	1 2.2 0.9	3 6.5 0.8	2 4.3 1.5	5 10.9 4.8	46 <u>3.2</u>
			Unknown	— — —	— — —	1 50.0 0.9	— — —	1 50.0 0.7	— — —
	TOTAL		672 46.0	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.0	1,459



## 2. Further Action

Table 32 gives a regional breakdown by the type of further action.

There is no further action in 90.0 percent of the cases in the province. The percentage is less in the Interior region.

In the province as a whole, there is 1.5 percent of all program participants who are returned to court. The percentage is greater in the Northern region.

There is 1.2 percent of the cases in the province that breach the community service order but are not sent to court. The percentage is greater in the North Fraser region, and there are no cases in this category in the Interior and South Fraser regions.

There is a very high proportion (34.2 percent) of forms from the Interior region which give no information in the area of "further action".

TABLE 32. Program Participants by Region  
and by Type of Further Action

TYPE OF FURTHER ACTION	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
Breach	9 52.9 1.3	2 11.8 2.7	—	—	2 11.8 1.5	4 23.5 3.9	17 1.2	
Court	7 31.8 1.0	1 4.5 1.4	1 4.5 0.9	4 18.2 1.1	7 31.8 5.2	2 9.1 1.9	22 1.5	
None	622 47.4 92.6	67 5.1 90.5	72 5.5 64.9	347 26.4 95.1	117 8.9 87.3	88 6.7 85.4	1,313 90.0	
Unknown	34 31.8 5.1	4 3.7 5.4	38 35.5 34.2	14 13.1 3.8	8 7.5 6.0	9 8.4 8.7	107 7.3	
TOTAL	672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1,459	

### 3. Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program

Table 33 gives a regional breakdown of comments about the program.

In the province as a whole, 77.5 percent of the forms have positive comments about the program. The percentage is greater in the South Fraser region and lesser in the Vancouver and Northern regions.

There is 6.2 percent of the forms in the province which have negative comments about the program. The percentage is greater in the Northern region. There are no forms with negative comments from the Interior region.

In the province as a whole, there is 4.0 percent of the forms which have comments that give no information about the effectiveness of the program. The percentage is greater in the Vancouver, Interior, and Northern regions. There are no forms in this group from the North Fraser region.

In the province as a whole, there is 6.4 percent of the forms which have inconclusive or neutral comments about the effectiveness of the program. The percentage is greater in the Northern region and lesser in the Interior region.

Although there is only 5.9 percent of the forms in the province as a whole with no comments given, there is a higher percentage than this in the Vancouver, Interior and North Fraser regions.

TABLE 33

Program Participants by Region and by  
Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program

COMMENTS	Count Row % Col. %	Vancouver Island	Vancouver	Interior	South Fraser	Northern	North Fraser	Province
Negative		57 62.6 8.5	3 3.3 4.1	—	13 14.3 3.6	15 16.5 11.2	3 3.3 2.9	91 6.2
Irrelevant		15 25.9 2.2	11 19.0 14.9	12 20.7 10.8	8 13.8 2.2	12 20.7 9.0	—	58 4.0
Inconclusive		39 41.5 5.8	3 3.2 4.1	2 2.1 1.8	22 23.4 6.0	23 24.5 17.2	5 5.3 4.9	94 6.4
Positive		523 46.3 77.8	49 4.3 66.2	82 7.3 73.9	321 28.4 87.9	79 7.0 59.0	76 6.7 73.8	1130 77.5
No Comments		38 44.2 5.7	8 9.3 10.8	15 17.4 13.5	1 1.2 0.3	5 5.8 3.7	13 22.1 18.4	86 5.9
TOTAL		672 46.1	74 5.1	111 7.6	365 25.0	134 9.2	103 7.1	1459

## IX. SUMMARY OF THE REGIONAL STATISTICS

This section summarizes the highlights of the program within each of the six Corrections regions of the province.

### 1. Vancouver Island Regional Summary

- (1) The Island region accounts for 46.0 percent of the program participants.
- (2) Court Locations: The program is operating in Victoria, Courtenay/Campbell River, and Nanaimo.
- (3) Juveniles/Adults: Participants are 57.7 percent juveniles and 42.3 percent adults, almost the same as the provincial breakdown.
- (4) Age Group: There is a higher percentage than the provincial average in the 14 and 15-year old groups. There is a lower percentage than the provincial average in the 17 to 24 years group.
- (5) Sex: There is a lower proportion of males (86.2 percent) and a larger proportion of females (13.8 percent) than the provincial average of 88.5 percent males and 11.5 percent females.
- (6) Racial Origin: There is a slightly lower proportion of Native Indians (8.2 percent) than the provincial average of 9.0 percent.
- (7) Offence: The Island region has the same offence breakdown as the province as a whole, except that there is a lower proportion of "Mischief" offences than the provincial average.
- (8) Multiple Offence/Counts: The Island region has the same breakdown as the provincial average.
- (9) Type of Admission: There is a lower percentage of admissions by written agreement than the provincial average.
- (10) Type of Supervision: There is a lower percentage of participants supervised by the victim, and there is a lower percentage supervised by a volunteer group together with the C.S. supervisor or probation officer than the provincial average.
- (11) Type of Service: There is a lower proportion of participants than the provincial average assigned to service for the victim. There are none assigned to service for the community and the victim.

Vancouver Island (Continued)

- (12) Work Description: There is a lower percentage of participants than the provincial average who are assigned work at a community recreation facility, work to repair damage, and work for the victim but not directly related to the offence. There is a higher percentage assigned to work for community and service agencies.
- (13) Assigned Work Hours: The breakdown by work hours in the Island region is almost the same as the provincial average. The average number of hours assigned per order is 33.7 as compared to 31.7 for the province.
- (14) Completion of the Work Order: There is a lower proportion of completed work orders (90.5 percent) than the provincial average of 93.3 percent.
- (15) Type of Further Action: The breakdown by the type of further action is the same as the provincial average.
- (16) Comments: The breakdown by comments on the effectiveness of the program is the same as the provincial average.



**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 2**

## 2. Vancouver Regional Summary

- (1) The Vancouver region accounts for 5.1 percent of the participants in the program. The program was really just underway in this region by June 1976.
- (2) Court Locations: The program is operating in Vancouver, West Vancouver, and North Vancouver.
- (3) Juveniles/Adults: There are only 4.0 percent juveniles and 95.9 percent adults, as compared to the provincial average of 55.7 percent juveniles and 44.3 percent adults.
- (4) Age Groups: Because of the relatively low percentage of juveniles in the program in the Vancouver region, there is a lower proportion than the provincial average in all the juvenile age groups, and a higher proportion than the provincial average in all the adult age groups.
- (5) Sex: There is a lower proportion of males (86.2 percent) and a higher proportion of females (16.2 percent) than the provincial average of 88.5 percent males and 11.5 percent females.
- (6) Racial Origin: There is a lower proportion of Native Indians (2.7 percent) than the provincial average of 9.0 percent.
- (7) Offence: The Vancouver region has a lower percentage of cases than the provincial average with the offences of "Impaired Driving", "Theft Over \$200", "Breach of G.L.A.", and "Breach of M.V.A.". There is a higher percentage than the provincial average with the offences of "Causing a Disturbance" and "Public Mischief".
- (8) Multiple Offences/Counts: There is a lower proportion of participants than the provincial average with two counts. There are none with four counts.
- (9) Type of Admission: There is a lower proportion of participants than the provincial average admitted by a Probation Officer Enquiry, and a higher proportion admitted by the court.
- (10) Type of Supervision: In the Vancouver region, the supervision type varies greatly from the provincial average. A higher percentage is supervised by a volunteer group, and by a volunteer group together with the C.S. supervisor or probation officer. A lower percentage



Vancouver (Continued)

is supervised by the victim, by the C.S. supervisor or probation officer, and by the victim together with a volunteer group.

- (11) Type of Service: There is a lower proportion of participants assigned to service for the victim than the provincial average. There are none assigned to work for the community and the victim.
- (12) Work Description: In the Vancouver region, the work assigned varies greatly from the provincial average. There is a higher percentage of participants than the provincial average assigned work for community and service agencies, and work offering technical and program assistance. There is a lower proportion of participants assigned work for a community recreation facility, work for park development or manual labour, and work for the victim but not directly related to the offence. There are no admissions assigned work to repair damage or to pay restitution.
- (13) Assigned Work Hours: In the Vancouver region, there is a lower proportion than the provincial average assigned work of 1-10, 11-20, and 31-40 hours. There is a higher proportion than the provincial average assigned work of 41-50 hours and 91-100 hours. The average number of hours assigned per order is 58.0 in the region, as compared to 31.7 for the province.
- (14) Completion of the Work Order: The completion of work orders in the Vancouver region (95.9 percent complete) is about the same as the provincial average of 93.3 percent.
- (15) Type of Further Action: The breakdown by type of further action is the same as the provincial average.
- (16) Comments: There is a lower proportion of positive comments about the effectiveness of the program than the provincial average. There is a higher proportion of irrelevant comments than the provincial average. There is a higher proportion of forms that give no comments than the provincial average.

3. Interior Regional Summary

- (1) The Interior region accounts for 7.6 percent of the participants in the program.
- (2) Court Locations: The program is operating in several centers throughout the region, the main ones being Cranbrook, Creston, Kimberley, and Vernon.
- (3) Juveniles/Adults: Participants are 62.2 percent juvenile and 37.8 percent adult, as compared to the provincial average of 55.7 percent juvenile and 44.3 percent adult.
- (4) Age Group: There is a lower proportion than the provincial average in the age groups of 11, 12, 13 and 25 to 29 years. There is a higher proportion than the provincial average in the 16 years group.
- (5) Sex: There is a higher proportion of males (93.7 percent) and a lower proportion of females (6.3 percent) than the provincial average of 88.5 percent males and 11.5 percent females.
- (6) Racial Origin: There is a lower proportion of Native Indians (5.4 percent) than the provincial average of 9.0 percent.
- (7) Offence: The Interior region has a lower percentage of participants than the provincial average with the offences of "Causing a Disturbance", "Impaired Driving", "Breach of N.C.A. for Possession", and "Breach of G.L.A.". There is a higher percentage than the provincial average with the offence of "Theft Under \$200".
- (8) Multiple Offences/Counts: The Interior region has the same breakdown as the provincial average.
- (9) Type of Admission: There is a lower proportion of admissions than the provincial average by a Probation Officer Enquiry, and a higher proportion admitted by the court.
- (10) Type of Supervision: There is a higher proportion of participants than the provincial average supervised by the victim, and by a volunteer group together with the C.S. supervisor or probation officer, and by the victim together with a volunteer group.

Interior (Continued)

- (11) Type of Service: There is a lower percentage of participants than the provincial average assigned to service for the victim. There is a higher percentage assigned to service for the community and the victim.
- (12) Work Description: There is a lower proportion of participants than the provincial average assigned work for community and service agencies. There is a higher proportion assigned work in community recreation facilities, technical or program assistance work, work for the victim but not directly related to the offence, and work to pay restitution. There are no cases assigned work to repair damage as a result of the offence.
- (13) Assigned Work Hours: The breakdown by work hours in the Interior region is almost the same as the provincial average, except that there is a higher proportion in the 41-50 hours category. The average number of hours assigned per order is 28.2, as compared to 31.7 for the province.
- (14) Completion of the Work Order: The completion of work orders in the Interior region (94.6 percent) is about the same as the provincial average of 93.3 percent.
- (15) Type of Further Action: There is a lower proportion of participants than the provincial average with no further action. There is a higher proportion of forms than the provincial average with no information given on further action. There are no forms indicating a breach of the order.
- (16) Comments: There is a higher percentage of forms than the provincial average with irrelevant comments about the effectiveness of the program, and there is a lower percentage with inconclusive (neutral) comments. There is a higher percentage of forms with no comments given, and no forms with negative comments.

4. South Fraser Regional Summary

- (1) The South Fraser region accounts for 25.0 percent of the participants in the program.
- (2) Court Locations: The program is operating in several centers throughout the region, the main ones being Abbotsford, Matsqui, and Mission.
- (3) Juveniles/Adults: Participants are 62.2 percent juvenile and 37.8 percent adult, as compared to the provincial average of 55.7 percent juvenile and 44.3 percent adult.
- (4) Age Group: There is a lower proportion than the provincial average in the age groups of 22 to 24 and 25 to 29 years. There is a higher proportion than the provincial average in the 11, 12, 13, and 16 years group.
- (5) Sex: There is a higher proportion of males (91.5 percent) and a lower proportion of females (8.5 percent) than the provincial average of 88.5 percent males and 11.5 percent females.
- (6) Racial Origin: There is a lower proportion of Native Indians (4.1 percent) than the provincial average of 9.0 percent.
- (7) Offence: The South Fraser region has a lower percentage than the provincial average with the offences of "Theft Over \$200", and "Breach of M.V.A.". There is a higher percentage than the provincial average with the offences of "Mischief" and "Breach of G.L.A.".
- (8) Multiple Offences/Counts: There is a higher proportion of participants than the provincial average with six or more counts.
- (9) Type of Admission: There is a higher proportion of admissions than the provincial average by a Probation Officer Enquiry, and a lower proportion by the court.
- (10) Type of Supervision: There is a higher percentage of participants than the provincial average supervised by the victim. A lower percentage is supervised by a C.S. supervisor or probation officer.

South Fraser (Continued)

- (11) Type of Service: There is a higher proportion of participants than the provincial average assigned to service for the victim.
- (12) Work Description: In the South Fraser region, the work assigned varies greatly from the provincial average. There is a higher percentage of cases than the provincial average assigned work for a community recreation facility, work to repair damage as a result of the offence, and work for the victim but not directly related to the offence. There is a lower percentage than the provincial average assigned work for community and service agencies and work offering technical or program assistance. There are no admissions assigned work to pay restitution.
- (13) Assigned Work Hours: The breakdown by work hours in the South Fraser region is almost the same as the provincial average, except that there is a higher proportion in the 11 to 20 hours category. The average number of hours assigned per order is 29.8, as compared to 31.7 for the province.
- (14) Completion of the Work Order: There is a higher proportion of completed work orders (98.1 percent) than the provincial average of 93.3 percent.
- (15) Type of Further Action: The breakdown by type of further action is almost the same as the provincial average, except that there are no admissions with breach of the order.
- (16) Comments: The breakdown by comments on the effectiveness of the program is almost the same as the provincial average, except that there is a higher proportion than the provincial average with positive comments.

5. Northern Regional Summary

- (1) The Northern region accounts for 9.2 percent of the participants in the program.
- (2) Court Locations: The program is operating in Fort St. James, Prince George, and Prince Rupert.
- (3) Juveniles/Adults: Participants are 42.5 percent juvenile and 57.7 adult, as compared to the provincial average of 55.7 percent juvenile and 44.3 adult.
- (4) Age Group: There is a lower proportion than the provincial average in the age groups of 11, 12, 13, and 16 years. There is a higher proportion than the provincial average in the 17 to 21 years group.
- (5) Sex: There is a higher proportion of males (91.0 percent) and a lower proportion of females (7.1 percent) than the provincial average of 88.5 percent males and 11.5 percent females.
- (6) Racial Origin: There is a much higher proportion of Native Indians (37.3 percent) than the provincial average of 9.0 percent.
- (7) Offences: The Northern region has a higher proportion than the provincial average with the offences of "Possession of Stolen Property" and "Breach of the N.C.A. for Possession". There is a lower proportion than the provincial average with the offences of "Theft Under \$200" and "Mischief". There are no admissions with "Public Mischief" offences.
- (8) Multiple Offences/Counts: There is a higher percentage of participants than the provincial average with one count, and a lower percentage with two or more counts.
- (9) Type of Admission: There is a lower proportion of admissions than the provincial average by a Probation Officer Enquiry, and a higher proportion by the court.
- (10) Type of Supervision: There is a lower percentage than the provincial average supervised by a volunteer group. There is a higher percentage supervised by the C.S. supervisor or probation officer, and by a volunteer group together with the C.S. supervisor or probation officer. There are no orders supervised by the victim.

Northern (Continued)

- (11) Type of Service: The breakdown by type of service is almost the same as the provincial average, except that there is a higher proportion of orders with service for both the victim and the community.
- (12) Work Description: There is a higher percentage of cases than the provincial average assigned work for park development or manual labour. There are no admissions assigned work to repair damage as a result of the offence, or work to pay restitution.
- (13) Assigned Work Hours: In the Northern region, there is a higher proportion than the provincial average assigned work of 1 to 10 and 11 to 20 hours. The average number of hours assigned per order is 20.6, as compared to 31.7 for the province.
- (14) Completion of the Work Order: The completion of work orders in the Northern region (94.8 percent) is about the same as the provincial average of 93.3 percent.
- (15) Types of Further Action: The breakdown by type of further action is almost the same as the provincial average, except that there is a higher proportion of forms indicating return to court.
- (16) Comments: There is a higher proportion than the provincial average with negative comments about the effectiveness of the program, a higher proportion with irrelevant comments, and a higher proportion with inconclusive or neutral comments. There is a lower proportion with positive comments.

6. North Fraser Regional Summary

- (1) The North Fraser region accounts for 7.1 percent of the participants in the program.
- (2) Court Locations: The program is operating primarily in Burnaby, Coquitlam, Maple Ridge, and New Westminster.
- (3) Juveniles/Adults: Participants are 66.0 percent juvenile and 34.0 percent adult, as compared to the provincial average of 55.7 percent juvenile and 44.3 percent adult.
- (4) Age Group: There is a higher proportion than the provincial average in every age group from 12 to 15 years. There is a lower proportion than the provincial average in the age groups from 16 to 29 years.
- (5) Sex: The sex breakdown in the North Fraser region is almost the same as the provincial average. There are 87.4 percent males and 12.6 percent females in the region, as compared to the provincial average of 88.5 percent males and 11.5 percent females.
- (6) Racial Origin: There is a lower proportion of Native Indians (2.9 percent) than the provincial average of 9.0 percent.
- (7) Offence: The North Fraser region has a higher proportion than the provincial average with the offences of "Theft over \$200", "Breach of N.C.A. for Possession", and "Breach of G.L.A.". There is a lower proportion than the provincial average with "Mischief" offences. There are no admissions with "Public Mischief" or "Impaired Driving".
- (8) Multiple Offences/Counts: There is a lower proportion of participants than the provincial average with one count, and a lower proportion with two or more counts.
- (9) Type of Admission: There is a higher percentage of admissions than the provincial average by a Probation Officer Enquiry, and a lower percentage by the court.
- (10) Type of Supervision: There is a lower proportion than the provincial average supervised by a volunteer group, and a lower proportion by a volunteer group together with the C.S. supervisor or probation officer. There is a higher proportion supervised by the C.S. Supervisor or probation officer alone. There are no orders supervised by the victim, or by the victim together with a volunteer group.



North Fraser (Continued)

- (11) Type of Service: The breakdown by type of service is almost the same as the provincial average, except that there are no orders with service for both the victim and the community.
- (12) Work Description: There is a higher proportion of participants than the provincial average assigned work for a community service agency, and work offering technical or program assistance. There is a lower proportion assigned work for a community recreation facility, and work for park development or manual labour. There are no participants assigned work to repair damage resulting from the offence, or work to pay restitution.
- (13) Assigned Work Hours: In the North Fraser region, there is a higher proportion than the provincial average assigned work of 11 to 20 and 31 to 40 hours. There is a lower proportion assigned work of 41 to 50 hours. The average number of hours assigned per order is 23.9, as compared to 31.7 for the province.
- (14) Completion of the Work Order: There is a lower proportion of completed work orders (89.3 percent) than the provincial average of 93.3 percent.
- (15) Type of Further Action: The breakdown by type of further action is almost the same as the provincial average, except that there is a higher percentage of participants with breach of the order.
- (16) Comments: There is a higher proportion of forms than the provincial average with no comments on the effectiveness of the program. There are no forms with irrelevant comments.



## CHAPTER VII

### A COMPARISON OF THE JUVENILE AND ADULT PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM

	Page
I. Introduction	90
II. Characteristics of Juveniles/Adults	91
1. Sex	91
2. Racial Origin	92
III. What Offences do Juveniles/Adults Commit?	93
1. Offence	93
2. Multiple Counts/Offences	95
IV. How are Juvenile/Adult Admissions to the Program Made?	96
V. What kind of Work are Juveniles/Adults Assigned	98
1. Type of Supervision	98
2. Type of Service	99
3. Work Description	100
4. Assigned Work Hours	101
VI. How do Juveniles/Adults Fare on the Program?	103
1. Completion of the Work Order	103
2. Type of Further Action	104
3. Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program	105
VII. Summary of the Juvenile/Adult Statistics	106

## A COMPARISON OF THE JUVENILE AND ADULT PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM

### I. INTRODUCTION

This section compares and contrasts juvenile and adult participants in the Community Service Order program.

There is a description of: the characteristics of juveniles and adults, what offences they commit, how they are admitted to the program, what kind of work they are assigned, and how they fare on the program.

Juveniles account for 55.7 percent of all participants in the program, and adults account for the other 44.3 percent.

## II. CHARACTERISTICS OF JUVENILES/ADULTS

### 1. Sex

Table 34 shows the distribution of juveniles and adults by sex. There are 88.5 percent male and 11.5 percent female participants in total; the distribution of males and females among juveniles and adults is almost exactly the same as this overall ratio.

TABLE 34.            Juvenile and Adult Program  
                      Participants by Sex

SEX	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
Male		720	571	1,291
	55.8		44.2	<u>88.5</u>
	88.7		88.3	
Female		92	76	168
	54.8		45.2	<u>11.5</u>
	11.3		11.7	
TOTAL		812	647	1,459
		55.7	44.3	

## 2. Racial Origin

Table 35 shows the distribution of juveniles and adults among the racial origin categories.

The proportion of juveniles and adults in each racial category is almost identical. For example, 9.2 percent of juvenile participants are Native Indian, and 8.7 percent of adults are Native Indian.

TABLE 35. Juvenile and Adult  
Program Participants by Racial Origin

RACIAL ORIGIN	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
Native Indian	75 57.3 9.2	56 42.7 8.7	131 9.0	
Non-Native	728 55.5 89.7	584 44.5 90.2	1,312 90.0	
Unknown	9 56.3 1.1	7 43.8 1.1	16 1.1	
TOTAL	812 55.7	647 44.3	1,459	

### III. WHAT OFFENCES DO JUVENILES/ADULTS COMMIT?

#### 1. Offence

Table 36 gives a description of offences committed by juvenile and adult participants in the program.

The percentage of adults with these offences is greater than the percentage of juveniles with these offences for: "Causing a Disturbance", "Public Mischief", "Impaired Driving", "Possession of Stolen Property", "Mischief", and "Breach of Narcotic Control Act for Possession". The percentage of juveniles is greater than the percentage of adults with the offences of "Theft Over \$200" and "Break and Enter".

TABLE 36

Juvenile and Adult Program Participants by Offence

OFFENCE	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
Causing a Disturbance	3 14.3 <u>0.4</u>	18 85.7 <u>2.8</u>	21 <u>1.4</u>	
Public Mischief	8 28.6 <u>1.0</u>	20 71.4 <u>3.1</u>	28 <u>1.9</u>	
Impaired Driving	3 10.3 <u>0.4</u>	26 89.7 <u>4.0</u>	29 <u>2.0</u>	
Theft Over \$200	58 73.4 <u>7.1</u>	21 26.6 <u>3.2</u>	79 <u>5.4</u>	
Theft Under \$200	233 58.5 28.7	165 41.5 25.5	398 27.3	
Break & Enter	244 74.8 <u>30.0</u>	82 25.2 <u>12.7</u>	326 <u>22.3</u>	
Possession of Stolen Property	20 35.1 <u>2.5</u>	37 64.9 <u>5.7</u>	57 <u>3.9</u>	
Mischief	56 45.2 <u>6.9</u>	68 54.8 <u>10.5</u>	124 <u>8.5</u>	
Breach of Narcotics Control Act - Possession	41 41.8 <u>5.0</u>	57 58.2 <u>8.8</u>	98 <u>6.7</u>	
Breach of Government Liquor Act	36 66.7 4.4	18 33.3 2.8	54 3.7	
Breach of Motor Vehicles Act	15 75.0 1.8	5 25.0 0.8	20 1.4	
Other Offences	82 39.6 10.1	125 60.4 19.3	207 14.2	
Unknown	13 72.2 1.6	5 27.8 0.8	18 1.2	
TOTAL	812 55.7	647 44.3	1459	



## 2. Multiple Counts/Offences

Table 37 shows the distribution of juvenile and adult program participants among the multiple count categories. 90.1 percent of adult participants have one count of one offence; only 83.5 percent of juvenile participants are in this category. There is a greater proportion of juveniles than of adults with two and three counts.

TABLE 37      Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Multiple Counts/Offences

MULTIPLE COUNTS/ OFFENCES	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
1 count of 1 offence		678 53.8 <u>83.5</u>	583 46.2 <u>90.1</u>	1,261 86.4
2 Counts/Offences		70 66.0 <u>8.6</u>	36 34.0 <u>5.6</u>	106 7.3
3 Counts/Offences		29 72.5 <u>3.6</u>	11 27.5 <u>1.7</u>	40 2.7
4 Counts/Offences		7 77.8 0.9	2 22.2 0.3	9 0.6
5 Counts/Offences		5 50.0 0.6	5 50.0 0.8	10 0.7
6 or more Counts/Offences		10 66.7 1.2	5 33.3 0.8	15 1.0
Unknown		13 72.2 1.6	5 27.8 0.8	18 1.2
TOTAL		812 55.7	647 44.3	1,459

#### IV. HOW ARE JUVENILE/ADULT ADMISSIONS TO THE PROGRAM MADE?

Table 38 shows how juvenile and adult admissions to the program are made. The information in the table indicates that juveniles and adults are admitted by quite different procedures.

Juvenile admissions are 57.5 percent by probation officer enquiry (P.O.E.) and 42.5 percent by the court. Most of the P.O.E. admissions are by verbal agreement rather than by a written agreement. Most of the court admissions are by a standard probation order rather than by a special community service probation order.

Adult admissions are almost all by the court. Only 9.6 percent are by a P.O.E. Those that are admitted by a P.O.E. are almost equally divided between a verbal agreement and a written agreement. Almost all of the court admissions are by a standard probation order rather than by a special community service probation order.

TABLE 38. Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Type of Admission

TYPE OF ADMISSION		Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILES	ADULTS	TOTAL
By Probation Officer Enquiry			467 88.3 <u>57.5</u>	62 11.7 <u>9.6</u>	529 36.2
	Verbal Agreement		357 90.8 44.0	36 9.2 5.6	393 26.9
	Written Agreement		104 80.0 12.8	26 20.0 4.0	130 8.9
	Unknown		6 100.0 0.7	—	6 0.4
By Court			345 37.1 <u>42.5</u>	585 62.9 <u>90.4</u>	930 63.7
	Community Service Probation Order		33 55.9 4.1	26 44.1 4.0	59 4.0
	Standard Probation Order		311 35.8 38.3	558 64.2 86.2	869 59.6
	Unknown		1 50.0 0.1	1 50.0 0.2	2 0.1
TOTAL			812 55.7	647 44.3	1,459

V. WHAT KIND OF WORK ARE JUVENILES/ADULTS ASSIGNED?

1. Type of Supervision

Table 39 describes the type of supervision of juvenile and adult work orders.

Juveniles and adults on the program have almost the same kind of supervision, except that a higher percentage of juveniles than of adults is supervised by a community service supervisor or probation officer. A higher percentage of adults than of juveniles is supervised by a volunteer group together with a community service supervisor or probation officer.

TABLE 39. Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Type of Supervision

TYPE OF SUPERVISION	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
By Victim		30 61.2 3.7	19 38.8 2.9	49 3.4
By Volunteer Group		522 54.3 64.3	440 45.7 68.0	962 65.9
By Community Service Supervisor or Probation Officer		203 63.2 <u>25.0</u>	118 36.8 <u>18.2</u>	321 22.0
By Victim and Group		4 100.0 0.5	—	4 0.3
By Group & C.S. Supervisor or Probation Officer		48 41.7 <u>5.9</u>	67 58.3 <u>10.4</u>	115 7.9
Unknown		5 62.5 0.6	3 37.5 0.5	8 0.5
TOTAL		812 55.7	647 44.3	1,459

## 2. Type of Service

Table 40 describes juvenile and adult participants in the program by the type of service.

Work orders of juveniles and adults are for almost the same kind of service, except that there is a slightly higher percentage of juvenile orders with service for the victim, and a slightly higher percentage of adult orders with service for the community.

TABLE 40 Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Type of Service

TYPE OF SERVICE	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
Service for Victim	45 70.3 <u>5.5</u>	19 29.7 <u>2.9</u>	64 4.4	
Service for Community	756 54.7 <u>93.1</u>	626 45.3 <u>96.8</u>	1,382 94.7	
Service for both Victim & Community	7 100.0 0.9	—	7 0.5	
Unknown	4 66.7 0.5	2 33.3 0.3	6 0.4	
TOTAL	812 55.7	647 44.3	1,459	

### 3. Work Description

Table 41 describes the type of work of juvenile and adult service orders.

There is a higher percentage of juvenile orders with work for a community recreation facility, work on park development or manual labour, and work for the victim but not directly related to the offence. There is a higher percentage of adult orders with work offering technical or program assistance and work to repair damage as a result of the offence.

TABLE 41. Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Work Description

WORK DESCRIPTION	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
Community Recreation Facility	161 61.0 19.8	103 39.0 15.9	264 18.1	
Community & Service Agencies	415 54.3 51.1	349 45.7 53.9	764 52.4	
Park Development or Manual Labour	165 63.0 20.3	97 37.0 15.0	262 18.0	
Program Assistance	9 14.3 1.1	54 85.7 8.3	63 4.3	
Repair Damage resulting from Offence	6 30.0 0.7	14 70.0 2.2	20 1.4	
For Victim but not Directly Related to Offence	44 74.6 5.4	15 25.4 2.3	59 4.0	
Pay Restitution	2 33.3 0.2	4 66.7 0.6	6 0.4	
Unknown	10 47.6 1.2	11 52.4 1.7	21 1.4	
TOTAL	812 55.7	647 44.3	1,459	

#### 4. Assigned Work Hours

Table 42 shows the number of hours of work assigned to juvenile and adult participants in the program.

There is a higher percentage of juvenile orders with assigned work of 1-10, 11-20, and 31-40 hours. There is a higher percentage of adult orders with assigned work of 21-30, 41-50, 51-60, and 91-100 hours.

The average hours of work assigned on juvenile orders is 28.3; the average on adult orders is 36.0.

TABLE 42

Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Assigned Work Hours

ASSIGNED WORK HOURS	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
01 - 10 Hours	223 63.7 27.5	127 36.3 19.6	350 24.0	
11 - 20 Hours	198 62.7 24.4	118 37.3 18.2	316 21.7	
21 - 30 Hours	108 52.2 13.3	99 47.8 15.3	207 14.2	
31 - 40 Hours	126 64.0 15.5	71 36.0 11.0	197 13.5	
41 - 50 Hours	55 35.0 6.8	102 65.0 15.8	157 10.8	
51 - 60 Hours	18 38.3 2.2	29 61.7 4.5	47 3.2	
61 - 70 Hours	4 57.1 0.5	3 42.9 0.5	7 0.5	
71 - 80 Hours	17 50.0 2.1	17 50.0 2.6	34 2.3	
81 - 90 Hours	7 77.8 0.9	2 22.2 0.3	9 0.6	
91 - 100 Hours	28 32.2 3.4	59 67.8 9.1	87 6.0	
101 - 199 Hours	13 68.4 1.6	6 31.6 0.9	19 1.3	
200 Hours & Over	4 50.0 0.5	4 50.0 0.6	8 0.5	
Unknown	11 52.4 1.4	10 47.6 1.5	21 1.4	
TOTAL	812 55.7	647 44.3	1459	
Average Hours Assigned Per Order	28.3	36.0	31.7	



VI. HOW DO JUVENILES/ADULTS FARE ON THE PROGRAM?

1. Completion of the Work Order

Table 43 gives a description of juveniles and adults by completion of work orders.

Slightly more juveniles (94.2 percent) than adults (91.3 percent) have complete work orders. Of the incomplete orders, for both juvenile and adults about half of these were incomplete through no fault of the offender.

TABLE 43. Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Completion of the Work Order

COMPLETION OF THE WORK ORDER		Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
YES (Complete)			767 56.4 <u>94.4</u>	594 43.6 <u>91.8</u>	1361 93.3
NO (Not Complete)			45 45.9 <u>5.5</u>	53 54.1 <u>8.2</u>	98 6.7
REASON FOR NOT COMPLETE	No Fault of Offender	22	28	50	
		44.0	56.0	3.4	
		2.7	4.3		
	Fault of Offender	23	23	46	
		50.0	50.0	3.2	
	2.8	3.6			
Unknown	—	2	2		
		100.0 0.3	0.1		
TOTAL			812 55.7	647 44.3	1,459

## 2. Type of Further Action

Table 44 shows the further action categories for juveniles and adults.

The distribution of juveniles and adults among the various types of further action is almost the same, except that a higher proportion of adults have breaches of the order.

TABLE 44. Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Type of Further Action

TYPE OF FURTHER ACTION	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
Breach	3 17.6 <u>0.4</u>	14 82.4 <u>2.2</u>	17 1.2	
Court	13 59.1 1.6	9 40.9 1.4	22 1.5	
None	735 56.0 90.5	578 44.0 89.3	1313 90.0	
Unknown	61 57.0 7.5	46 43.0 7.1	107 7.3	
TOTAL	812 55.7	647 44.3	1,459	

### 3. Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program

Table 45 describes the types of comments given on the forms for juvenile and adult program participants.

There is a slightly higher proportion of juvenile orders (7.4 percent) than adult orders (5.3 percent) with inconclusive or neutral comments on the effectiveness of the program. There is a higher proportion of adult orders with positive comments.

TABLE 45. Juvenile and Adult Program Participants  
by Comments on the Effectiveness of the Program

COMMENTS ON EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAM	Count Row % Col. %	JUVENILE	ADULT	TOTAL
Negative		47 51.6 5.8	44 48.4 6.8	91 6.2
Irrelevant		31 53.4 3.8	27 46.6 4.2	58 4.0
Inconclusive		60 63.8 7.4	34 36.2 5.3	94 6.4
Positive		611 54.1 75.2	519 45.9 80.2	1130 77.5
Unknown		63 73.3 7.8	23 26.7 3.6	86 5.9
TOTAL		812 55.7	647 44.3	1459

## VII. SUMMARY OF THE JUVENILE/ADULT STATISTICS

1. Juveniles account for 55.7 percent of the participants in the program; adults account for the other 44.3 percent.
2. Sex: The distribution of juveniles and adults between males and females is almost the same as the overall program average of 88.5 percent males and 11.5 percent females.
3. Racial Origin: About 9.0 percent of juvenile participants and 9.0 percent of adult participants are Native Indian.
4. Offence: There is a higher percentage of juveniles than adults admitted to the program with offences of "Theft Over \$200" and "Break & Enter". For most other offences, there is a higher percentage of adults than juveniles.
5. Multiple Counts/Offences: There is generally a higher percentage of juveniles than adults admitted to the program with more than one count of one offence.
6. Type of Admission: 57.5 percent of juvenile admissions are by a P.O.E. and 42.5 percent by the court. Only 9.6 percent of adult admissions are by a P.O.E. and the other 90.4 percent are by the court.
7. Type of Supervision: A higher percentage of juveniles are supervised by a community service supervisor or probation officer. A higher percentage of adults are supervised by a volunteer group together with a community service supervisor or probation officer.
8. Type of Service: A slightly higher percentage of juvenile orders are for the victim of the offence, and a slightly higher percentage of adult orders are for the community.

9. Work Description; A higher percentage of juveniles are assigned work for a community recreation facility, work on park development or manual labour, and work for the victim but not directly related to the offence. A higher percentage of adults are assigned work offering technical or program assistance and work to repair damage resulting from the offence.
10. Assigned Work Hours: The average hours of work assigned for juvenile orders is 28.3; the average for adult orders is 36.0.
11. Completion of the Work Order: 94.2 percent of juvenile orders are complete; 91.3 percent of the adult orders are complete.
12. Type of Further Action: A slightly higher percentage of adults than juveniles have breaches of the order.
13. Comments: A slightly higher percentage of juvenile orders than of adult orders have inconclusive or neutral comments on the effectiveness of the program. A higher percentage of adult orders have positive comments.



### FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

We would like to know if this type of report is useful to you.  
Please send us your comments, using these questions as a guide.

1. Is the information useful to you?
2. What additional information would you like to see?
3. Which sections are of particular interest to you?

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_

RETURN ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Detach this page and send it to:

Director,  
Program Evaluation & Data Systems,  
Corrections Branch,  
533 Yates Street,  
Victoria, B.C.  
V8W-1K7





**END**