

CR sent
4-13-82

PROJECT-159

✓
**THE COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDER
PROGRAMME IN ONTARIO**

4. SUMMARY

by

Marian L. Polonoski

Planning and Research Branch



Ontario

MINISTRY OF	Honourable
CORRECTIONAL	Nick Leluk
SERVICES	Minister
	Glenn R. Thompson
	Deputy Minister

JULY, 1981

81042

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO



PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION

M.J. Algar
Executive Director

PLANNING AND RESEARCH BRANCH

A.C. Birkenmayer
Manager, Research Services

PROJECT STAFF

Research Assistant Silvia Hermann

July, 1981

ISBN 0-7743-6759-8

ADMINISTRATIVE ABSTRACT

This report is the fourth and last in a series of reports dealing with the Community Service Order (CSO) Programme during its first three years of operation in Ontario. The results were found to be highly consistent with the preliminary findings of prior phases of the study. The type of offender being selected for the CSO programme tended to be a low risk offender with non-serious criminality. The offender was usually male, single and approximately 21 years of age, with evidence of stability in his lifestyle.

When examined individually, the pilot project areas were found to be dealing with similar types of offenders. This may indicate agreement among project Co-ordinators and Judges as to suitable candidates for the programme.

In contrast, there was little agreement among the judiciary on the actual utilization of the CSO option. It has been used as simply another condition of probation, as a more stringent form of probation, as an alternative to incarceration and as a separate sentencing option. Although the CSO programme was initially intended to act as an alternative to incarceration, the low-risk nature of the CSO population indicates that it is unlikely that the CSO is being used as an alternative to incarceration to any great degree. At present it appears that the programme is providing a separate sentencing alternative.

Broad variations and extremes in Orders given by Judges for similar offences were evident across the Province. Any offence can result in a variety of assignments, possibly even extreme assignments far below or above suggested limits.

The overall recidivism rate for the period of time from the assignment of the CSO to one year following the completion of hours was found to be 18 percent. This rate may be lower than recidivism rates found for other available programmes. It is conceivable, though, that the low-risk nature of this offender population might contribute to their possibly having a high success rate in any programme.

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

81042

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Canada, Ministry of Correctional
Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ADMINISTRATIVE ABSTRACT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
I INTRODUCTION	1
A. BACKGROUND OF THE CSO PROGRAMME AND THE RESEARCH	1
II METHODOLOGY	3
A. FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH	3
B. THE POPULATION	3
C. THE INSTRUMENTS	3
III RESULTS	5
A. DESCRIPTION OF THE TOTAL CSO POPULATION	5
1. Social/Demographic Background	5
2. The CSO Disposition	5
3. The CSO Experience	6
4. Recidivism	7
B. DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOT PROJECTS	18
1. Peterborough/Lindsay Pilot Project	18
2. Oshawa/Ajax Pilot Project	21
3. Belleville Pilot Project	23
4. Brampton/Peel Pilot Project	25
5. Scarborough Pilot Project	27
6. St. Catharines Pilot Project	29
7. Hamilton/Wentworth Pilot Project	30

	<u>Page</u>
8. Kitchener/Cambridge Pilot Project	32
9. Windsor Pilot Project	34
10. London Pilot Project	36
11. Thunder Bay Pilot Project	37
12. Kenora Pilot Project	39
C. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OFFENCE TYPE AND CSO ASSIGNMENT	49
1. Limitations of the Findings	49
2. CSO Assignments and Selected Offence Types in Ontario	50
3. CSO Assignments and Selected Offence Types by Year of CSO Disposition	56
4. CSO Assignments and Selected Offence Types by Pilot Project	58
IV SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	61
V REFERENCES	64
APPENDICES	65

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	DISTRIBUTION OF CSO PROBATIONERS	4
2.	PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME, IN GENERAL AND IN 1978 AND 1979	8
3.	OFFENCES LEADING TO CONVICTIONS AT CSO DISPOSITION, DURING CSO AND IN FIRST YEAR AFTER CSO	13
4.	TASKS PERFORMED BY CSO PROBATIONERS	16
5.	PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT	41
6.	CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES IN ONTARIO	52
7.	CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES, OVERALL AND BY YEAR OF DISPOSITION	54
8.	CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES BY PILOT PROJECT AREA	60

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>FIGURE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	RECIDIVISM DURING AND IN FIRST YEAR AFTER CSO	17

I INTRODUCTION

This document is the fourth and last in a series of reports to emerge from a research study into the Community Service Order (CSO) programme during its first three years of operation in Ontario. The purpose of this final report is to present some broad findings of the research and to address a few remaining key issues. Specifically, this document:

- 1) describes the CSO probationers, first as an entire population and second, in groups categorized by year of CSO disposition and by pilot project area;
- 2) reports recidivism rates of CSO probationers;
- 3) examines judicial decision-making regarding certain offences and their resultant CSO assignments.

A. BACKGROUND OF THE CSO PROGRAMME AND THE RESEARCH

A brief historical perspective attests to the rapid growth of the CSO programme in Ontario¹. In November of 1977, the Ontario Ministries of Correctional Services and the Attorney General formally announced that an experimental CSO programme would commence with a number of pilot projects. By January of 1978, six pilot projects became operational in the Province. However, in a few short months, this experimental phase had expanded, with the Government contracting six additional pilot projects by September of 1978. These twelve original projects are those which have been under examination over the course of this research.

The two-year pilot project phase officially ended in March of 1980 and, exactly one year later, at the preparation of this document, the CSO programme has expanded to include 42 projects. These projects are currently of two basic types. In the first type, the project is administered by the correctional system and, specifically, by Probation & Parole Services. Within the second type are those projects which are administered by a community organization, such as an agency, a citizen's committee or by a Native organization.

Research into the 12 pilot CSO programmes in Ontario was undertaken in January of 1978. The focus of the study was on probationers ordered to perform community service by the Courts in the 1978 and 1979 calendar years. The research examined the types of offenders receiving CSOs in those areas, the kinds of services they provided to their communities and their experiences in the programme.

¹ For a more comprehensive description of the CSO programme and its development in Ontario, see "The Community Service Order Programme in Ontario, 1. A Description of the Initial Cases" by Polcnoski (1979).

The products of this research, to date, have been enlightening, as well as substantial. Research has provided:

- 1) a preliminary description of the initial CSO cases and their community service experiences (Polonoski, 1979),
- 2) a description of a sample of probationers and their perceptions of the programme at the point of CSO completion (Polonoski, 1980a) and
- 3) a description of a sample of probationers, their perceptions of the programme and their recidivism one year following the completion of their Orders (Hermann, 1980).

The findings of these phases of the study were supportive of the programme. Probationers tended to be low-risk offenders, sentenced for relatively non-serious offences. They felt that both they and their communities had benefited from the CSO programme and that they had enjoyed participating in it. There was some indication that these attitudes were of a long-lasting nature. The original recidivism rate of the CSO probationers was found to be 12%. Most of these observations are confirmed in this final report.

II METHODOLOGY

A. FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH

This investigation focused on all the probationers issued a CSO in the pilot projects in Ontario between December, 1977 and December 1979. Of major interest for the purposes of this final document were their social/demographic histories at the point of sentencing, their CSO assignments, their experiences during the performance of their CSOs and their recidivism, both during and one year after the completion of their Orders.

B. THE POPULATION

The research was designed to include in the study sample all those probationers issued CSOs as a condition of their probation orders in the 12 pilot project areas. The geographic distribution of the 1,956 CSO probationers included in the study during the 1978 and 1979 calendar year is provided in Table 1. However, for various unforeseen reasons, such as project operational problems, misconceptions about the responsibility for research and clerical errors, not all the clients passing through the CSO programme in these pilot projects were necessarily included in this study. What is therefore actually reflected in Table 1 is the CSO population of the pilot projects as reported to Research Services by the local CSO programme organizers. By far, the majority of the population emerged from the combined Peterborough/Lindsay area, while the smallest proportions of the entire population were provided by the two Native projects, Kenora and London.

C. INSTRUMENTS

The data presented in this report were recorded on three instruments, which have been described in detail in the three earlier reports. The first instrument, the Client Information Face Sheet, is a formalized information tool of Probation Services which describes the offender's social/demographic history and specifications of the probation order. The second instrument was designed by Research Services for this study and is the CWO Experience Form. It measured the probationer's experience in performing community service as a court's disposition, the specifications of the probation order (hours, conditions) and any further convictions of the probationer during the performance of his CSO. The third instrument, a Recidivism Data Coding Form, recorded any criminal activity that the probationer was involved in during a one-year period after the termination of the CSO experience. The sources of information for these data collection instruments were the Probation & Parole Services, the local CSO organizers, the Ministry's computerized Adult Information System and Main Office files.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF CSO PROBATIONERS

REGION AND PILOT PROJECTS	N	%
OSHAWA-KAWARTHA LAKES		
Peterborough/Lindsay	388	19.8
Oshawa/Ajax	239	12.2
EASTERN		
Belleville	209	10.7
HALTON-PEEL		
Brampton-Peel	145	7.4
TORONTO EAST		
Scarborough	132	6.7
WEST CENTRAL		
St. Catharines	93	4.7
Hamilton/Wentworth	71	3.6
Kitchener/Cambridge	286	14.6
SOUTH WEST		
Windsor	145	7.4
London	14	0.7
NORTH WEST		
Thunder Bay	176	9.0
Kenora	58	3.0
TOTAL	1,956	100.0

III RESULTS

The following sections address three key issues about the CSO programme in Ontario. The first section provides a description of the sample of CSO offenders to pass through the CSO programme in the pilot project areas during 1978 and 1979, as a whole and in terms of year of CSO disposition. A description of each of the 12 pilot projects, highlighting several major client group features and the pilot project's community placements is found in the second section. In the third section, the relationship between offence type and CSO hour assignment, as determined by the Judiciary, in general, by year of CSO disposition and by pilot project area is documented.

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE TOTAL CSO POPULATION

This section provides a brief description of the 1,956 probationers who passed through the CSO programme in the pilot projects during 1978 and 1979. Various features of the sample, in its entirety and in terms of year of CSO disposition are presented in Table 2.

The 848 probationers issued CSOs in 1978 were compared to the 1,092 probationers given CSOs in 1979 to determine whether the character of the typical CSO probationer had changed over time. Sixteen offenders either without a confirmed conviction date on record or with a conviction date prior to these years were excluded from this comparison. No notable differences were found between these two groups. This would indicate that the Judiciary in these pilot project areas had been utilizing the CSO option consistently during these years. They were clearly selecting similar individuals from the general offender population for inclusion in the CSO programme.

1. SOCIAL/DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Regardless of year of sentence, the CSO programme participants generally typified low-risk offenders. They tended to be male, about 21 years old and single. Eight in ten had achieved some high school by the time they were sentenced to a CSO and almost a third were involved in an educational programme at that time. Half had been gainfully employed at a job when sentenced.

2. THE CSO DISPOSITION

The criminal activity which led to the CSO sentence was examined. It was found that three in every four probationers were assigned hours on a single conviction. Furthermore, the most common offences were property-related (Table 3). In fact, THEFT UNDER \$200 and BREAK & ENTER² were the offence types with the greatest representation.

² To facilitate data analysis, similar offence types have in some cases been combined under a single offence type heading. See Appendix A for a description of these general offence types.

Probationers were subsequently sentenced to an average probation period of about 16 months (Table 2). The average number of hours attached to the probation term was 76 hours, although the actual assignments ranged from four to 1,000 hours³. About half the Orders required less than 56 hours of community service and 70% were in the range of 40 to 240 hours. When the average assignments were examined by year of CSO disposition, a small increase of five hours in the average 1979 Order over the average 1978 Order was noted.

3. THE CSO EXPERIENCE

By the close of this study, that is, by the end of the third year since the research began, 85% of all the cases had been closed, or 94% of the 1978 cases and 78% of the 1979 cases. Closures included those cases:

- which were transferred out of the project area,
- which were breached for non-compliance with probation or community service orders,
- which never started their assignments and
- which fulfilled their CSO requirements.

The remainder, of course, were those probationers still performing their community service hours.

The community service experiences of those closed cases who had worked some portion of their assignments were examined. Generally, probationers worked at only one placement and had been in direct contact with the beneficiaries of their services. Local co-ordinators indicated that the probationers provided satisfactory services at all or some of their agency placements. The various tasks performed by the probationers are provided in Table 4. Half worked at simple manual labour jobs and one-fifth were involved in activities with young people.

The overall level of success of the CSO programme cannot truly be established from these data. However, several factors are indicative of the positive nature of the programme. Two-thirds of the probationers worked either all of the hours assigned to them or more. The average length of time taken to close a case was six months. Few probationers had their probation terminated early, although there was some indication that this situation may have been changing. Twelve percent of the 1978 group were terminated early compared to 23% of the 1979 group. Almost one-fifth maintained contact with a placement after the fulfillment of their assignments, by either becoming employed at the placement or by continuing their volunteer work there.

³ See Appendix B for a detailed representation of the CSO assignments.

4. RECIDIVISM

For the purposes of this research recidivism was defined as a reconviction which occurred (i) while the probationer was performing his community service or (ii) during the year following the completion/closure of the CSO case. The recidivism of the entire population at each of these phases is illustrated in Figure 1.

Recidivism data during the CSO phase were available for 78% of the probationers. However, it proved to be most difficult to acquire one-year follow-up information. Some cases were still active and some had not begun their hours. Others had missing or indeterminate information and some had been closed too recently to be eligible for a one-year follow-up. In any event, one-year recidivism data were available for 43% of the entire sample, or 62% of the 1978 group and 22% of the 1979 group.

Eighteen percent of the probationers recidivated either during their CSO experience or in the first 12 months after it. Twelve percent were convicted of an offence only during the performance of their hours. Over half of these had been convictions for failing to meet the prescribed conditions of their probation and/or community service order (Table 3).

The recidivism rate within the one-year follow-up period was also found to be very small at 13%. Only 15% of the 1978 cases and 10% of the 1979 cases had been reconvicted during this period. On the average, those reconvicted were first reconvicted within six months of completing their CSO requirements.

The offences committed during the follow-up period appeared to be less serious in nature than those offences which had originally led to the CSO (Table 3). About 20% of the probationers were reconvicted respectively on a BREACH OF PROBATION/CSO, on a THEFT UNDER \$200 and on a BREAK & ENTER. Moreover, greater proportions of probationers were convicted on a BREACH OF THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT, BREACH OF THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT, or SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION during the follow-up period. An examination of the most serious disposition received by the recidivists for their offences showed that half received a term of incarceration. About one-quarter, however, were granted additional probation.

At the end of that one-year follow-up period, just under one-quarter of the probationers were still on the original term of probation which had the CSO condition.

TABLE 2

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME,
IN GENERAL AND IN 1978 and 1979

FACTORS	YEAR OF CSO DISPOSITION				TOTAL POPULATION (n=1,956)	
	1978 (n=848)		1979 (n=1,092)			
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<u>DEMOGRAPHIC HISTORY</u>						
Sex						
Male	670	79.0	869	79.6	1,554	79.4
Female	178	21.0	223	20.4	402	20.6
Total	848	100.0	1,092	100.0	1,956	100.0
Age at Disposition (years)						
16 - 17	319	39.8	356	36.0	675	37.7
18 - 20	239	29.8	325	32.9	564	31.5
21 - 65	243	30.3	307	31.1	550	30.7
Total	801	100.0	988	100.0	1,789	100.0
Not reported	47		104		167	
Mean Age at Disposition (years)		20.9		21.1		21.0
Native						
Yes	23	2.7	23	2.1	46	2.4
No	825	97.3	1,069	97.9	1,910	97.6
Total	848	100.0	1,092	100.0	1,956	100.0
Marital Status						
Single	607	78.2	774	79.6	1,385	79.0
Married, common-law	119	15.3	146	15.0	266	15.2
Other	50	6.4	52	5.3	102	5.8
Total	776	100.0	972	100.0	1,753	100.0
Not reported	72		120		203	
Highest Grade Completed						
8 or less	118	15.3	136	14.3	254	14.7
9 or 10	375	48.8	444	46.7	821	47.6
11 to 13	260	33.8	317	33.4	580	33.6
Some university/college	12	1.6	36	3.8	48	2.8
Other	4	0.5	17	1.8	21	1.2
Total	769	100.0	950	100.0	1,724	100.0
Not reported	79		142		232	
In Educational Programme at Disposition						
Yes	179	29.7	201	32.3	381	31.0
No	424	70.3	422	67.7	847	69.0
Total	603	100.0	623	100.0	1,228	100.0
Not reported	245		469		728	
Working at Disposition						
Employed	322	50.9	336	49.0	660	49.9
Unemployed	305	48.2	340	49.6	646	48.9
Homemaker	6	0.9	10	1.5	16	1.2
Total	633	100.0	686	100.0	1,322	100.0
Not reported	215		406		634	

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME,
IN GENERAL AND IN 1978 and 1979

FACTORS	YEAR OF CSO DISPOSITION				TOTAL POPULATION (n=1,956)	
	1978 (n=848)		1979 (n=1,092)			
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<u>CRIMINAL HISTORY</u>						
On Probation Already at Disposition						
Yes	76	9.4	70	6.9	146	8.0
No	732	90.6	946	93.1	1,683	92.0
Total	808	100.0	1,016	100.0	1,829	100.0
Not reported	40		76		127	
Number of Counts						
One	617	75.6	793	76.6	1,411	76.1
More than one	199	24.4	242	23.4	442	23.9
Total	816	100.0	1,035	100.0	1,853	100.0
Not reported	32		57		103	
Term of Probation(months)						
Under 1 - 6	115	13.6	202	18.7	317	16.5
7 - 12	309	36.6	428	39.7	737	38.3
13 - 18	129	15.3	191	17.7	320	16.6
19 - 24	248	29.3	217	20.1	466	24.2
25 - 36	44	5.2	41	3.8	85	4.4
Total	845	100.0	1,079	100.0	1,925	100.0
Indeterminate, no probation	3		13		31	
Mean Number of Months of Probation (months)	16.6		14.8		15.6	
Hours Assigned						
4 to 40	303	39.6	271	30.7	576	34.8
41 to 80	190	24.8	310	35.1	503	30.4
81 to 120	176	23.0	195	22.1	372	22.5
121 to 160	48	6.3	52	5.9	99	6.0
161 to 200	33	4.3	33	3.7	66	4.0
201 to 1,000	15	2.0	21	2.4	36	2.2
Total	765	100.0	882	100.0	1,654	100.0
Indeterminate	83		210		302	
Mean Number of Hours Assigned (hours)	73.7		78.2		75.7	
Median of Hours Assigned (hours)	50.0		60.0		56.0	
CSO Completion Status						
Worked all hours assigned	500	59.0	568	52.0	1,073	54.9
Worked more hours	97	11.4	130	11.9	227	11.6
Worked fewer hours	108	12.7	75	6.9	185	9.5
Worked no hours:						
•CSO never started, closed	28	3.3	23	2.1	51	2.6
•CSO ongoing	47	5.5	238	21.8	293	15.0
Worked or assigned indeterminate hours	68	8.0	58	5.3	127	6.5
Total	848	100.0	1,092	100.0	1,956	100.0

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME,
IN GENERAL AND IN 1978 and 1979

FACTORS	YEAR OF CSO DISPOSITION				TOTAL POPULATION (n=1,956)	
	1978 (n=848)		1979 (n=1,092)			
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<u>CSO EXPERIENCES OF THOSE WHO WORKED HOURS</u>						
Number of Placements						
One	474	61.3	519	62.5	998	61.9
More than one	237	30.7	262	31.5	501	31.1
Indeterminate	62	8.0	50	6.0	113	7.0
Total	773	100.0	831	100.0	1,612	100.0
Not reported	0		0		0	
Ever Worked with Beneficiaries						
Yes	539	77.8	499	66.5	1,044	72.0
No	154	22.2	251	33.5	406	28.0
Total	693	100.0	750	100.0	1,450	100.0
Not reported	80		81		162	
Agency Satisfaction						
All satisfied	565	81.9	627	88.1	1,197	85.0
All dissatisfied	46	6.7	25	3.5	72	5.1
Some satisfied/some not	79	11.4	60	8.4	140	9.9
Total	690	100.0	712	100.0	1,409	100.0
Not reported	83		119		203	
Part of Week Worked						
Weekdays	372	54.4	362	51.6	739	53.1
Weekends	135	19.7	117	16.7	254	18.2
Both	177	25.9	222	31.7	399	28.7
Total	684	100.0	701	100.0	1,392	100.0
Not reported	89		130		220	
Part of Day Worked						
Daytime	483	70.8	472	67.5	962	69.3
Evenings	77	11.3	71	10.2	148	10.7
Both	122	17.9	156	22.3	278	20.0
Total	682	100.0	699	100.0	1,388	100.0
Not reported	91		132		224	
Probation Terminated Early						
Yes, for any reason	80	12.3	162	22.8	224	17.9
No	569	87.7	547	77.2	1,119	82.1
Total	649	100.0	709	100.0	1,363	100.0
Not reported, unsure, no probation	124		122		249	
Still Associated with Agency						
Yes, employed	18	2.6	24	3.2	43	3.0
Yes, volunteer	114	16.3	108	14.5	223	15.4
No	567	81.1	613	82.3	1,184	81.7
Total	699	100.0	745	100.0	1,450	100.0
Not reported	74		86		162	

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME,
IN GENERAL AND IN 1978 and 1979

FACTORS	YEAR OF CSO DISPOSITION				TOTAL POPULATION (n=1,956)	
	1978 (n=848)		1979 (n=1,092)			
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<u>Convicted of Offence During CSO</u>						
Yes, breach or failure	55	7.5	34	4.4	90	5.9
Yes, other	65	8.9	32	4.1	97	6.4
No	613	83.6	712	91.5	1,331	87.7
Total	733	100.0	778	100.0	1,518	100.0
Not reported	0		53		94	
<u>RECIDIVISM ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION OF CSO</u>						
One Year Status						
Recidivism data available	524	61.8	309	28.3	836	42.7
Recidivism data not available:						
•case ongoing	47	5.5	238	21.8	293	15.0
•not one year yet	93	11.0	376	34.4	469	24.0
•case transferred, no information available, never started CSO	184	21.7	169	15.5	358	18.3
Total	848	100.0	1,092	100.0	1,956	100.0
Recidivism						
Re-convicted	81	15.5	32	10.4	113	13.5
On remand, no re-conviction	6	1.1	3	1.0	9	1.1
No re-conviction, no remand	437	83.4	274	88.7	714	85.4
Total	524	100.0	309	100.0	836	100.0
Months to First Re-conviction (months)						
1 - 2	16	19.8	10	31.3	26	23.0
3 - 4	20	24.7	4	12.5	24	21.2
5 - 6	10	12.3	3	9.4	13	11.5
7 - 8	15	18.5	6	18.8	21	18.6
9 - 10	13	16.0	5	15.6	18	15.9
11 - 12	7	8.6	4	12.5	11	9.7
Total	81	100.0	32	100.0	113	100.0
Mean Number of Months to First Re-conviction						
	5.5		5.7		5.7	
Most Serious Disposition Received						
Fine/time	14	17.3	6	18.8	20	17.7
Probation	21	25.9	8	25.0	29	25.7
CSO	5	6.2	0	0.0	5	4.4
Intermittent sentence	3	3.7	0	0.0	3	2.7
Incarcerated	38	46.9	18	56.3	56	49.6
Total	81	100.0	32	100.0	113	100.0

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME,
IN GENERAL AND IN 1978 and 1979

FACTORS	YEAR OF CSO DISPOSITION		TOTAL POPULATION (n=1,956)
	1978 (n=848)	1979 (n=1,092)	
<u>CURRENT STATUS</u>	n %	n %	n %
Status One Year after CSO Completion	(of 524)	(of 309)	(of 836)
Ministry contact:			
serving sentence	12 2.3	4 1.3	16 1.9
on remand	8 1.5	4 1.3	12 1.4
on original CSO probation	119 22.7	72 23.3	191 22.8
on new probation	30 5.7	12 3.9	42 5.0
No Ministry contact	373 71.2	222 71.8	598 71.5

TABLE 3

OFFENCES LEADING TO CONVICTIONS AT CSO DISPOSITION, DURING CSO AND IN FIRST YEAR AFTER CSO

CONVICTED OF AT LEAST ONE:	CSO OFFENCE		OFFENCE DURING CSO		OFFENCE IN FIRST YEAR AFTER CSO	
	N	(% of 1956)	N	(% of 187)	N	(% of 113)
PERSON-RELATED OFFENCE						
. assault	78	4.0	7	3.7	6	5.3
. harassment	3	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
. intimidation/threatening	1	0.1	1	0.5	0	0.0
. manslaughter	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
. forceable confinement	0	0.0	2	1.1	1	0.9
PROPERTY-RELATED OFFENCE						
. theft under \$200	605	30.9*	10	5.3	22	19.5
. theft over \$200	164	8.4	9	4.8	7	6.2
. theft mail	3	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.9
. attempt theft/indictable offence	29	1.5	4	2.1	3	2.7
. take vehicle without consent	25	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.8
. break & enter	335	17.1	24	12.8	19	16.8
. arson	6	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.9
. forgery	16	0.8	1	0.5	0	0.0
. fraud	101	5.2	2	1.1	1	0.9
. uttering	16	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
. mischief causing damage	102	5.2	1	0.5	1	0.9
. wilful damage	74	3.8	1	0.5	5	4.4
. possession of stolen property under \$200	88	4.5	2	1.1	5	4.4
. possession of stolen property over \$200	100	5.1	8	4.3	5	4.4
. possession of burglary tools	3	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
. robbery	6	0.3	2	1.1	1	0.9

TABLE 3 (cont.)

PUBLIC MORALS & DECENCY OFFENCE						
. indecent offence	7	0.4	1	0.5	1	0.9
. abandon child	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
. fail to provide necessities of life	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
. contributing to juvenile delinquency	4	0.2	1	0.5	0	0.0
. unlawful sex	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
PUBLIC ORDER & PEACE OFFENCE						
. obstruct justice	25	1.3	2	1.1	2	1.8
. false information	11	0.6	1	0.5	2	1.8
. personate with intent	3	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
. breach of Bankruptcy Act	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
. breach of bail	6	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
. breach of probation/CSO	22	1.1	104	55.6*	23	20.4*
. fail to appear/comply/obey	27	1.4	6	3.2	6	5.3
. cause disturbance	29	1.5	2	1.1	4	3.5
. common nuisance	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
. false firealarm	6	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
. prowl, trespass at night	2	0.1	1	0.5	0	0.0
. weapons	26	1.3	0	0.0	5	4.4
. public mischief	77	3.9	3	1.6	0	0.0
. mischief dangerous	5	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
. conspiracy	2	0.1	1	0.5	0	0.0
. cruelty to animal	1	0.1	1	0.5	0	0.0
. escape	2	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.9
. Juvenile Delinquency Act	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
. criminal negligence	7	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.9
. breach of Railway Act	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9

TABLE 3 (cont.)

DRUG OFFENCE						
. simple drug possession	98	5.0	11	5.9	10	8.8
. drug trafficking	18	0.9	3	1.6	1	0.9
TRAFFIC OFFENCE						
. drive while license suspended	17	0.9	1	0.5	7	6.2
. dangerous driving	31	1.6	0	0.0	2	1.8
. fail to remain	10	0.5	1	0.5	0	0.0
. breach of Highway Traffic Act	2	0.1	2	1.1	7	6.2
LIQUOR OFFENCE						
. driving while impaired	37	1.9	5	2.7	7	6.2
. breach of Liquor Control Act	6	0.3	6	3.2	18	15.9
. refuse breath sample	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
OTHER OFFENCE						
. attempt summary offence	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
. dangerous operation of vessel/vessel misc.	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
. other Provincial statutes	0	0.0	1	0.5	0	0.0
. other Federal statutes	9	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
. breach of Municipal by-laws	1	0.1	0	0.0	3	2.7
. take fish by snagging	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
UNKNOWN OFFENCE	19	1.0	8	4.8	1	0.9

* Most commonly mentioned offence.


TABLE 4

TASKS PERFORMED BY CSO PROBATIONERS

TASK	N	% OF 1612
Repairs, maintenance, construction, refinishing, manual labour	790	49.0
Activities with teens, youth, children	306	19.0
Clerical work, involving office work, map drawing, research, report writing, book repairs, librarian duties, translating, teaching English	166	10.3
Activities with blind, sick, handi- capped, mentally retarded	162	10.0
Help with animals or game	139	8.6
Festival or programme organization, involving canvassing, stage or television work, poster making, course work	103	6.4
Work at recycling plant, sorting goods for needy, cutting rags, work at warehouse	95	5.9
Landscaping, involving tree- planting, greenhouse work, gardening, clearing brush, cutting or piling wood	88	5.5
Delivery, pick-ups, chauffeur, protective service	81	5.0
Activities with senior citizens	63	3.9
Cooking or kitchen duties	35	2.2

FIGURE 1

RECIDIVISM DURING AND IN FIRST YEAR AFTER CSO



B. DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOT PROJECT AREAS

The 1,956 probationers were sorted by project area in which they completed their CSO requirements. If an offender was sentenced to a CSO in one pilot project and was subsequently transferred to another, he would be identified in the receiving pilot project area only. In this section, the probationer groups in the individual project areas are described, as well as the kinds of work placements. Comparable statistics on these groups are given in Table 5.

The perceptions of some of the local project coordinators regarding the use of the CSO as a sentencing alternative in their areas have been included where possible⁴.

1. PETERBOROUGH/LINDSAY PILOT PROJECT (n=388)

Project Description

The Peterborough programme is operated through the Volunteer Services in the local Information Centre and has been under contract since January of 1978. The Judiciary reportedly has been most supportive of the project, using the CSO disposition quite consistently. Breaches for failure to complete hours have been dealt with by the Judiciary by allotting one day in jail for each incomplete hour.

The Lindsay programme is a satellite of the Peterborough programme, operating through the Kawartha Youth Centre. The CSO programme is reportedly only used by the Provincial Judge in this area. It is the combined opinion of the local coordinator and Probation Office that between 4% and 10% of the clients might have been sentenced to jail, had it not been for the CSO programme. The CSO has been used mainly as an important condition of probation.

While the probationers in this area were predominantly male, the Peterborough/Lindsay project also had one of the greatest proportions of female CSO probationers. The average age of clients was 21 years old and most were single. Over a third were in a school programme at the time of their disposition and almost half were working.

The average assignment in this area was the lowest among all the pilot projects. While the Orders ranged from eight to 250 hours, the average was 41 hours. About half the Orders were assignments of 30 hours or less.

Ten percent of the probationers in this project area had acquired another conviction during their CSO assignments, but only eight percent in the year after completing them.

Placement Description

LOCAL TELEVISION/RADIO STATION

Helped at all types of work related to TV operation.

⁴ These perceptions were the "educated guesses" of the local coordinators as reported by them in a progress report to the Ministry in mid-1980.

LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Helped in the nursery, did office work, waxed floors and cleaned pews.

LOCAL HOSPITAL

Delivered flowers to patients, helped out in diet clinic, worked for the building services department, did grounds work, worked in kitchen, geriatrics and in Central Supply, was elevator operator and porter, read to patients and wrote letters.

LOCAL CITIZENS

Cleaned, cut grass, painted fences, dug trenches, did farm chores, cared for animals, shovelled snow and insulated attics, helped to feed citizens and minded children, painted, did carpentry work for multiple sclerosis patients and did odd jobs. Helped with haying and tended sheep for senior citizens, shopped and played cribbage.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION

Planted trees, helped in the greenhouse and fish-hatchery and did general maintenance.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Washed windows for senior citizens, cleaned stairwells, be-friended a "little brother", did a telephone survey and delivered meals for Meals-on-Wheels.

HUMANE SOCIETY

Fed animals and cleaned after them, cut grass.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES

Fed and read to senior citizens, did general maintenance, helped in the craft room and was cook's helper.

UNITED WAY

Painted, prepared kits and packed and sorted material for moving the office.

YOUTH CENTRE

Assisted programme director, helped on newspaper pick-ups and cleaned kitchens.

RED CROSS

Cut grass for handicapped and phoned donors for blood donor clinic.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS

Cared for pre-schoolers and assisted teachers.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES

Cleaned ice, worked in a canteen, helped in sports tournaments.

PROBATION OFFICE

Did office work and helped in group situations.

SERVICE CLUB

Stuffed envelopes, filed and did general office work, helped to clean up a river bed, served for teas and helped at a bazaar.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION

Did park maintenance and gardening, swept sand from park sidewalks and tended the rink.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA

Cut brush, cleaned windows and cupboards, did general office duties, sorted clothes, helped in the nursery swim programme, supervised and taught a swimming programme, helped at hockey games, supervised and transported children to bowl, coached soccer and helped at a banquet.

LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Manned festival booths, cleared the grounds, made torches for the torch parade, took tickets and assembled a stage; raked leaves, cleaned troughs, helped to plough farm land, cut grass and painted; helped at winter carnival.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED

Helped with swimming programme for crippled children and acted as teacher's aide; worked with MR children in the crafts room and audiology; helped in the gym programme for handicapped and pool programme with learning disabled.

LUNG ASSOCIATION

Typed, stamped and stuffed envelopes and filed.

LOCAL LIBRARIES

Read onto tapes for blind and handicapped, helped with the children's programme and did research.

VOLUNTEER BUREAU

Transported elderly and handicapped to and from medical appointments, typed and helped with publicity, did telephone follow-ups and re-arranged furniture; painted and did office work.

RECYCLING DEPOT

Helped with glass and tin recycling.

LOCAL FIRE DEPARTMENT

Painted the firehall and washed fire trucks.

LOCAL THEATRE GROUP

Set up the stage and did stage work.

LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Cleaned up rubbish.

LOCAL CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

Cleaned brush for snowmobile trails.

LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS

Helped with snow removal.

2. OSHAWA/AJAX PILOT PROJECT (n=239)

Project Description

This CSO pilot project has been co-ordinated through the local Probation/Parole office since December of 1977. It is the only pilot project which is correctional system-based. The CSO probationer caseload is reportedly about 150 persons. It is also said that the County Court Judges have used the CSO more as an alternative to jail and the Provincial Court Judges, more as a condition of a probation order.

Clients in the Oshawa/Ajax project were, as in the other projects, mostly male, 20 years old and single. This area, however, had the largest proportion of probationers who were quite young; half were 16 or 17 years old. A third of the clients were in an educational programme and half were employed when sentenced to the CSO. This project had the second greatest proportion of clients who were already on probation when sentenced and also the largest proportion given probation terms of over 12 months.

The average CSO in this area was 89 hours with about half the Orders being for up to 90 hours. The actual range of assignments, though, was from 10 to 200 hours. While working these hours, 18% of the clients were convicted on a new charge. In addition, four in ten had their probation terminated early. This was a larger proportion than in any other pilot project. Twenty-one percent were reconvicted during the one year period after their CSO, which was the second highest re-conviction rate among the projects. By the end of the first year, a third were still on their original probation term. This was the greatest proportion of probationers still on their CSO probation term among all the pilot projects, although this is very likely a function of their lengthy probation orders.

Placement Description

LOCAL TELEVISION/RADIO STATION

Helped with lighting and cameras, translated, acted as stage director and stage hand and did manual labour.

LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Did lawn maintenance, helped people with wheel-chairs into church, repaired hymn books.

LOCAL HOSPITALS

Helped with elderly patients, helped with recreational activities, typed, painted and served at snack bar.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION

Did maintenance work, repaired playground equipment and coached.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Painted and did maintenance at needy girls' camp, helped with toy collection and distribution and was receptionist.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES
Instructed crafts, did landscaping, read to patients, visited and supervised bingos.

RED CROSS
Did maintenance work.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS
Supervised children.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES
Helped with pool maintenance.

SALVATION ARMY
Helped with youth sports programme and drove vans for picking up goods and elderly people.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION
Did general maintenance work and cleaned a river bed.

BOY SCOUTS, BROWNIES AND GIRL GUIDES
Acted as scout leader.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA
Organized a tournament, coached baseball, did office duties, coached hockey, coached soccer and made graphics and posters.

HOSTELS AND DROP-IN CENTRES
Did clerical work, renovated, performed kitchen duties, did woodworking, organized programmes and moved furniture.

LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS
Painted, collected garbage and helped in parades.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED
Cleaned and fed crippled children, helped in class-room programme and raised funds. Landscaped and did maintenance work for MR centre, fed and played with children and participated in children's and class-room activities.

CORRECTIONAL/DETENTION/COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTRE
Supervised programmes.

LOCAL CONSERVATION AUTHORITY
Cleared grass, drew maps and landscaped.

RECYCLING PLANT
Unloaded autos and sorted recycled materials.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUBS
Did janitorial work and supervised and coached children.

LOCAL ART GALLERY
Packed and uncrated materials and hung pictures.

NATIVE PEOPLE'S RESERVE
Cut wood.

LIFE SKILLS PROGRAMME
Participated in groups and helped with the elderly.

MUNICIPAL OFFICES
Did maintenance work.

3. BELLEVILLE PILOT PROJECT (n=209)

Project Description

The project operating in Belleville, the Community-Oriented Sentencing Programme, is community-based. It has been developed by a cross-section of professionals and concerned community individuals. This programme was contracted in February of 1978. An unconfirmed estimate of the proportion of CSO clients who might have received jail terms, had it not been for the CSO programme, is in the area of 20 to 25%.

The average CSO offender in this project was male and 21 years old. Most were single, although this project had the greatest proportion of clients who were married or living common-law.

In addition to having the second highest average assignment, Belleville had the greatest average term of probation (i.e., 21 months). The Orders issued to probationers averaged assignments of 112 hours and ranged from 10 to 960 hours. Half of these Orders, though, were assignments in excess of 100 hours.

Sixteen percent of the probationers had been re-convicted during their CSO experience and 17%, in the one year period after its completion.

Placement Description

LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS
Painted and did maintenance work.

LOCAL HOSPITALS
Worked in coffee shop, did office work, worked with alcoholics and was responsible for patients attending A.A. meetings.

LOCAL CITIZENS
Cleaned windows, painted, re-decorated, raked leaves, renovated, did construction work, babysat and visited senior citizens.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION
Did maintenance work and office work.

SOCIAL SERVICES
Painted.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES
Helped with crafts, tutored, drove residents, visited with residents and did maintenance work.

CHILDREN'S CENTRE AND CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY

Did maintenance work and helped in group homes.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS

Did maintenance work and renovated, helped with education programme and tended children.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES

Did maintenance work, picked up trash, painted and acted as entrance guards.

SERVICE CLUB

Helped at fund-raising, helped with a party held for the deaf, did maintenance work, set up a banquet hall and picked apples.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION

Did area maintenance, helped with swimming programme, cleared trails and raked leaves.

BOY SCOUTS, BROWNIES AND GIRL GUIDES

Acted as scout leader.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA

Was assistant referee, assistant coach, umpire or swim coach, helped in penalty box, did office work, and baby-sat in day-care centre.

LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS

City clean-up.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED

Did maintenance work, helped out in MR programmes and supervised a bowling outing.

PUBLIC WORKS

Did maintenance work.

CSO PROGRAMME HEADQUARTERS

Painted offices and signs, layed carpeting and moved furniture.

LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITIES

Did maintenance and yard work.

HOME MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME

Cleaned, cut grass and shovelled snow.

VOLUNTEER BUREAU

Did clerical work.

LOCAL CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES

Hauled logs and did park maintenance work.

ADULT LITERACY AND LIFE SKILLS PROGRAMMES

Did carpentry work and did secretarial work.

CENTRE FOR ALCOHOLICS

Involved in card games and woodworking programme.

LOCAL FIRE DEPARTMENT

Painted a fire truck.

4. BRAMPTON/PEEL PILOT PROJECT (N=145)

Project Description

The Brampton/Peel CSO programme operates under the auspices of the Elizabeth Fry Society and has been under contract since July of 1978. Clients in this project were found to typically be male, single, and about 19 years old. This project had the greatest proportion of offenders who were either actively involved in an educational programme at the time of their court disposition or who were working.

The average number of hours assigned on a CSO in this area was 66 hours, with Orders ranging from 10 to 250 hours. Half the Orders were for over 50 hours.

Only nine percent of the clients were convicted of an offence during the performance of their Orders and almost one-quarter maintained contact with one of their community placements, either as an employee or a volunteer. Only 5% of the clients were reconvicted during the year following the completion of their Orders. In comparison to the other projects, Brampton/Peel had the lowest proportion of persons placed on remand or reconvicted during that year.

Placement Description

LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Did carpentry work.

LOCAL HOSPITAL

Helped with in-patient transportation and entertained in pediatrics.

ENERSAVE

Did gardening.

LOCAL CITIZEN

Made and donated pizzas.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION

Prepared playing fields, painted and cleaned, did grounds maintenance work, did research, assisted in nursery school classroom activities, chopped wood and tutored.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Moved a family, measured stairwells for an installation for the handicapped, shovelled snow, did gardening and grounds work, did housework, did carpentry for handicapped and senior citizens.

HUMANE SOCIETY

Cared for animals.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES

Did gardening, provided transportation and company, worked in a tuck shop, helped with feeding, did typing and visited.

CHILDREN'S CENTRE AND CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY

Acted as teacher's assistant and did gardening at children's treatment centre, drove children to visits.

RED CROSS

Stored supplies and helped organize the storage facilities.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS

Led children's crafts and sports activities in After School programme; admitted children in the morning, prepared snacks, aided in the crafts programme, provided general supervision and painted wall murals.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRE

Did general maintenance, cleaned, set up meeting rooms, did carpentry, kept time for sport activities and made cabinets.

SALVATION ARMY

Helped a family move, helped sort goods for the needy, tested appliances and dispersed toys and gifts to needy families for Christmas programme.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION

Helped to organize a community festival, helped with skating class for handicapped children, administered a recreation survey, did painting, cleaning and carpentry work, helped to prepare playing fields, dismantled a building and retrieved materials and set up displays for Christmas.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA

Baby-sat for mothers in a "Y" programme, helped in Life Skills programme and acted as chaperone on day trips.

WOMEN'S RESIDENCE

Did gardening, carpentry work and snow shovelling.

LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Worked in an information booth at a community festival, supervised a ski area, set up tables, cleaned grounds, organized events and kept time during Special Olympics.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED

Dug a foundation for a wheelchair lift, painted, did banking, made deliveries, helped with craft programme, assisted handicapped riders, did publicity work, learned how to operate a wheelchair and illustrated this service to others, did some gardening, visited handicapped residents, did bicycle repairs for MR,

acted as steward at a race, helped at outings and did gardening at a group home.

LOCAL FIRE DEPARTMENT

Did graphics and painted signs.

ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

Related to child on one-to-one basis in gym and crafts programme, assisted with community festival preparations, did typing and assisted in sheltered workshop.

5. SCARBOROUGH PILOT PROJECT (N=132)

Project Description

This project services the entire Scarborough area, and is based in the John Howard Society of Metropolitan Toronto and has been under contract since December, 1977. It is reported that the local Judiciary has made broad use of the CSO option. While the clients in this project were predominantly single and male, this project had one of the greatest proportion of client groups who were female. As well, the Scarborough project contained the greatest proportion of older probationers. Almost half were over 20 years old and the average age of probationers was 23 years old. One-quarter were involved in some educational programme at the time of their CSO disposition and two-thirds were employed.

The average CSO assignment in the Scarborough area was 76 hours, although the Orders ranged from 10 to 200 hours. Half the Orders were in excess of 75 hours.

Only five percent of the cases were convicted of another offence during their CSO assignment. After the completion of their requirements, about a third were either employed by or a volunteer at one of their CSO placements. In fact, this project had the highest proportion of offenders to maintain such contacts after CSO completion.

Twelve percent of those followed-up one year after CSO completion were reconvicted and most of these received a term of incarceration as their most serious disposition. Scarborough had the largest proportion of recidivists to receive this sentence.

Placement Description

LOCAL TELEVISION/RADIO STATION

Learned to operate a camera, helped to run equipment and helped to organize people in the community.

LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Did gardening, did maintenance work and painted.

LOCAL HOSPITALS

Helped in recreational programme, be-friended patients, acted as escort, was swimming instructor and supervised and assisted in woodworking shop.

LOCAL CITIZENS
Cleaned, worked on an assembly line and did odd jobs.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRE, BOARD OF EDUCATION
Helped in the adult upgrading programme.

SOCIAL SERVICES
Visited senior citizens, helped them with housework and shopping and did office work; drove a truck, handled and bundled newspapers, drove seniors and handicapped and taught basic English to non-English speaking people.

ENDANGERED ANIMAL SANCTUARY
Cleaned animal cages and performed other general duties.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES
Helped with arts and craft programme, was receptionist (mailed, phoned, worked on accounts) did maintenance work, made toys, helped at fund-raising luncheons, did research, socialized and helped with feeding, bowled and helped with elderly.

CHILDREN'S CENTRES AND CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY
Acted as a "big brother", was a librarian's helper, was swimming instructor, supervised recreation area and drove children.

RED CROSS
Did maintenance work, cleaned and did gardening, helped to set up blood donor clinics, telephoned blood donors, was a volunteer driver and did office work.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS
Supervised children.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES
Taught English to adults, supervised children, helped with day-care and taught, taught needle point and embroidery to women and prepared horse-shoe pits for local horseshoe pitcher association.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION
Did clerical work at Pioneer Village and did maintenance work at park.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA
Did maintenance work, helped with the recreation programme, assisted in child-care duties and performed clerical and librarian duties.

SHORT-TERM RESIDENCE FOR ADULTS
Painted and did general repairs and cleaning.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED
Tacked, led and groomed horses.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUB
Helped out at front desk, in the gym, games room and lounge, was involved in woodworking programme, did maintenance work, coached baseball and hockey and acted as timekeeper.

VOLUNTEER BUREAU
Did maintenance work.

LOCAL DRUM AND BUGLE CORPS
Recruited, instructed and helped with a fund-raising.

6. ST. CATHARINES PILOT PROJECT (N=93)

Project Description

This project was contracted to the John Howard Society in St. Catharines in September, 1978. It is somewhat unlike the other pilot projects in that its placements are predominantly work-group oriented. Much like the other pilot projects, on the other hand, clients in this area were male, single and about 23 years old. Few were in an educational programme or working at the time of their CSO sentence. In fact, this pilot project had the highest unemployed rate among clients.

The St. Catharines project had the lowest average term of probation (i.e., nine months). However, it also had the greatest average Order (i.e., 145 hours). In fact, half of the Orders had assignments in excess of 80 hours. Assignments in this area ranged from 20 to 1,000 hours and were largely for a prescribed number of days of community service computed on an eight-hour work day. Perhaps as a function of the high rate of unemployment, probationers largely worked their community service hours during the day time, weekdays.

The conviction rate of the probationers during the performance of their hours was 10%, although the recidivism rate in the year following the cases' closure was 19%.

Placement Description

SOCIAL SERVICES
Sorted clothes and distributed them to the needy, installed glass in broken windows, cleaned the exterior and interior of buildings, removed weeds, cut down trees, removed scraps to the dump, was a guard, refinished wooden office desks (sanded and varnished) and repaired donated appliances.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES
Cleaned the building, painted windows and tended the flower beds and shrubs.

UNITED WAY
Painted, cleaned and did janitorial work.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES
Helped to coach sports.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION

Cleared brush and small dead trees, cut grass, tidied community park lands and assisted at the local rink.

SPORTS ASSOCIATION

Sanded and refinished oars.

LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Installed glass and window panes, constructed signs and painted park benches, painted, sanded and restored old carousel, removed nails from re-usable lumber, dug old canal contours and retrieved old canal artifacts, helped build bicycle path, did woodworking and drafted maps related to canal properties.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED

Assisted MR children in a workshop, did gardening and kept the grounds, removed snow, fixed fences, cleaned windows, painted, did renovation and general janitorial duties.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUB

Assisted in physical training exercises with young children.

7. HAMILTON/WENTWORTH PILOT PROJECT (N=71)

Project Description

This project was originally contracted to the Elizabeth Fry Society in September, 1978. The CSO programme is reported to have a high profile among the Judiciary in this area and to be used largely as an add-on to probation or a jail term.

The Hamilton/Wentworth project had the greatest proportion of male clients among the twelve pilot projects. They tended to be about 23 years old and single. None were in an educational programme when sentenced and over half were unemployed. Similar to the St. Catharines project and probably because of the high rate of unemployment, probationers preferred to work their community service hours during the day and on weekdays.

Over half the CSOs contained assignments of over 96 hours. The average Order was for 106 hours and the range was from 20 to 558 hours.

Ten percent of the clients were convicted of another offence during their CSO experience and eight percent were reconvicted in the first year after completing their assignments.

Placement Description

LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUP

Did maintenance work in the cemetery.

LOCAL HOSPITAL/MEDICAL CENTRE

Did landscaping, helped in the transportation and communication department and provided child care.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION

Coached floor hockey, worked in the warehouse and printing and duplicating department, moved furniture, repaired desks, helped in the recreation programme, taught swimming and did typing.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Cleaned, did research and assisted staff at a group home.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES

Helped in the kitchen, did maintenance work and helped in a research survey on medical facilities for senior citizens.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS

Provided child care.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES

Coached sports, did telephone work, helped in a swimming programme and coached children.

SERVICE CLUB

Worked with boys.

BOY SCOUTS, BROWNIES AND GIRL GUIDES

Did maintenance work.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA

Coached children.

NATIVE WOMEN'S CENTRE

Did maintenance work.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED

Did maintenance work at the CNIB, worked with MR children, assisted children with cerebral palsy, worked with the handicapped in assessment and evaluation department, taught auto mechanics and helped in the furniture refinishing shop.

LOCAL CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

Did maintenance work.

MULTICULTURAL CENTRE

Did general maintenance work.

PUBLIC LIBRARY

Created display walls for a summer reading club.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUB

Helped in the swimming programme.

8. KITCHENER/CAMBRIDGE PILOT PROJECT (n=286)

Project Description

This CSO project operates under the auspices of the John Howard Society, which was contracted in September of 1978. Clients were normally found to be male, single and 21 years of age. This pilot project had the greatest proportion of clients with greater than a Grade 8 education. Almost a third were in an educational programme at the time of the CSO disposition and over half were employed. Almost three-quarters were placed on probation for 12 months or less and over half were ordered to perform 40 hours of community service or less. The average Order was for 53 hours, with Orders ranging from 10 to 250 hours.

Fourteen percent of the clients were convicted during the performance of their community service and 11% during the first year after the Order's completion. The greatest proportion of clients to subsequently receive another term of probation as their most serious disposition was found in this project.

Placement Description

LOCAL TELEVISION/RADIO STATION
Did maintenance work.

LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS
Helped with cemetery maintenance, cleaned, painted, helped with recycling drive, set up summer camp, chopped trees, landscaped, built pens, ploughed snow, helped in nursery, did clerical work and did general maintenance work.

LOCAL HOSPITALS
Was a candy-striper and worked with stroke and elderly patients.

RAPE DISTRESS CENTRE
Baby-sat for adults taking a course.

LOCAL CITIZENS
Did home and yard maintenance for senior citizens.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION
Assisted a professor, worked with pre-school children, helped in Biology Department's green-houses, cleaned and did janitorial work, helped in library and kindergarten, marked school work and did clerical tasks.

SOCIAL SERVICES
Did mailing, helped at a social club and did janitorial work.

HUMANE SOCIETY
Painted, cleaned and moved stones.

LOCAL NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICE ORGANIZATION
Baby-sat and baked for a bake sale.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD
Did clerical work.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES
Visited senior citizens, drove seniors, worked in laundry room, helped set up tables, did gardening and general maintenance, helped in a publicity programme and showed films.

CANADIAN CANCER AND ARTHRITIS SOCIETIES
Did clerical work.

YOUTH IN CONFLICT WITH THE LAW
Attended a bowl-a-thon, delivered booklets and did clerical tasks.

CHILDREN'S CENTRE
Did painting, carpentry and maintenance.

ST. JOHN'S AMBULANCE
Practiced first aid.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS
Painted, cleaned, baby-sat for pre-schoolers and did general maintenance.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES
Did janitorial work, helped with arena maintenance, helped at banquets, supervised floor hockey, baby-sat, umpired in T-ball, shovelled snow, cut grass, helped with movie projector and helped in self-defence classes.

PROBATION OFFICE, VOLUNTEER PROBATION PROGRAMME
Cleaned and helped put out a newsletter.

SALVATION ARMY
Helped with odd jobs and cleaned.

SERVICE CLUB
Sold Christmas trees and did a variety of tasks.

REGIONAL POLICE DEPARTMENT
Painted.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION
Did maintenance work.

BOY SCOUTS, BROWNIES AND GIRL GUIDES
Aided programmers in scout groups and did maintenance work.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA
Coached hockey, coached and umpired baseball, lined fields for football and coached, cleaned YM/YWCA facilities, painted and kept time at boxing competitions for children.

HOME FOR BATTERED WIVES
Did maintenance work.

LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS
Was on the planning committee for a community festival, delivered pamphlets and baby-sat for a ladies group in the community development project.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED
Painted, cleaned, did carpentry work, baked, worked in a greenhouse, related on a one-to-one basis with MR children, helped at a bowling function and helped with swimming programme.

CORRECTIONAL/DETENTION CENTRE
Did maintenance work.

9. WINDSOR PILOT PROJECT (N=145)

Project Description

This project is agency-based, affiliated with the St. Leonard's Society of Canada in Windsor, and has been under contract since January of 1978. The local County and Provincial Court Judges are reported to use the CSO programme, although they do not seem to use it as an alternative to incarceration.

The majority of the CSO clients in this project were male and about 23 years old. While most were single, this project had the largest proportion of separated, divorced or widow(er)ed clients. Precisely one-quarter were in a school programme and over half were employed, at the time of their sentence.

This project also had the greatest proportion of probationers to receive Orders of between 41 and 200 hours (90%). The average assignment was 100 hours, with a range of 10 to 300 hours.

Only nine percent of the probationers in this area were convicted of an offence during the performance of these hours. During the year after the completion of their hours, however, 16% were again convicted of an offence.

Placement Description

LOCAL RELIGIOUS GROUPS
Did yard maintenance, painted, assisted church caretaker, did secretarial work, assisted with children's programmes, translated and refinished furniture.

LOCAL HOSPITALS
Helped on children's ward and surgical ward, researched data for a study, helped out in the physiotherapy department, transported patients, was involved in research activities, provided escort service, fed patients and worked with chronic care patients.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION
Taught children, assisted children in sports, supervised children's activities, cut lawns, weeded, fertilized ground and worked in flower beds.

SOCIAL SERVICES
Did secretarial work, did weekend cooking at a halfway house, wrote and audited reports, prepared news releases, did carpentry, plastering repairs and plumbing, moved furniture, did general maintenance, helped with public education and co-led activities within a group home setting.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES
Did general maintenance, visited and entertained seniors, assisted in recreational programmes and served food.

CHILDREN'S CENTRE AND CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY
Did maintenance and repairs and acted as a "big brother".

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS
Provided day care.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES
Did janitorial duties, tended to ice, supervised basketball games, ran the time clock for hockey games, supervised dances and other youth activities.

SERVICE CLUBS
Researched data for a study, drove children to participate in games, coached children, cleaned a hall, set up bingo games for senior citizens, helped with children's floor hockey activities.

BOY SCOUTS, BROWNIES AND GIRL GUIDES
Worked with Scouts.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA
Did clerical work, did maintenance work, acted as assistant coach, worked on camping research project, supervised children during recreational activities and assisted in the enforcement of Fire Marshall regulations in the stands.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED
Did secretarial work, helped with physical fitness programmes, taught crippled children to ride horses, groomed horses, worked with the deaf, repaired hearing equipment and supervised MR activities.

LOCAL CHARITIES
Provided general labour, was a truck helper and jitney operator, helped on a loading dock, repaired appliances, did maintenance work, helped with shipping and receiving of goods and worked on furniture display.

VOLUNTEER BUREAUS

Did book work and answered the telephone, refinished furniture, counselled and made referrals for the unemployed.

HOME FOR UNWED MOTHERS

Did housework.

LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECT

Posted signs for a political group.

10. LONDON PILOT PROJECT (n=14)

Project Description

This project is a Native programme that involves Native clients working for Native agencies. Operating through the N'Amerind Friendship Centre, the project services the Native Indian population in London and three surrounding reserves, and has been under contract since June of 1978.

The London project had very small representation in this study. For this reason, these data must be used cautiously.

The majority of the CSO referrals are said to have come from one Judge and it is estimated that about 20% of the CSOs given to offenders in this area could be considered an alternative to a jail sentence. CSOs seem to be used more as a stronger sanction than straight probation.

The probationers tended to have been male, about 20 years old and single. Because of the nature of the project, a third of the probationers were Native. Two out of the three people on whom information was available were employed at the time of the CSO disposition.

Of particular note is the fact that almost a quarter of the clients were already on probation at the time of their CSO sentence, the highest proportion among all the projects. It is also the London project which had one of the greatest proportions of offenders convicted on a single offence to receive their CSOs. The average assignment was 65 hours, while the Orders ranged from 10 to 170 hours. Half the Orders were for assignments in excess of 50 hours. All of the probationers who worked on their Orders, at some time worked directly with the beneficiaries of their services.

This CSO project had the greatest conviction rate during the CSO experience, at 23% (or 3 out of 13). However it also had the greatest proportion of clients to maintain contact with a community placement as an employee or volunteer after completing their CSO requirements. During the year after completion, 45% of the probationers in this project were again re-convicted.

Placement Description

CORRECTIONAL/DETENTION CENTRE

Helped with visits with court-workers.

CSO PROGRAMME HEADQUARTERS

Painted building and trim, did basic renovations, plastered and sanded, acted as receptionist, helped at a bingo, in the kitchen, played cards, supervised children, involved in craft instruction and was assistant baseball coach.

NATIVE PEOPLE'S RESERVE AND CENTRES

Wrote summaries and evaluations on research work done by the Native Centre, cleaned yards, cut grass and did gardening and odd jobs.

11. THUNDER BAY PILOT PROJECT (n=176)

Project Description

The CSO project in Thunder Bay was contracted to the John Howard Society in January, 1978. All the Judges at the Provincial and District Court levels reportedly have made use of the CSO option. An unconfirmed estimate is that no more than 25% of the CSO probationers are given a CSO in this area as an alternative to imprisonment.

The probationers in this project were typically male. Their average age was 19 years old and, in fact, this project had the greatest proportion of young offenders; eight in ten were under 21 years old. In conjunction, the Thunder Bay project had the greatest representation of single offenders. One in three clients were in an educational programme at the time of their sentence and about one in two were working.

This project also had one of the largest proportions of clients to be given a CSO on a single conviction. Over half of the probationers were given a CSO assignment of 50 hours or more, while the average Order was for 71 hours. The Orders ranged from 4 to 300 hours.

Ten percent were convicted prior to the completion of their community service assignments and 15%, during the one year period after the completion.

Placement Description

LOCAL HOSPITALS

Assembled bicycles.

LOCAL CITIZENS

Washed windows, cut lawns, repaired autos, shovelled snow, cleaned, baby-sat and provided duties as required to a victim.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION

Cleaned, did maintenance work, welded, was electrician's assistant and carpenter's assistant and did library duties.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Did janitorial work.

HUMANE SOCIETY

Painted and dug ditches.

NURSING HOMES AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES

Assisted senior citizens.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS

Assisted in the supervision of children.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES

Did janitorial work and cleaned the rink.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION

Provided general labour, was baseball umpire and rink worker.

SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS AND YM/YWCA

Did office duties and supervised workshop for general public and supervised a roller skating marathon for cystic fibrosis.

LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Did general clean-up duties and helped to dismantle stages and booths at community festival, assisted with bridge repair and did general maintenance.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED

Did maintenance work.

CORRECTIONAL/DETENTION/COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTRE

Did secretarial work.

LOCAL SCHOOL BUS SERVICE

Cleaned buses.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUBS

Acted as youth resource worker and helped to coordinate activities, camped with youths, delivered firewood, renovated the club, chopped cement blocks and did general maintenance work.

VOLUNTEER BUREAU

Bowled with senior citizens, sorted clothes at clothing depot and drove.

DROP-IN CENTRE

Acted as youth resource worker.

NATIVE PEOPLE'S RESERVE AND METIS ASSOCIATION

Provided general labour, shovelled snow and cleaned the rink.

FREE CLOTHING DEPOT

Cut clothes into rags for sale, sorted and folded clothes, operated the front desk and did general maintenance.

LOCAL THEATRE GROUP

Built props, painted and assisted in the preparation for theatre productions.

LOCAL NEWSPAPER

Did washing and cleaning after vandals.

12. KENORA PILOT PROJECT (n=58)

Project Description

This programme is a Native project servicing much of the reserve area around Kenora. It has been operated by the Ne-Chee Friendship Centre in Kenora since June of 1978. Clients were mostly male, single and approximately 19 years old. As might be expected, this project had the greatest proportion of Native offenders. Kenora also had the largest proportion of offenders who had achieved only a Grade 8 education or less.

The average CSO assignment was 62 hours and over half of the clients had been ordered to perform over 50 hours. Assignments ranged from 10 to 200 hours. All of those on whom information was available worked directly with the beneficiaries of their services. However, more of the CSO probationers in Kenora provided dissatisfactory service at all their community placements than in the other projects. This project also had the highest conviction rate among clients during the performance of their hours (37%). Only 18% were re-convicted, though, during the first year after the closing of their cases.

Placement Description

LOCAL CITIZENS

Drove game for hunting party, repaired a garage, cleared and burned brush, washed windows and put up storm windows.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CENTRES, BOARD OF EDUCATION

Painted, did janitorial duties, shovelled snow and helped in a kitchen.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Painted inside and outside of group home and laboured.

PET FARM

Laboured.

NURSING HOME AND SENIOR CITIZEN CENTRES

Acted as companion to senior citizens and laboured.

NURSERY AND DAY SCHOOLS

Laboured.

LOCAL COMMUNITY CENTRES

Cleaned, shovelled snow, handled pop cases, flooded ice and was caretaker.

SALVATION ARMY

Laboured.

LOCAL PARKS AND RECREATION

Cleaned up parks and waterfront.

HOMES, CENTRES, SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED & HANDICAPPED

Laboured.

LOCAL HOUSING PROGRAMME

Hauled and piled lumber.

NATIVE PEOPLE'S RESERVE AND CENTRE

Provided janitorial service, put up storm windows at office and laboured.

GIRLS' CLUB

Organized a sports tournament and acted as supervisor and coach.

CENTRE FOR ALCOHOLICS

Acted as companion to patients at the Centre.

LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS

Laboured and graded roads.

TABLE 5

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT

FACTOR	PILOT PROJECT											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY (n=388)	OSHAWA/ AJAX (n=239)	BELLEVILLE (n=209)	BRAMPTON/ PEEL (n=145)	SCARBOROUGH (n=132)	ST. CATHARINES (n=93)	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH (n=71)	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE (n=286)	WINDSOR (n=145)	LONDON (n=14)	THUNDER BAY (n=176)	KENORA (n=58)
<u>DEMOGRAPHIC HISTORY</u>												
Sex												
Male	277 71.4	204 85.4	172 82.3	120 82.8	94 71.2	82 88.2	63 88.7	210 73.4	119 82.1	11 78.6	155 88.1	47 81.0
Female	111 28.6	35 14.6	37 17.7	25 17.2	38 28.8	11 11.8	8 11.3	76 26.6	26 17.9	3 21.4	21 11.9	11 19.0
Total	388 100.0	239 100.0	209 100.0	145 100.0	132 100.0	93 100.0	71 100.0	286 100.0	145 100.0	14 100.0	176 100.0	58 100.0
Age at Disposition												
16 - 17	155 41.8	114 51.4	63 33.2	48 42.9	32 26.2	21 25.6	17 27.9	76 28.5	45 32.8	4 30.8	81 49.1	19 40.4
18 - 20	106 28.6	63 28.4	64 33.7	39 34.8	32 26.2	30 36.6	22 36.1	100 37.5	36 26.3	4 30.8	54 32.7	12 25.5
21 - 65	110 29.6	45 20.3	63 33.2	25 22.3	58 47.5	31 37.8	22 36.1	91 34.1	56 40.9	5 28.5	30 18.2	16 34.0
Total	371 100.0	222 100.0	190 100.0	112 100.0	122 100.0	82 100.0	61 100.0	267 100.0	137 100.0	13 100.0	165 100.0	47 100.0
Not reported	17	17	19	33	10	11	10	19	8	1	11	11
Mean Age at Disposition (years)	21.1	19.6	20.8	19.3	23.1	23.5	22.6	21.3	22.7	20.5	18.7	19.5
Native												
Yes	6 1.5	1 0.4	1 0.5	1 0.7	1 0.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 1.0	0 0.0	5 35.7	5 2.8	23 39.7
No	382 98.5	238 99.6	208 99.5	144 99.3	131 99.2	93 100.0	71 100.0	283 99.0	145 100.0	9 64.3	171 97.2	35 60.3
Total	388 100.0	239 100.0	209 100.0	145 100.0	132 100.0	93 100.0	71 100.0	286 100.0	145 100.0	14 100.0	176 100.0	58 100.0
Marital Status												
Single	291 78.4	189 85.9	143 73.0	87 87.0	82 71.3	61 73.5	49 83.1	184 74.8	93 67.9	10 76.9	157 94.6	39 83.0
Married, common-law	58 15.6	26 11.8	41 20.9	11 11.0	21 18.3	16 19.3	5 8.5	45 18.3	27 19.7	2 15.4	6 3.6	8 17.0
Other	22 5.9	5 2.3	12 6.1	2 2.0	12 10.4	6 7.2	5 8.5	17 6.9	17 12.4	1 7.7	3 1.8	0 0.0
Total	371 100.0	220 100.0	196 100.0	100 100.0	115 100.0	83 100.0	59 100.0	246 100.0	137 100.0	13 100.0	166 100.0	47 100.0
Not reported	17	19	13	45	17	10	12	40	8	1	10	11

TABLE 5 CONTINUED
PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT

FACTORS	PILOT PROJECT											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY (n=388)	OSHAWA/ AJAX (n=239)	BELLEVILLE (n=209)	BRAMPTON/ PEEL (n=145)	SCARBOROUGH (n=132)	ST. CATHARINES (n=93)	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH (n=71)	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE (n=286)	WINDSOR (n=145)	LONDON (n=14)	THUNDER BAY (n=176)	KENORA (n=58)
Highest Grade Completed												
8 or less	57 15.2	34 15.7	29 14.8	8 9.3	13 11.5	16 20.0	9 16.1	25 10.2	26 19.4	3 25.0	20 12.3	14 30.4
9 or 10	175 46.5	110 50.9	99 50.5	30 34.9	47 41.6	36 45.0	21 37.5	134 54.5	56 41.8	4 33.3	85 52.1	24 52.2
11 to 13	131 34.8	69 31.9	65 33.2	42 48.8	47 41.6	25 31.3	21 37.5	70 28.5	46 34.3	5 41.7	51 31.3	8 17.4
Some university/college	11 2.9	1 0.5	2 1.0	0 0.0	4 3.5	3 3.8	1 1.8	14 5.7	5 3.7	0 0.0	7 4.3	0 0.0
Other	2 0.5	2 0.9	1 0.5	6 7.0	2 1.8	0 0.0	4 7.1	3 1.2	1 0.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Total	376 100.0	216 100.0	196 100.0	86 100.0	113 100.0	80 100.0	56 100.0	246 100.0	134 100.0	12 100.0	163 100.0	46 100.0
Not reported	12	23	13	59	19	13	15	40	11	2	13	12
In Educational Programme at Disposition												
Yes	116 35.9	58 33.7	41 27.0	16 41.0	11 24.4	6 10.3	0 0.0	47 30.1	32 25.0	0 0.0	54 36.7	0 0.0
No	207 64.1	114 66.3	111 73.0	23 59.0	34 75.6	52 89.7	1 100.0	109 69.9	96 75.0	0 0.0	93 63.3	7 100.0
Total	323 100.0	172 100.0	152 100.0	39 100.0	45 100.0	58 100.0	1 100.0	156 100.0	128 100.0	0 0.0	147 100.0	7 100.0
Not reported	65	67	57	106	87	35	70	130	17	14	29	51
Working at Disposition												
Employed	156 48.9	92 51.7	77 46.1	30 65.2	29 64.4	17 23.6	5 41.7	103 57.5	74 56.1	2 66.7	66 45.5	9 37.5
Unemployed	155 48.6	85 47.8	86 51.5	16 34.8	16 35.6	54 75.0	7 58.3	76 42.5	56 42.4	1 33.3	79 54.5	15 62.5
Homemaker	8 2.5	1 0.6	4 2.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 1.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 1.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Total	319 100.0	178 100.0	167 100.0	46 100.0	45 100.0	72 100.0	12 100.0	179 100.0	132 100.0	3 100.0	145 100.0	24 100.0
Not reported	69	61	42	99	87	21	59	107	13	11	31	34

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT

FACTORS	PILOT PROJECT											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY (n=388)	OSHAWA/ AJAX (n=239)	BELLEVILLE (n=209)	BRAMPTON/ PEEL (n=145)	SCARBOROUGH (n=132)	ST. CATHARINES (n=93)	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH (n=71)	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE (n=286)	WINDSOR (n=145)	LONDON (n=14)	THUNDER BAY (n=176)	KENORA (n=58)
<u>CRIMINAL HISTORY</u>												
On Probation Already at Disposition												
Yes	24 6.3	27 12.1	16 7.8	5 4.3	12 9.8	8 9.6	1 1.6	23 8.6	10 7.2	3 23.1	14 8.3	3 6.3
No	358 93.7	197 87.9	188 92.2	112 95.7	110 90.2	75 90.4	62 98.4	244 91.4	128 92.8	10 76.9	154 91.7	45 93.8
Total	382 100.0	224 100.0	204 100.0	117 100.0	122 100.0	83 100.0	63 100.0	267 100.0	138 100.0	13 100.0	168 100.0	48 100.0
Not reported	6	15	5	28	10	10	8	19	7	1	8	10
Number of Counts												
One	297 77.7	139 61.2	165 80.1	95 81.2	94 77.0	63 76.8	50 73.5	206 76.3	102 73.4	11 84.6	142 84.0	47 81.0
More than one	85 22.3	88 38.8	41 19.9	22 18.8	28 23.0	19 23.2	18 26.5	64 23.7	37 26.6	2 15.4	27 16.0	11 19.0
Total	382 100.0	227 100.0	206 100.0	117 100.0	122 100.0	82 100.0	68 100.0	270 100.0	139 100.0	13 100.0	169 100.0	58 100.0
Not reported	6	12	3	28	10	11	3	16	6	1	7	0
Term of Probation (months)												
Under 1-6	11 2.8	5 2.1	10 4.8	28 19.6	6 4.7	43 46.7	8 13.3	111 39.4	6 4.2	6 42.9	71 41.3	12 21.1
7-12	211 54.7	37 15.5	41 19.7	73 51.0	62 48.1	27 29.3	21 35.0	96 34.0	78 54.5	4 28.6	57 33.1	30 52.6
13-18	8 2.1	130 54.4	47 22.6	13 9.1	19 14.7	12 13.0	15 25.0	25 8.9	28 19.6	0 0.0	16 9.3	7 12.3
19-24	150 38.9	59 24.7	78 37.5	25 17.5	31 24.0	9 9.8	15 25.0	38 13.5	23 16.1	4 28.6	27 15.7	7 12.3
25-36	6 1.6	8 3.3	32 15.4	4 2.8	11 8.5	1 1.1	1 1.7	12 4.3	8 5.6	0 0.0	1 0.6	1 1.8
Total	386 100.0	239 100.0	208 100.0	143 100.0	129 100.0	92 100.0	60 100.0	282 100.0	143 100.0	14 100.0	172 100.0	57 100.0
Indeterminate, no probation	2	0	1	2	3	1	11	4	2	0	4	1
Mean Number of Months on Probation (months)	17.0	18.9	21.1	13.7	17.3	9.5	15.7	12.0	15.7	12.9	11.6	13.3

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT

FACTORS	PILOT PROJECT											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY (n=388)	OSHAWA/ AJAX (n=239)	BELLEVILLE (n=209)	BRAMPTON/ PEEL (n=145)	SCARBOROUGH (n=132)	ST. CATHARINES (n=93)	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH (n=71)	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE (n=286)	WINDSOR (n=145)	LONDON (n=14)	THUNDER BAY (n=176)	KENORA (n=58)
Hours Assigned												
4 to 40	230 64.2	16 9.8	27 15.4	45 35.4	11 10.8	10 11.4	24 33.8	124 54.9	9 7.3	6 42.9	58 36.9	17 34.0
41 to 80	89 24.9	62 38.0	38 21.7	46 36.2	58 56.9	43 48.9	10 14.1	49 21.7	32 26.0	4 28.6	49 31.2	23 46.0
81 to 120	33 9.2	56 34.4	65 37.1	30 23.6	28 27.5	6 6.8	20 28.2	37 16.4	55 44.7	2 14.3	32 20.3	8 16.0
121 to 160	4 1.1	21 12.9	21 12.0	1 0.8	3 2.9	14 15.9	4 5.6	10 4.4	15 12.2	1 7.1	6 3.8	0 0.0
161 to 200	0 0.0	8 4.9	14 8.0	2 1.6	2 2.0	4 4.5	8 11.3	5 2.2	9 7.3	1 7.1	11 7.0	2 4.0
201 to 1,000	2 0.6	0 0.0	10 5.7	3 2.4	0 0.0	11 12.5	5 7.0	1 0.4	3 2.4	0 0.0	1 0.6	0 0.0
Total	358 100.0	163 100.0	175 100.0	127 100.0	102 100.0	88 100.0	71 100.0	226 100.0	123 100.0	14 100.0	157 100.0	50 100.0
Indeterminate	30	76	34	18	30	5	0	60	22	0	19	8
Mean Number of Hours Assigned (hours)	41.4	89.2	111.7	66.4	75.5	144.7	106.0	53.1	99.8	64.6	70.5	62.0
Median of Hours Assigned (hours)	30.0	90.0	100.0	50.0	75.0	80.0	96.0	40.0	100.0	50.0	48.0	50.0
CSO Completion Status												
Worked all hours assigned	254 65.5	103 43.1	84 40.2	85 58.6	71 53.8	70 75.3	34 47.9	166 58.0	67 46.2	7 50.0	107 60.8	25 43.1
Worked more hours	63 16.2	17 7.1	17 8.1	24 16.6	18 13.6	1 1.1	14 19.7	22 7.7	28 19.3	5 35.7	11 6.3	7 12.1
Worked fewer hours	18 4.6	23 9.6	60 28.7	10 6.9	3 2.3	9 9.7	20 28.2	7 2.4	16 11.0	1 7.1	18 10.2	0 0.0
Worked no hours:												
.CSO never started, closed	9 2.3	11 4.6	5 2.4	3 2.1	0 0.0	3 3.2	0 0.0	1 0.3	1 0.7	1 7.1	15 8.5	2 3.4
.CSO ongoing	23 5.9	72 30.1	37 17.7	19 13.1	33 25.0	9 9.7	3 4.2	47 16.4	23 15.9	0 0.0	18 10.2	9 15.5
Worked or assigned indeterminate hours	21 5.4	13 5.4	6 2.9	4 2.8	7 5.3	1 1.1	0 0.0	43 15.0	10 6.9	0 0.0	7 4.0	15 25.9
Total	388 100.0	239 100.0	209 100.0	145 100.0	132 100.0	93 100.0	71 100.0	286 100.0	145 100.0	14 100.0	176 100.0	58 100.0

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT

FACTORS	PILOT PROJECT											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY (n=388)	OSHAWA/ AJAX (n=239)	BELLEVILLE (n=209)	BRAMPTON/ PEEL (n=145)	SCARBOROUGH (n=132)	ST. CATHARINES (n=93)	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH (n=71)	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE (n=286)	WINDSOR (n=145)	LONDON (n=14)	THUNDER BAY (n=176)	KENORA (n=58)
<u>CSO EXPERIENCES OF THOSE WHO WORKED HOURS</u>												
Number of Placements												
One	214 60.1	110 70.5	93 55.7	55 44.7	82 82.8	63 77.8	49 72.1	115 48.3	75 62.0	12 92.3	98 68.5	32 68.1
More than one	119 33.4	34 21.8	68 40.7	65 52.8	12 12.1	15 18.5	18 26.5	80 33.6	37 30.6	1 7.7	43 30.1	9 19.1
Indeterminate	23 6.5	12 7.7	6 3.6	3 2.4	5 5.1	3 3.7	1 1.5	43 18.1	9 7.4	0 0.0	2 1.4	6 12.8
Total	356 100.0	156 100.0	167 100.0	123 100.0	99 100.0	81 100.0	68 100.0	238 100.0	121 100.0	13 100.0	143 100.0	47 100.0
Not reported	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ever Worked with Beneficiaries												
Yes	284 85.3	89 61.8	115 74.7	79 66.4	60 65.2	72 93.5	36 59.0	102 52.8	79 69.9	13 100.0	104 74.3	11 100.0
No	49 14.7	55 38.2	39 25.3	40 33.6	32 34.8	5 6.5	25 41.0	91 47.2	34 30.1	0 0.0	36 25.7	0 0.0
Total	333 100.0	144 100.0	154 100.0	119 100.0	92 100.0	77 100.0	61 100.0	193 100.0	113 100.0	13 100.0	140 100.0	11 100.0
Not reported	23	12	13	4	7	4	8	45	8	0	3	36
Agency Satisfaction												
All satisfied	266 80.4	126 88.7	116 73.9	96 80.7	84 93.3	74 97.4	36 97.3	147 88.6	87 79.8	11 84.6	120 94.5	34 81.0
All dissatisfied	18 5.4	9 6.3	14 8.9	6 5.0	2 2.2	1 1.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	12 11.0	1 7.7	1 0.8	8 19.0
Some satisfied/some not	47 14.2	7 4.9	27 17.2	17 14.3	4 4.4	1 1.3	1 2.7	19 11.4	10 9.2	1 7.7	6 4.7	0 0.0
Total	331 100.0	142 100.0	157 100.0	119 100.0	90 100.0	76 100.0	37 100.0	166 100.0	109 100.0	13 100.0	127 100.0	42 100.0
Not reported	25	14	10	4	9	5	31	72	12	0	16	5

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT

FACTORS	PILOT PROJECT											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY (n=388)	OSHAWA/ AJAX (n=239)	BELLEVILLE (n=209)	BRAMPTON/ PEEL (n=145)	SCARBOROUGH (n=132)	ST. CATHARINES (n=93)	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH (n=71)	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE (n=286)	WINDSOR (n=145)	LONDON (n=14)	THUNDER BAY (n=176)	KENORA (n=58)
Part of Week Worked												
Weekdays	194 58.3	82 57.7	76 47.8	42 35.9	48 51.1	47 61.0	31 83.8	89 46.4	63 56.3	9 69.2	54 31.4	4 36.4
Weekends	72 21.6	24 16.9	21 13.2	27 13.1	16 17.0	3 3.9	4 10.8	40 20.8	27 24.1	0 0.0	20 19.0	0 0.0
Both	67 20.1	36 25.4	62 39.0	48 41.0	30 31.9	27 35.1	2 5.4	63 32.8	22 19.6	4 30.8	31 29.5	7 63.6
Total	333 100.0	142 100.0	159 100.0	117 100.0	94 100.0	77 100.0	37 100.0	192 100.0	112 100.0	13 100.0	105 100.0	11 100.0
Not reported	23	14	8	6	5	4	31	46	9	0	38	36
Part of Day Worked												
Daytime	265 79.8	89 62.7	97 61.8	82 70.7	42 44.7	76 98.7	27 73.0	119 62.0	79 70.5	9 69.2	69 65.7	8 72.7
Evenings	19 5.7	30 21.1	18 11.5	10 8.6	26 27.7	0 0.0	4 10.8	20 10.4	12 10.7	1 7.7	8 7.6	0 0.0
Both	48 14.5	23 16.2	42 26.8	24 20.7	26 27.7	1 1.3	6 16.2	53 27.6	21 18.8	3 23.1	28 26.7	3 27.3
Total	332 100.0	142 100.0	157 100.0	116 100.0	94 100.0	77 100.0	37 100.0	192 100.0	112 100.0	13 100.0	105 100.0	11 100.0
Not reported	24	14	10	7	5	4	31	46	9	0	38	36
Probation Terminated												
Early												
Yes, for any reason	7 2.4	59 40.7	41 29.3	8 7.3	16 18.8	11 14.3	9 23.7	49 22.9	23 22.1	3 23.1	15 11.9	3 23.1
No	290 97.6	86 59.3	99 70.7	102 92.7	69 81.2	66 85.7	29 76.3	165 77.1	81 77.9	10 76.9	111 88.1	10 76.9
Total	297 100.0	145 100.0	140 100.0	110 100.0	85 100.0	77 100.0	38 100.0	214 100.0	104 100.0	13 100.0	126 100.0	13 100.0
Not reported, unsure, no probation	59	11	27	13	14	4	30	24	17	0	17	34
Still Associated with Agency												
Yes, employed	11 3.4	4 2.7	2 1.2	7 5.9	3 3.4	0 0.0	5 10.0	3 1.4	1 0.9	2 16.7	3 2.2	2 15.4
Yes, volunteer	59 18.0	24 16.4	24 14.9	21 17.8	29 32.6	2 2.6	5 10.0	25 11.7	22 20.4	4 33.3	7 5.2	1 7.7
No	257 78.6	118 80.8	135 83.9	90 76.3	57 64.0	76 97.4	40 80.0	186 86.9	85 78.7	6 50.0	124 92.5	10 76.9
Total	327 100.0	146 100.0	161 100.0	118 100.0	89 100.0	78 100.0	50 100.0	214 100.0	108 100.0	12 100.0	134 100.0	13 100.0
Not reported	29	10	6	5	10	3	18	24	13	1	9	34

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT

FACTORS	PILOT PROJECT											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY (n=388)	OSHAWA/ AJAX (n=239)	BELLEVILLE (n=209)	BRAMPTON/ PEEL (n=145)	SCARBOROUGH (n=132)	ST. CATHARINES (n=93)	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH (n=71)	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE (n=286)	WINDSOR (n=145)	LONDON (n=14)	THUNDER BAY (n=176)	KENORA (n=58)
Convicted of Offence During CSO												
Yes, breach or failure	22 6.5	9 6.0	13 7.9	5 4.3	1 1.1	3 3.8	0 0.0	19 8.9	5 4.4	0 0.0	8 5.6	5 12.2
Yes, other	13 3.8	18 11.9	13 7.9	5 4.3	4 4.3	5 6.3	4 9.8	10 4.7	5 4.4	3 23.1	7 4.9	10 24.4
No	303 89.6	124 82.1	139 84.2	107 91.5	89 94.7	72 90.0	37 90.2	185 86.4	103 91.2	10 76.9	128 89.5	26 63.4
Total	338 100.0	151 100.0	165 100.0	117 100.0	94 100.0	80 100.0	41 100.0	214 100.0	113 100.0	13 100.0	143 100.0	41 100.0
Not reported	18	5	2	6	5	1	27	24	8	0	0	6
RECIDIVISM ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION OF CSO												
One-Year Status												
Recidivism data avail- able	219 56.4	94 39.3	96 45.9	44 30.3	57 43.2	58 62.4	36 50.7	75 26.2	50 34.5	11 78.6	74 42.0	22 37.9
Recidivism data not available												
.Case ongoing	23 5.9	72 30.1	37 17.7	19 13.1	33 25.0	9 9.7	3 4.2	47 16.4	23 15.9	0 0.0	18 10.2	9 15.5
.Not one year yet	86 22.2	42 17.6	52 24.9	60 41.4	25 18.9	13 14.0	0 0.0	92 32.2	55 37.9	2 14.3	33 18.8	9 15.5
.Case transferred, no information available, never started CSO	60 15.5	31 13.0	24 11.5	22 15.2	17 12.9	13 14.0	32 45.1	72 25.2	17 11.7	1 7.1	51 29.0	18 31.0
Total	388 100.0	239 100.0	209 100.0	145 100.0	132 100.0	93 100.0	71 100.0	286 100.0	145 100.0	14 100.0	176 100.0	58 100.0
Recidivism												
Re-convicted	18 8.2	20 21.3	16 16.7	2 4.5	7 12.3	11 19.0	3 8.3	8 10.7	8 16.0	5 45.5	11 14.9	4 18.2
On remand, no re-conv.	1 0.5	3 3.2	0 0.0	1 2.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 6.0	0 0.0	1 1.4	0 0.0
No remand, no re-conv.	200 91.3	71 75.5	80 83.3	41 93.2	50 87.7	47 81.0	73 91.7	67 89.3	39 78.0	6 54.5	62 83.8	18 81.8
Total	219 100.0	94 100.0	96 100.0	44 100.0	57 100.0	58 100.0	36 100.0	75 100.0	50 100.0	11 100.0	74 100.0	22 100.0

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSO PROGRAMME BY PILOT PROJECT

FACTORS	PILOT PROJECT											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY (n=388)	OSHAWA/ AJAX (n=239)	BELLEVILLE (n=209)	BRAMPTON/ PEEL (n=145)	SCARBOROUGH (n=132)	ST. CATHARINES (n=93)	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH (n=71)	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE (n=286)	WINDSOR (n=145)	LONDON (n=14)	THUNDER BAY (n=176)	KENORA (n=58)
Months to First Re-conviction (months)												
1- 2	1 5.6	3 15.0	3 18.8	0 0.0	4 57.1	4 36.4	0 0.0	3 37.5	1 12.5	2 40.0	3 27.3	2 50.0
3- 4	6 33.3	6 30.0	1 6.3	2 100.0	0 0.0	2 18.2	2 66.7	0 0.0	1 12.5	1 20.0	1 9.1	2 50.0
5- 6	2 11.1	3 15.0	5 31.3	0 0.0	1 14.3	1 9.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 12.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
7- 8	2 11.1	3 15.0	3 18.8	0 0.0	2 28.6	0 0.0	1 33.3	3 37.5	2 25.0	1 20.0	4 36.4	0 0.0
9-10	6 33.3	5 25.0	1 6.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 9.1	0 0.0	1 12.5	1 12.5	1 20.0	2 18.2	0 0.0
11-12	1 5.6	0 0.0	3 18.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 27.3	0 0.0	1 12.5	2 25.0	0 0.0	1 9.1	0 0.0
Total	18 100.0	20 100.0	16 100.0	2 100.0	7 100.0	11 100.0	3 100.0	8 100.0	8 100.0	5 100.0	11 100.0	4 100.0
Mean Number of Months to First Re-conviction	6.7	5.6	6.3	3.5	3.7	5.6	5.0	6.0	7.3	4.4	6.2	2.0
Most Serious Disposition Received												
Fine/time	3 16.7	1 5.0	2 12.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 27.3	1 33.3	3 37.5	1 12.5	2 40.0	3 27.3	1 25.0
Probation	3 16.7	6 30.0	4 25.0	0 0.0	2 28.6	5 45.5	0 0.0	4 50.0	1 12.5	0 0.0	3 27.3	1 25.0
CSO	1 5.6	0 0.0	1 6.3	1 50.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 12.5	0 0.0	1 9.1	0 0.0
Intermittent sentence	1 5.6	2 10.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Incarceration	10 55.6	11 55.0	9 56.3	1 50.0	5 71.4	3 27.3	2 66.7	1 12.5	5 62.5	3 60.0	4 36.4	2 50.0
Total	18 100.0	20 100.0	16 100.0	2 100.0	7 100.0	11 100.0	3 100.0	8 100.0	8 100.0	5 100.0	11 100.0	4 100.0
CURRENT STATUS (One Year After CSO Completion)	(of 219)	(of 94)	(of 96)	(of 44)	(of 57)	(of 58)	(of 36)	(of 75)	(of 50)	(of 11)	(of 74)	(of 22)
Ministry Contact:												
.Serving sentence	1 0.5	2 2.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 3.5	2 3.4	1 2.8	0 0.0	1 2.0	2 18.2	4 5.4	1 4.5
.On remand	0 0.0	4 4.3	1 1.0	1 2.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 1.3	4 8.0	0 0.0	1 1.4	0 0.0
.On original probation	61 27.9	31 33.0	26 27.1	7 15.9	15 26.3	5 8.6	10 27.8	7 9.3	8 16.0	3 27.3	14 18.9	4 18.2
.On new probation	6 2.7	11 11.7	5 5.2	1 2.3	3 5.3	2 3.4	2 5.6	3 4.0	3 6.0	1 9.1	4 5.4	1 4.5
No Ministry contact	156 71.2	53 56.4	68 70.8	35 79.5	38 66.7	48 82.8	23 63.9	65 86.7	36 72.0	6 54.5	53 71.6	17 77.3

C. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OFFENCE TYPE AND CSO ASSIGNMENT

The CSO assignments issued by the Judiciary to the probationers ranged between four and 1,000 hours. Naturally, one wonders what sorts of behaviour might lead to such an extreme range of sentences. In response to this query, the relationship between CSO assignment and offence type was examined. To reduce the confounding of multiple convictions, only those assignments issued on a single conviction were scrutinized.

The resultant findings, with their limitations, are herein described. The average number of hours assigned by the Courts for specific offences are presented in the first part of this section, this relationship in terms of the year of CSO disposition in the second part and this relation by pilot project area in the third. It is anticipated that these data might be useful to the Judiciary as an account of how CSOs have been utilized, in selected areas of Ontario.

1. LIMITATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

Before proceeding further, several limitations of these findings must be acknowledged. They are the product of either (a) the sentencing process itself or (b) the method of data analysis.

1) An offence name is a generic term. It identifies a certain kind of activity or behaviour which can occur under any number of dissimilar circumstances. The offence names used in this research are, therefore, very general.

2) The sentence of a term of probation with a CSO condition may have been concurrent with some additional sanction, such as a short jail term or a restitution condition. In this event, the Judiciary may have deemed it appropriate to reduce the CSO assignment it might normally issue for that offence.

3) In some instances, where representation was quite small, similar types of offences have been combined to facilitate analysis. A list of various offence types and the specific offences which have been subsumed under the respective heading may be found in Appendix A.

4) In instances where cases have been transferred, the number of CSO hours assigned would be represented in the receiving pilot project area rather than the transferring pilot project.

5) Finally, the data are presented in terms of the AVERAGE of all the CSOs under examination. In some cases, average CSO assignments have been computed on the basis of a small number of cases. The averages do not necessarily provide a preferred or model CSO assignment for the offence, but do provide a ball-park figure of the real-life situation.

2. CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES IN ONTARIO

In this section, the Judicial decisions about appropriate CSO assignments in 12 pilot projects across Ontario are examined. The results are clear: there is considerable variability in the number of hours assigned for specific offences by the Judiciary. However, as mentioned previously, this irregularity might be a reflection of their discretionary decision-making or of differing circumstances surrounding the offence.

If the number of hours assigned on a CSO is a reflection of the perceived severity of the offence, then the greater the assignment, the greater the offence's seriousness. Using the CSO assignment as a standard, the relative seriousness of offences in the various offence categories are, in most cases, as might be expected. In Table 6 is a representation of the relative seriousness of selected offences. In Table 7, the hours assigned on CSOs for specific offences are provided. It was estimated that an offence resulting in an Order averaging between 65 and 85 hours was at a medium level of seriousness.

Property-Related Offences

The Property-Related Offence category was the most heavily represented offence category. In this category, the lowest average assignment was 46 hours, which was issued for THEFT UNDER \$200. Also at this lower level of seriousness are offences such as POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY UNDER \$200 and TAKE VEHICLE WITHOUT CONSENT. The greatest assignment, on the other hand, was an average of 206 hours given for ARSON. Also at this upper or serious end of the range are FRAUD, ROBBERY, FORGERY and BREAK & ENTER.

The variability in judicial decisions is confirmed in the following example from this offence category. As has been mentioned earlier, the Orders of this entire population ranged from four to 1,000 hours. The Order for four hours, of community service was given for a conviction of MISCHIEF CAUSING DAMAGE, an offence which resulted in an Order for 240 hours, in another case. At the other extreme, the 1,000-hour Order was issued for a FRAUD conviction, which elsewhere also led to an Order for 20 hours.

Person-Related Offences

Person-related offences are typically perceived as serious offences because they threaten individual or personal safety. In this study, however, offences in the Person-Related Offence category seemed to be considered about medium in seriousness. An ASSAULT averaged about 78 hours and was therefore similar in seriousness to the POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY OVER \$200 and UTTERING.

Public Morals & Decency Offences

Offences against Public Morals and Decency were not common to this probationer sample. This may be, however, a

function of the initial screening process. In terms of judicial decision-making, the assignments given for an INDECENT OFFENCE were consistent. Orders for these offences ranged from 60 to 80 hours and averaged 70 hours. These offences were also of medium seriousness and resulted in CSO assignments similar to those given for WILFUL DAMAGE and WEAPONS.

Public Order & Peace Offences

The Public Order and Peace Offence category had the next most highly represented group of offences. At the lower or less serious end of this offence group were MISCHIEF DANGEROUS and CAUSE DISTURBANCE, with assignments of about 40 hours. At the extreme upper end was PERSONATE WITH INTENT, with 125 hours. The offence most commonly represented in this group, though, was PUBLIC MISCHIEF, which resulted in Orders ranging from 10 to 200 hours. On the average, PUBLIC MISCHIEF was low-medium in seriousness. It had an average assignment of 61 hours, which is about equal to that issued by the Courts for POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY UNDER \$200.

Drug Offences

For simplicity's sake, Drug offences were categorized as either SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION or DRUG TRAFFICKING (See Appendix A for details). The assignments ordered for these two offence types were very dissimilar, indicating a broad difference in the perceived seriousness of them. Orders for SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION ranged from 10 to 120 hours and averaged a low 44 hours. This was comparable to those Orders given for CAUSING A DISTURBANCE and THEFT UNDER \$200. DRUG TRAFFICKING, on the other hand, led to an average assignment of 111 hours, which is relatively high in seriousness. Orders ranged from 50 to 240 hours and were comparable to those issued for DANGEROUS DRIVING and ATTEMPT THEFT/INDICTABLE OFFENCE.

Traffic Offences

Traffic offences seemed to be perceived as medium in seriousness. Within this offence group, however, DANGEROUS DRIVING had the greatest average assignment, or was the most serious offence. Simultaneously, DANGEROUS DRIVING resulted in both the lowest and highest single CSO assignments in this group (12 hours and 250 hours, respectively). This indicates significant disparity in sentencing by the Judiciary.

Liquor Offences

Within the Liquor Offence category were offences of low to medium seriousness. BREACH OF THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT resulted in Orders averaging a low 47 hours, which is about equal to those Orders given for THEFT UNDER \$200 and SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION. At the other end, DRIVING WHILE IMPAIRED resulted in Orders averaging 76 hours, which was similar to those Orders given for UTTERING and ASSAULT.

Other Offences

The Other Offence category contained offences of such a wide variety and which resulted in such dissimilar Orders that it was too difficult to interpret.

TABLE 6

CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES IN ONTARIO

AVER.NO. HRS. ASSIGNED	PERSON-RELATED OFFENCE	PROPERTY-RELATED OFFENCE	PUBLIC MORALS & DECENCY OFFENCE	PUBLIC ORDER & PEACE OFFENCE	DRUG OFFENCE	TRAFFIC OFFENCE	LIQUOR OFFENCE	OTHER OFFENCE
1 ↑ 20								
-				*Prowl,Trespass at night				
30				*Mischief Dangerous				*Dangerous Operation of vessel/Vessel Miscellaneous
-				Cause Disturbance False Information				*Take Fish by Snagging
40		Theft Under \$200			Simple Drug Possession		*Breach Liquor Control Act	
-								
50	*Manslaughter	Take Vehicle without Consent		*Conspiracy False Firealarm				*Breach Municipal By-Laws
-								
60		Possess Stolen Property Under \$200		Fail to Appear/ Comply/Obey Public Mischief				
-		Mischief Causing Damage		Obstruct Justice				
70		Wilful Damage	Indecent Offence	Weapons				
-		Theft of Mail Uttering		Breach/Fail Probation Criminal Negligence		Fail to Remain		
	Assault					Drive While Li- cense Suspended	Driving While Impaired	

80		Possess Stolen Property Over \$200 *Possess Burglary Tools Theft Over \$200					
-							Other Federal Statutes
90							
-		Break & Enter					
100	*Intimidation	Forgery		*Juvenile Delinquency Act *Cruelty to Animal			
-						Dangerous Driving	
110					Drug Traffick		
-		Attempt Theft/ Indictable Offence					
120		Robbery		*Bankruptcy Act			
-			*Contributing to Juvenile Delinquency	*Personate with Intent			
130							
-							
140		Fraud					
↓							
200							
-		Arson					
210							

* Average CSO was computed on the basis of one or two cases.

TABLE 7

CSO ASSIGNMENT AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES,
OVERALL AND BY YEAR OF DISPOSITION

OFFENCE TYPE	AVERAGE NO. OF HOURS ASSIGNED (n OF CASES)	LOWEST- HIGHEST ORDER	AVERAGE NO. OF HOURS ASSIGNED (n)	
			1978	1979
<u>PERSON-RELATED</u>				
Manslaughter	52 (1)	52	0 (0)	52 (1)
Assault	78 (49)	15 - 250	80 (20)	77 (29)
Intimidation	100 (1)	100	100 (1)	0 (0)
<u>PROPERTY-RELATED</u>				
Theft Under \$200	46 (386)	8 - 250	45 (177)	46 (209)
Take Vehicle Without Consent	56 (17)	25 - 100	59 (7)	56 (9)
Possess Stolen Property Under \$200	64 (38)	10 - 200	50 (16)	74 (22)
Mischief Causing Damage	66 (42)	4 - 240	59 (12)	69 (30)
Wilful Damage	71 (38)	16 - 300	67 (18)	75 (20)
Theft of Mail	76 (3)	20 - 108	60 (2)	108 (1)
Uttering	77 (5)	30 - 100	71 (4)	100 (1)
Possess Stolen Property Over \$200	80 (55)	10 - 250	82 (26)	77 (29)
Possess Burglary Tools	80 (1)	80	0 (0)	80 (1)
Theft Over \$200	81 (86)	20 - 229	89 (41)	73 (45)
Break & Enter	95 (155)	20 - 312	102 (78)	88 (77)
Forgery	99 (6)	25 - 250	137 (3)	62 (3)
Attempt Theft/Indictable Offence	114 (14)	10 - 960	159 (8)	53 (6)
Robbery	121 (4)	85 - 150	125 (2)	117 (2)
Fraud	140 (41)	20 - 1,000	93 (17)	173 (24)
Arson	206 (4)	40 - 558	299 (2)	112 (2)
<u>PUBLIC MORALS & DECENCY</u>				
Indecent Offence	70 (4)	60 - 80	70 (3)	71 (1)
Contributing to Juvenile Delinquency	125 (2)	100 - 150	150 (1)	100 (1)
<u>DRUG</u>				
Simple Drug Possession	44 (61)	10 - 120	29 (34)	64 (27)
Drug Traffick	111 (10)	50 - 240	100 (2)	114 (8)
<u>TRAFFIC</u>				
Fail to Remain Drive While License Suspended	72 (5)	20 - 150	0 (0)	72 (5)
Dangerous Driving	77 (11)	30 - 100	84 (3)	75 (8)
	106 (21)	12 - 225	97 (10)	115 (11)

TABLE 7 (Cont'd)

CSO ASSIGNMENT AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES,
OVERALL AND BY YEAR OF DISPOSITION

OFFENCE TYPE	AVERAGE NO. OF HOURS ASSIGNED (n OF CASES)	LOWEST- HIGHEST ORDER	AVERAGE NO. OF HOURS ASSIGNED (n)	
			1978	1979
<u>PUBLIC ORDER & PEACE</u>				
Prowl, Trespass at Night	25 (1)	25	25 (1)	0 (0)
Mischief Dangerous	37 (2)	25 - 50	25 (1)	50 (1)
Cause Disturbance	40 (18)	8 - 100	39 (11)	43 (7)
False Information	41 (3)	12 - 60	31 (2)	60 (1)
Conspiracy	50 (1)	50	0 (0)	50 (1)
False Fire Alarm	52 (3)	16 - 80	38 (2)	80 (1)
Fail to Appear/Comply/ Obey	60 (4)	30 - 100	50 (2)	70 (2)
Public Mischief	61 (41)	10 - 200	38 (14)	73 (27)
Obstruct Justice	66 (14)	8 - 200	81 (6)	55 (8)
Weapons	70 (14)	10 - 120	67 (7)	74 (7)
Breach/Fail Probation	72 (5)	50 - 100	70 (4)	80 (1)
Criminal Negligence	75 (3)	20 - 125	50 (2)	125 (1)
Juvenile Delinquency Act	100 (1)	100	100 (1)	0 (0)
Cruelty to Animal	100 (1)	100	100 (1)	0 (0)
Bankruptcy Act	120 (1)	120	0 (0)	120 (1)
Personate with Intent	125 (2)	100 - 150	150 (1)	100 (1)
<u>LIQUOR</u>				
Breach Liquor Control Act	47 (2)	20 - 75	47 (2)	0 (0)
Impaired	76 (26)	30 - 300	113 (7)	63 (19)
<u>OTHER</u>				
Dangerous Operation of Vessel/Vessel	30 (2)	20 - 40	20 (1)	40 (1)
Miscellaneous	40 (1)	40	0 (0)	40 (1)
Take Fish by Snagging	50 (1)	50	0 (0)	50 (1)
Municipal By-Laws	85 (2)	50 - 120	85 (2)	0 (0)
Other Federal Statutes				

3. CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES BY YEAR OF CSO DISPOSITION

Generally speaking, it was found that offence types which had greater representation by the probationer sample, also had greater consistency in the average Orders issued for them, in 1978 and 1979. The average CSO assignments for single offences in 1978 ranged broadly between about 20 and 165 hours of community service. Average Orders in 1979, on the other hand, had greater compression between 40 and 130 hours. This may have been a function of the improved guidelines for the Judiciary, which encouraged the issuance of Orders specifying between 40 and 240 hours of community service. Please refer again to Table 7 for a comparison of CSO assignments during these two years.

Property-Related Offences

In the Property-Related Offence category, the greater the representation that offence had, the greater the consistency between the 1978 and 1979 CSO assignments. The average assignments for THEFT UNDER \$200 in 1978 and 1979 were equivalent, at about 45 hours. This would indicate considerable uniformity in judicial decision-making about an appropriate sentence for this offence. Furthermore, regardless of year of disposition, THEFT UNDER \$200 resulted in the lowest average assignment in this offence category.

CSOs issued for THEFT OVER \$200, BREAK & ENTER and POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY OVER \$200 also had high degrees of consistency between 1978 and 1979, with less than 20 hours difference in average assignments. The most serious single offence in this category was ARSON in 1978 and FRAUD in 1979.

Person-Related Offences

The average CSO assignment for an offence in the Person-Related Offence category did not vary between 1978 and 1979. A closer examination of the average Orders for the specific kinds of ASSAULT offences corroborated this consistency. Regardless of year of disposition, an ASSAULT conviction resulted in an average of 80 hours of community service.

Public Morals & Decency Offences

The representation was so minimal in the Public Morals and Decency Offence category that an analysis of change over time in average Orders was foregone.

Public Order & Peace Offences

In the Public Order and Peace Offence category, the offence with the greatest representation also had a dramatic increase in average CSO in 1979. The average CSO issued for PUBLIC MISCHIEF increased by 35 hours in 1979, over 1978, which is contrary to the trend identified in the other offence categories.

Drug Offences

Regardless of year of CSO disposition, SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION was the less serious offence in the Drug Offence category. A generous distance in average assignments between these offences was maintained, despite the fact that the average CSO for DRUG TRAFFICKING in 1979 remained within 14 hours of that for 1978 and the average CSO for SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION increased by 35 hours.

Traffic Offences

CSO assignments issued for Traffic Offences also had remarkable consistency between 1978 and 1979. Average Orders in 1979 for two traffic offences, DRIVING WHILE LICENCE SUSPENDED and DANGEROUS DRIVING, only changed a net of nine hours over those of 1978.

Liquor Offences

Liquor offences seem to have been perceived as being more serious in 1978 than in 1979. In 1979, average Orders decreased quite dramatically. The average CSO for DRIVING WHILE IMPAIRED, for example, fell from a high level of seriousness (113 hours) to a low-medium level (63 hours).

4. CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES BY PILOT
PROJECT AREA

Analyzing the offence types and their respective CSO assignments, in terms of pilot project areas, seriously dilutes the representation within cells. Only where there is some volume of evidence are the data discussed. Please refer to Table 8.

On the whole, perceptions of offence seriousness by the Judiciary varied remarkably among the pilot project areas. That is, if CSO assignment can be a valid standard of seriousness. For example, not only might an offence in one area result in a lower assignment than in any other project, but all of the Orders issued in that area might generally be at a lower rate. See, for example, Peterborough/Lindsay. Conversely, Orders issued in St. Catharines often tended to be greater than in the other areas. Moreover, one offence type might result in very diverse assignments, in different pilot projects. PUBLIC MISCHIEF in Hamilton/Wentworth averaged a 20-hour Order, compared to an average Order of 137 hours in Belleville.

Property-Related Offences

THEFT UNDER \$200 has been the most common offence for which CSOs have been issued (Polonoski, 1979) and Peterborough/Lindsay had the greatest incidence of single THEFT UNDER \$200 convictions. Peterborough/Lindsay, as well as Hamilton/Wentworth, had the lowest average CSO for this offence (33 hours). However, Orders ranged anywhere up to an average of 96 hours, as in St. Catharines.

THEFT OVER \$200 also led to a wide variety of assignments. Very heavy assignments of 135 to 160 hours were issued in Hamilton/Wentworth, Belleville and St. Catharines while less demanding Orders of 40 to 47 hours were issued in London, Peterborough/Lindsay and Kenora. In all the projects, there was a greater average Order for THEFT OVER \$200 than for THEFT UNDER \$200.

POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY UNDER \$200 resulted in Orders ranging from an average of 32 hours in Hamilton/Wentworth to 97 hours in Windsor. The majority of the pilot projects had average CSOs in the 66 to 97 hour range.

POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY OVER \$200 was generally, and not surprisingly, perceived as a more serious offence than POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY UNDER \$200. In Windsor and Kitchener/Cambridge, though, the average CSO for POSSESSION OVER was less than that for POSSESSION UNDER. In Thunder Bay and Kenora, the average Order was the same for the two offences. Overall, the lowest average CSO for POSSESSION OVER was 37 hours in Kitchener/Cambridge and the greatest was 123 hours in Hamilton/Wentworth.

4. CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES BY PILOT PROJECT AREA

Analyzing the offence types and their respective CSO assignments, in terms of pilot project areas, seriously dilutes the representation within cells. Only where there is some volume of evidence are the data discussed. Please refer to Table 8.

On the whole, perceptions of offence seriousness by the Judiciary varied remarkably among the pilot project areas. That is, if CSO assignment can be a valid standard of seriousness. For example, not only might an offence in one area result in a lower assignment than in any other project, but all of the Orders issued in that area might generally be at a lower rate. See, for example, Peterborough/Lindsay. Conversely, Orders issued in St. Catharines often tended to be greater than in the other areas. Moreover, one offence type might result in very diverse assignments, in different pilot projects. PUBLIC MISCHIEF in Hamilton/Wentworth averaged a 20-hour Order, compared to an average Order of 137 hours in Belleville.

Property-Related Offences

THEFT UNDER \$200 has been the most common offence for which CSOs have been issued (Polonoski, 1979) and Peterborough/Lindsay had the greatest incidence of single THEFT UNDER \$200 convictions. Peterborough/Lindsay, as well as Hamilton/Wentworth, had the lowest average CSO for this offence (33 hours). However, Orders ranged anywhere up to an average of 96 hours, as in St. Catharines.

THEFT OVER \$200 also led to a wide variety of assignments. Very heavy assignments of 135 to 160 hours were issued in Hamilton/Wentworth, Belleville and St. Catharines while less demanding Orders of 40 to 47 hours were issued in London, Peterborough/Lindsay and Kenora. In all the projects, there was a greater average Order for THEFT OVER \$200 than for THEFT UNDER \$200.

POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY UNDER \$200 resulted in Orders ranging from an average of 32 hours in Hamilton/Wentworth to 97 hours in Windsor. The majority of the pilot projects had average CSOs in the 66 to 97 hour range.

POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY OVER \$200 was generally, and not surprisingly, perceived as a more serious offence than POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY UNDER \$200. In Windsor and Kitchener/Cambridge, though, the average CSO for POSSESSION OVER was less than that for POSSESSION UNDER. In Thunder Bay and Kenora, the average Order was the same for the two offences. Overall, the lowest average CSO for POSSESSION OVER was 37 hours in Kitchener/Cambridge and the greatest was 123 hours in Hamilton/Wentworth.

The average CSOs given for BREAK & ENTER were not uniform across the pilot projects. Orders ranged from an average of 57 hours in Kitchener/Cambridge to 124 hours in Hamilton/Wentworth. BREAK & ENTER resulted in an average of 63 hours of community service in the Peterborough/Lindsay area, which was low-medium in seriousness, as in the other projects, but a heavy assignment within that area.

The CSO assignment for a FRAUD was generally substantial. With the exceptions of Kenora and Peterborough/Lindsay, average Orders issued for a FRAUD conviction ranged from 75 to 375 hours, in the pilot projects.

Perceptions of seriousness of MISCHIEF CAUSING DAMAGE were highly irregular among pilot projects. Average Orders ranged from 25 hours in Thunder Bay, to 150 hours in St. Catharines. Similarly, WILFUL DAMAGE resulted in a broad range of assignments: in Brampton/Peel and Kitchener/Cambridge Orders averaged 27 hours, compared to 109 hours in St. Catharines. Sentences of community service given for PUBLIC MISCHIEF, as well, were variable. Average CSOs ranged from 20 hours in Hamilton/Wentworth and Kenora to 137 hours in Belleville.

Person-Related Offences

ASSAULT offences tended to result in fairly heavy community service assignments in the 12 projects. An ASSAULT conviction led to an average assignment of 30 hours in the Peterborough/Lindsay area, but a 170-hour assignment in London. Half of the Orders for this offence in the projects, though, averaged in the 70 to 100 hour range.

Drug Offences

Not surprisingly, the average CSOs issued for Drug offences were greater for DRUG TRAFFICKING than for SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION. Orders given for SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION in the projects ranged in average from 10 to 90 hours, but were less than 60 hours in average in over half the projects.

TABLE 8

CSO ASSIGNMENTS AND SELECTED OFFENCE TYPES BY PILOT PROJECT AREA

OFFENCE TYPE	AVERAGE NO. OF HOURS ASSIGNED IN PILOT PROJECT AREA (n OF CASES)											
	PETERBOROUGH/ LINDSAY	OSHAWA/ AJAX	BELLEVILLE	BRAMPTON/ PEEL	SCARBOROUGH	ST.CATHARINES	HAMILTON/ WENTWORTH	KITCHENER/ CAMBRIDGE	WINDSOR	LONDON	THUNDER BAY	KENORA
THEFT UNDER \$200	33 (141)	73 (29)	56 (46)	58 (25)	66 (21)	96 (7)	33 (6)	39 (72)	70 (10)	0 (0)	36 (29)	0 (0)
THEFT OVER \$200	45 (18)	107 (10)	146 (7)	67 (7)	70 (3)	160 (1)	135 (4)	72 (8)	103 (11)	40 (1)	62 (8)	47 (8)
POSSESS STOLEN PROPERTY UNDER \$200	34 (8)	0 (0)	83 (3)	78 (2)	75 (4)	0 (0)	32 (4)	90 (2)	97 (5)	80 (2)	66 (7)	40 (1)
POSSESS STOLEN PROPERTY OVER \$200	48 (14)	100 (1)	115 (10)	83 (6)	80 (4)	0 (0)	123 (7)	37 (4)	77 (5)	0 (0)	66 (3)	40 (1)
BREAK & ENTER	63 (29)	102 (11)	122 (29)	84 (7)	76 (5)	119 (4)	124 (10)	57 (6)	112 (15)	0 (0)	102 (22)	74 (17)
FRAUD	39 (4)	80 (5)	172 (5)	75 (1)	90 (4)	375 (6)	112 (5)	82 (4)	125 (5)	0 (0)	100 (1)	30 (1)
MISCHIEF CAUSING DAMAGE	75 (2)	76 (10)	55 (8)	98 (3)	100 (2)	150 (1)	32 (2)	59 (9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (3)	60 (2)
WILFUL DAMAGE	43 (3)	47 (2)	100 (1)	27 (6)	0 (0)	109 (7)	0 (0)	27 (2)	75 (2)	60 (1)	95 (11)	47 (3)
PUBLIC MISCHIEF	57 (4)	72 (5)	137 (4)	58 (11)	100 (2)	80 (2)	20 (1)	31 (6)	30 (2)	27 (2)	40 (1)	20 (1)
ASSAULT	30 (4)	100 (4)	103 (7)	53 (3)	70 (3)	75 (2)	100 (1)	66 (12)	150 (2)	170 (1)	79 (7)	53 (3)
SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION	18 (22)	10 (1)	75 (2)	80 (2)	90 (3)	0 (0)	40 (2)	32 (9)	59 (7)	0 (0)	73 (13)	0 (0)

IV SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results were found to be highly consistent with the preliminary findings of prior phases of this study.

There was considerable uniformity in the type of offender being selected for the CSO programme by the Judiciary. The CSO probationer was generally identifiable as a low-risk offender, in 1978 and 1979, and in the pilot projects. The CSO client was typically male and single. He was about 21 years old, that is, beyond the age of greatest risk⁵. There was also evidence of stability in his lifestyle and of non-serious criminality.

While there was uniformity in the target group of offenders, there was little agreement among the Judiciary on the actual utilization of the CSO option. The Community Service Order has been perceived as fulfilling a number of functions in the sentencing process. It has been used as simply another condition of probation, as a stronger form of straight probation, as an alternative to a term of incarceration and as a separate sentencing alternative. Initially, CSOs were intended to provide an alternative sentence to the incarceration of offenders, where the usual terms of probation were an insufficient disposition. It was a major function of the CSO programme to help offset the critical overcrowding of inmates in correctional institutions. In the first phase of this study, however, research was unable to clearly establish the prior criminality of the initial cases, which might have hinted at the incarceration-risk factor of those clients (Polonoski, 1979). It was reported at that time, though, that the "preliminary data suggest that the CSO programme is providing an alternative sentencing disposition"⁶. Because of the low-risk nature of this CSO client population, however, it is unlikely that the CSO option is constituting an alternative to incarceration too extensively. These probationers probably would not have otherwise been sentenced to a term of incarceration and would, in all likelihood, do well in any community-based programme. More so, the CSO programme seems to be providing a separate sentencing alternative.

When examined individually, the pilot projects evidently are dealing with similar types of offenders. Where there were gross dissimilarities in the nature of the clients, they can, in all likelihood, be attributed to differing individual pilot project objectives. For example, the target group of the Kenora and London projects is Native offenders, the target group of St. Catharines is unemployed offenders and the Judiciary in the Peterborough/Lindsay project use CSOs to deter shop-lifters. This overall uniformity, however,

⁵ Madden (1977), Ontario (1980), Polonoski (1980, a).

⁶ Polonoski (1979), p. 43.

is not too surprising. There is a high level of awareness among project coordinators as to the accepted selection criteria for suitable candidates for the programme. This, in conjunction, with the cooperative effort generally existing between local coordinators and Judges, helps to ensure some homogeneity in offenders being assigned to the programme.

The CSO assignments given by the Judges for the original CSO conviction ranged very broadly across the pilot projects. In 1979, the Judiciary were encouraged, by the CSO programme developers, to specify Orders in the range of 40 to 240 hours. This was precipitated by the broad variations and extremes in Orders which had become evident across the Province. In addition, they were asked to specify a time frame within which the hours were to be completed and a rate of completion. These thrusts facilitate the breaching process, but failed to provide an adequate framework for determining appropriate assignments. Orders continued to contain extreme numbers of hours and dissimilar sentences for similar offences.

As has been mentioned earlier, variance in sentencing among projects may often be attributed to the discretionary power of the Judiciary. As well, though, it may be a result of the unique offences for which probationers were sentenced in that area. This variance may also be a function of the Judge's perceived purpose of the CSO sentence, be it a punitive measure or a rehabilitative one. At what number of hours, one might ask, does an Order intended for rehabilitation become punitive?

The culmination of these complexities is that inconsistency in sentencing is the rule. Perhaps one of the weaknesses of the CSO programme lies in its deficiency in assignment guidelines. Any offence can, at present, result in a variety of assignments and possibly even extreme assignments far below or above the suggested limits. A framework for determining size of CSO assignments, which takes into consideration such factors as prior criminal record, seriousness of offence and any mitigating circumstances is required. Each of the factors would affect the norm to the extent that the assignment could be inflated or reduced, within a minimum and maximum number of hours.

In view of the findings of this research, it is recommended that:

- the Community Service Order be recognized as a viable, separate sentencing option;
- the Judiciary be encouraged to utilize the CSO programme and to cooperate with the local CSO organizers in identifying suitable candidates for the programme;

- a framework through which appropriate CSO assignments can be determined be developed by the Justice system and that this framework designate a maximum and minimum limit to the hours which can be assigned.

One significant weakness of this research was its failure to adequately document the breaching of CSO cases. This can largely be attributed to the changing state of the CSO programme, as it developed and matured over the three years of this study. Some operational guidelines which were expected to facilitate the breaching process were introduced for the Judiciary, after the research was well underway. A date for the commencement and completion of hours and a rate of completion of hours were to be specified by the Courts on the Orders. However, these specifications and related breaching details were not documented by Research. It is also recommended, therefore, that:

- future research conducted on the CSO programme focus on the breaching process for failure to comply with the Order.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

V REFERENCES

Hermann, Silvia. The Community Service Order Programme in Ontario. 3. A One Year Follow-up. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services, February, 1981.

Madden, P.G. Factors Related to Age in First Incarcerates. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services, November, 1977.

Polonoski, Marian. The Community Service Order Programme in Ontario. 1. A Description of the Initial Cases. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services, June, 1979.

- a. Polonoski, Marian. The Community Service Order Programme in Ontario. 2. Participants and their Perceptions. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services, February, 1980.
- b. Polonoski, Marian L. Chronic Young Offenders. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services, November, 1980.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

SPECIFIC OFFENCES COLLATED UNDER OFFENCE TYPES

<u>OFFENCE TYPE:</u>	<u>INCLUDES:</u>
ASSAULT	Common Assault, Bodily Assault, Assault with Intent to Commit Bodily Harm, Assault Police, Assault.
BREAK & ENTER	Attempted Break & Enter, Break & Enter, Unlawfully in Dwelling House, Break, Enter & Commit.
FRAUD	Attempted Fraud, Fraud Accommodation, Fraud, Fraud Concealment, False Pretence.
ATTEMPTED THEFT/ INDICTABLE OFFENCE	Attempted Theft, Attempted Indictable Offence.
OBSTRUCT JUSTICE	Attempt to Obstruct Justice, Mislead Police Officer, Obstruct Police, Obstruct Justice.
WEAPONS	Prohibited Weapon, Restricted Weapon, Weapon Dangerous, Concealed Weapon, Dangerous Firearm.
CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE	With Motor Vehicle, Causing Bodily Harm.
FAIL TO APPEAR/COMPLY/ OBEY	Fail to Appear, Wilful Failure, Fail to Appear Summons, Fail to Obey Court Order, Fail to Comply-Recognizance.
FALSE INFORMATION	False Information, Perjury/False Statement.
SIMPLE DRUG POSSESSION	Possess Marijuana, Possess Narcotic, Possess Restricted Drug.
DRUG TRAFFICK	Possession for Purposes of/Traffick Narcotics, Possession for Purposes of/Traffick Restricted Drug, Possession for Purposes of/Traffick Controlled Drug.
DRIVING WHILE IMPAIRED	Over 80 mg., Driving While Impaired.
INDECENT OFFENCE	Indecent Act, Indecent Exhibition, Indecent Assault, Gross Indecency.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

NUMBER OF HOURS ASSIGNED ON CSO

