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HIGHLIGHTS OF THE REPORT AND LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This report summarizes the services provided by, and the evaluation of, a pilot project entitled Community Integration Project for Ethnocultural Offenders. This project was funded by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) and operated by the Immigrant Centre of Manitoba Inc (IC). The Project ran between October 2012 and March 2013.

The Pilot Project can be considered a success, certainly from a feasibility study perspective. The Program and the associated research discovered what works, and what does not work in ethnocultural programming in the prison system. These results occurred despite the many setbacks that were experienced. Chief among these was the severely truncated time frame. While initially proposed as a one-year project, the effective program delivery time became four months. As a result, a number of aspects of programming had to be dropped or altered from the original plan.

Services were delivered to 16 registered participants and a number of incarcerated men who were not formally in the program. The participants were unanimously highly appreciative and complementary of the services they received. Consultations were also provided to CSC staff on matters related to ethnocultural services in the community.

Interviews for the program evaluation took place with many CSC staff, IC staff, program participants, and others. In addition, a variety of data collection instruments were developed and administered.

A total of 13 recommendations were made in the report, chief among these is that a program for ethnocultural men who are incarcerated or on parole is funded on a permanent basis. The report concludes that this program would be best suited to be operated under the auspices of the IC, in close partnership with CSC.

The following are the recommendations as found in the report:

Recommendation 1:
A. That CSC staff receive (further) training on the role of ethnicity, culture, resettlement, and (refugee and relocation) trauma in the rehabilitation of incarcerated men, and  
B. That CSC consider collecting more detailed information on ethnicity and culture, rather than on, or in addition to race.

Recommendation 2:
That CSC and the IC formally establish admission criteria for future ethnocultural programs.

Recommendation 3:
That Escorted Temporary Absences are considered as a viable feature of a future ethnocultural program.
Recommendation 4:
That, if the program is to continue, individual participants receive concrete plans to use specific services of the IC and that a person-to-person connection be made before release or shortly after.

Recommendation 5:
That a future program does a more in-depth exploration of the family dynamics of participants and the possible services to their families.

Recommendation 6:
That plans for reintegration into ethnic communities are individualized and based on the stated needs of the individual program participant.

Recommendation 7:
That, if the program is renewed, an information session and a brochure for POs are provided explaining the program, eligibility criteria, and the referral system.

Recommendation 8:
A. That, if the program is renewed, a closer working relationship between the IC staff and the POs is established, and
B. That the Regional Manager of Ethnocultural services and other management staff take a lead role in assertively promoting the Program and assuring its implementation.

Recommendation 9:
That, if the Program is not continued, a Web-based portal with ethnocultural resources is developed and kept current.

Recommendation 10:
That a version of Section 84 is developed for incarcerated offenders with Ethnocultural backgrounds.

Recommendation 11:
That specific, concrete service goals are determined shortly after intake and that these are reviewed monthly or every other month.

Recommendation 12:
That the Community Reintegration Project for Ethnocultural Offenders is made permanent with 1.0FTE staffing provided under contract by the Immigrant Centre.

Recommendation 13:
That ethnocultural services planning starts at Intake.
INTRODUCTION

Description of the Immigration Centre

For more than 65 years the Immigration Centre (IC) has provided settlement services to immigrants and refugees from all over the world. The IC is Manitoba's community leader in providing immigration and settlement services for immigrants to connect, integrate, and fully participate in Canadian Society. Its quality, innovative immigration and settlement services in Manitoba are now being copied by other provinces. Its model of collaborative partnerships has enabled the Centre to be innovative when looking at the needs of newcomers and creating programs and services to meet those needs. With an estimated 200 immigrants arriving on the streets of Winnipeg every week, and with the figure to double over the next decade, the IC is at the forefront of connecting with similar organizations, educational institutions, employers, and the immigrant community. The IC was a finalist for the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce Spirit of Winnipeg Award for Innovation and Entrepreneurship within the charity sector. It was featured in the New York Times in a November 2010 article about the successful integration of newcomers in Manitoba and the Centre has been featured multiple times on CTV, CBC, and Shaw TV.

Each year, the Immigrant Centre sees increases in the number of clients it serves. Last year, the IC provided services to 16,602 newcomers.

A Brief History of the Project

This pilot project found its origins several years ago in a conversation between Linda Lalande, the Executive Director of the Immigrant Centre Manitoba Inc. (IC) and Simin Hadidi, Acting Regional Manager of Ethnocultural Services of the Correctional Service Canada (CSC). They both identified a need for newcomer federal offenders to re-integrate better into society after their release from federal prison. Specifically, they felt that strengthening the connections between the offender and his family and his ethnocultural community would lead to better outcomes.

Consequently, on January 12, 2012 the IC submitted a proposal to CSC of a pilot project entitled Community Integration Project for Ethnocultural Offenders. CSC signed a formal contract for the project on March 12, 2012. CAN Management Consulting was contracted that month to perform the evaluation of the project.

I would like to personally thank Dr. Rudy Ambtman, Ph.D. CAN Management Consulting, Alycia Kalisz BSW, Project Coordinator and our Evaluation Advisory Committee. The Evaluation Advisory Committee was comprised of John Hutton MSW, Executive Director John Howard Society, Leilah Said, BSW who works with Child and Family Services, Roselyn Advincula, BSW who is the Program Coordinator for the
Neighbourhood Immigrant Settlement Workers, and Boris Ntambwe, BSW who is the Coordinator du Programme PAR at Accueil Francophone.

Some definitions and prison population descriptions

Ethnocultural offender, prisoner, parolee, program participant, and incarcerated man are used to designate the individual who is the focus of this project.¹

The adjective ethnocultural is defined with greater difficulty than the accompanying nouns (more on this below). Initially, the intent of the IC was to define all potential program participants as “ethnocultural” if they were newcomers to Canada (i.e., those not born in Canada, regardless of cultural or racial background). However, CSC essentially equates the terms “ethnocultural offender” with “vis-min’s” (visible minority, a CSC term), especially on the front line service level, to designate all visible minorities (i.e., those non-white and non-Aboriginal designated). Eventually, the definition used for the project was as follows (see also The Target Group chapter below):

- Any individual of a visible minority (i.e., not Aboriginal or Caucasian)
- Any individual who is not born in Canada (regardless of race)
- Any individual whose parent(s) are not born in Canada (regardless of race)

Thus, the terms visible minority and ethnocultural will not be used interchangeably in this report.

CSC published the following statistics on visible minority offenders under its jurisdiction (incarcerated and parole, male and female) in the Prairie Region in January 2012²:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiatic</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Asian</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The researcher prefers the designation “program participant,” but the other labels are used in various documents and by CSC.
Numbers are not available for Manitoba separately, nor for separation by sex. However, we did obtain a one-day (March 15, 2013) snap-shot of visible minority inmates for both SMI and RI. This count shows that the self-identified visible minority population of SMI is 54 (8.7%) and that of RI is 28 (16.4%), for a combined percentage of approximately 10%. This is slightly lower than the earlier figures from the Prairie Region, but not inconsistent with that region’s figures.

To get an idea of the annual percentages by race of incarcerated individuals released with conditions, the following graph is illustrative (this is for all of Canada; a more detailed breakdown was not found):

Federal Conditional Release Population by Race (as of April 10, 2011)

The proposal for the pilot project did not include a literature review and a full review is outside the scope of this study. However, a limited review of available reports found that visible minority offenders, with the possible exception of black offenders are generally considered lower risk to re-offend than Caucasians:

In summary, visible minority offenders seem to be less “entrenched” in a criminal lifestyle than Caucasian offenders. They tend to have less extensive criminal histories, are incarcerated less often for offences against the person, and are lower in risk and need than Caucasian offenders. They also tend to have higher levels of education, less unemployment, and are less often single. These circumstances may help

---

in rehabilitation. Among visible minority offenders, Black offenders tend to exhibit more problem areas than Asian or “other visible minority” offenders.4

The report goes on to suggest that these incarcerated men may need different programming than offenders who are not visible minority.

Outline of the project

The overall goal of the project is to assist ethnocultural parolees with their reintegration into the community. As this is a pilot project, the intent is, briefly, to learn whether a) providing ethnocultural inmates and parolees with services would benefit them and b) how these services could best be delivered and what the best practices are.

The following are the three service objectives of the project5:

1. To connect the client (offender) with the services of the IC, and the community, commencing first while the client is in the system, developing a trust and a framework of needed resources and services and then working with the client and the Community Parole Officers on an ongoing basis upon release.
2. To develop and support a single, easily accessible portal of information to gain access to ethnocultural community resources.
3. To strengthen the release and parole plan. Often there are no family supports and the client is disconnected from their ethnocultural community. The Ethnocultural Reintegration Project would act as a community mentor and encourage/develop links and family ties.

The contract then specifies the scope, tasks, and deliverables (see the Conclusions section).

Program was to run from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013.

---

5 From the IC/CSC contract
METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION RESEARCH

The Evaluation Plan

The following plan was adopted by the Evaluation Advisory Committee at its first meeting on December 10, 2012:

Objective 1:
To connect the client (Offender) with the services of the Immigrant Centre, and the Community, commencing first while the client is in the system, developing a trust and a framework of needed resources and services and then working with the client and the Community Parole Officers on an ongoing basis upon release.

Determine inputs (i.e., hours spent on each participant, nature of service activities):
- Each participant has a demographic identification form (specifying such specifics as age, marital status, years in Canada, ethnic/county background, immigration status, offence, sentence, time served, previous criminal activities, family details, etc.): the Social History Ethno-cultural Review (SHER) is based on three models/assumptions:
  1. Strain/Frustration Model poses that the trauma of immigration and assimilation may "push" some ethno-cultural individuals towards criminal activity
  2. Cultural Conflict Model maintains that there is a disconnect between culturally specific behaviours/practices of the country of origin and Canadian values, such as the Criminal Code
  3. The lure of immigrant gangs and the cachet of gang membership with ethno-cultural youth (i.e., a sense of belonging) and socio-economic factors (of better and faster income, relative to the individual's education and employment prospects)
- Each participant has a summary on file of the ethno-cultural elements that have a bearing on his re-integration (e.g., relationships with family and community, social networks, rootedness in culture of origin, degree of acculturation to mainstream culture, language proficiency etc.) (SHER)
- Each participant has a set of written, mutually agreed goals that form the basis of the service (SHER)
- Each participant has ongoing contact form/record
  - This form specifies nature of contact (e.g., individual or family counselling session, consultation with collateral), the mode (e.g., face-to-face, telephone, correspondence), the length of time, etc.
  - Each contact is briefly summarized, particularly as related to service goals
- Other: (E.g., What are the PO’s goals/service objectives, if any)
  - Describe development and effectiveness of the SHER as a data collection and service planning tool.
Evaluation of (Interim) Individual Progress

- Participants and Immigrant Centre staff (also parole officers) rate each participant’s progress on 5-point scale (on a survey) for each of the service goals.
- Connection to Immigrant Centre other services and community organization is recorded.
- Changes in family ties and community connections are rated on 5-point scales (see also Objective 3 below).

Input from Participants

- Individual participants are asked about their views on the Project and recommendations for the future.

Feedback from Individual Parole Officers

- Service providers fill out a questionnaire on their satisfaction with the consultation process.
- Individual service providers are asked about their views on the Project and recommendations for the future.

Some of the following activities may also take place:

Workshops: None anticipated. Evaluate if any occur.

Objective 2:
To develop and support a single, easily accessible portal of information to gain access to ethno-cultural community resources.

Describe the Nature of the Portal and its Use

- Overview of the portal and its development.
- Record whether Probation Officers have accessed the portal (if time for usage allows).

Objective 3:
To strengthen the release and parole plan. Often there are no family supports and the client is disconnected from their ethno-cultural community. The Ethno-cultural reintegration project would act as a community mentor and encourage/develop links and family ties.

Note 1: There is some overlap with Objective 1 and some individual goals for this objective are listed there (See Evaluation of (Interim) Individual Process and Individual Parole Officers).

Note 2: Due to the short time frame remaining for the project, the family component has essentially been eliminated. Therefore, it is not expected that much work will be done with families, although some contact may occur.

Evaluation of (Interim) Individual Progress
• Families are asked to provide their views on how the Project has assisted them and the participant in terms of reconnecting after release, only if any contact has occurred between the program staff and the family (see Note 2).

• Community members who have come in contact with the Project are asked their views on how well the project has reconnected the client with the community.

Family and Community Input
• Family and community members are asked to provide their views on the future of the Project, only if any contact has occurred between the program staff and the family (see Note 2).

The above evaluation tools are all relative to specific offenders and their services. We also would ask key informants how they see the ‘system’ functioning and where they see a need for changes or additions.

Commentary on, and Revisions to the Original Plan

As described above, the evaluation is largely qualitative, rather than quantitative. The main data gathering technique was using structured interviews to elicit as much information on various topics as possible. The interview schedules are listed in Appendix A. These served as general guidelines for the interviews, rather than as strict question and answers surveys. While all the questions would be asked, the interviewer would also follow up on points raised by respondents that were not necessarily part of the questionnaire. The researcher and the staff member reviewed the completed surveys in order to determine common themes.

Each participant was scheduled to receive an intake by the staff member that was recorded on the Social History Ethnocultural Review (see Appendix A). This review was designed to collect some demographic data, family background, and history. The Review also provided a summary of the degree of acculturation and the participant’s relationship with his culture and ethnic community. The staff member also administered an interview schedule focussing on participants’ social and ethnocultural networks. Subsequent sessions were recorded by the staff member. Participants were not recorded on the IC data base.

Upon completion of the program, each participant was administered the Participant Satisfaction Survey (see Appendix A). The parole officers of most participants were also interviewed, using the PO Evaluation of Individual Participant schedule (see Appendix A). The latter schedules enquired about the activities of each participant but also asked about opinions regarding the program. These two schedules were administered by the researcher.

The evaluation was participatory in nature. That is, the participants were—as much as possible- partners in the design of the program and the evaluation. This was accomplished by an initial meeting of 14 volunteers on January 16, 2013. Due to the
delays described above, this meeting occurred rather late in the process. As a result of
the condensed time frame, full participation of program participants in the evaluation
was not possible. The input received from the participants had much to do with the
services delivered, rather than with the evaluation per se. They generally indicated that
they felt comfortable with being asked some general questions related to their
satisfaction with the program.

Thus, the interview schedules were developed with input by the program participants as
well as the Evaluation Advisory Committee. The Participant Satisfaction Survey was
written in easy to understand language (Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level: 4.0), due to several
participants' low level of English.

IC staff were interviewed on several occasions regarding their experiences and
thoughts about the Program. Summaries of these interviews were recorded by the
researcher. Additional members of the CSC were also interviewed, including: Regional
Manager Ethnocultural Services, Acting Manager Assessment and Intervention, and
Aboriginal Community Liaison Officer.

Also interviewed was the Executive Director of the John Howard Society of Manitoba.
FINDINGS

Program Description and Implementation Process

A slow start

The first delay occurred after CSC approved the proposal for the program. As it was early in a fiscal year, and the department was not sure about a possible funding freeze, it took until October 12, 2012 until the IC received word that the funds had been approved. The program could not start until after that point. Despite the delay, CSC required completion of the program, including a completed evaluation report, before the end of the 12/13 fiscal year.

There were a number of problems hiring the social worker to staff the program. The first person, who had been instrumental in drafting the program outline, decided—very unexpectedly—not to accept the position once funding was secured. Several attempts to find other staff resulted in the people who had been offered the position rejecting it at the last minute. After all these delays, the individual who was recruited eventually did not start until October 1, 2012. By the time she had received her orientation and security clearance, not until November, there were effectively four months left for the program. She finally received her picture ID on January 29, 2013, but that delay did not significantly affect her activities. She worked, on average, 28 hours per week until March 31, 2013. The researcher received security clearance around the same time as the staff member. However, he did not receive his photo ID until February 4, 2013. This delay caused some inconvenience and contributed in a minor way to the already backed up research, but did not further change the data gathering.

Given these delays, the program and the evaluation had to be scaled down considerably. It was expected that the number of clients who would reasonably be available and could be served in the time period would range from 10 to 15. In actuality, there were 16 participants registered.

The first meeting of the Evaluation Advisory Committee, a working group formed to provide input into the project and evaluation, took place on December 10, 2012. After that initial meeting the Evaluation Advisory Committee met three more times on a monthly basis.

The target group criteria

The contract specified that the program was intended for “ethnocultural offenders.” This term was not further defined. This lack of clarity caused considerable difficulties in the early stages of the program. As the IC primarily serves immigrants, the early interpretation of ethnocultural was that of incarcerated men who were not born in
Canada. This was also the admission criteria adopted by the first meeting of the Evaluation Advisory Committee.

Difficulties arose from the application of this definition. First, CSC collects information in its Offender Management System (OMS) on an eclectic mix of racial (e.g., Black, Caucasian), world region (e.g., Latin American, South-East Asian), country (e.g., Japanese, Filipino) and language (Hispanic) backgrounds of incarcerated men, not so much on their cultural heritage. The information collected is based on inmate self-identified reporting. However, CSC staff appear to conceptualize their clients along three main lines: Caucasian, Aboriginal, and Visible Minority (“vis-min”). Thus, a Caucasian incarcerated man who is born outside Canada is perceived as part of the non-vis-min, non Aboriginal group. This conceptualization implies that these individuals do not require additional or special consideration. On the other hand, an individual who is a visible minority, but born in Canada appears to warrant different attention, even if that individual’s family has been here for generations.

This disconnect between how –especially front line- staff of CSC and the staff of the IC view culture and race is interesting. Not only did it contribute to the initial confusion on who the target group for the project was, it also suggest that –at least among front line CSC staff- there exist a lack of understanding of ethnicity/culture and the role it plays in people’s daily lives, including reintegration of parolees back into society.

The IC staff member spent some time working with parole officers (POs) clarifying that race and ethnicity are not interchangeable concepts. We concluded that there appears to be a need for further education. Our first recommendation is therefore:

**Recommendation 1:**
A. That CSC staff receive (further) training on the role of ethnicity, culture, resettlement, and (refugee and relocation) trauma in the rehabilitation of incarcerated men, and
B. That CSC consider collecting more detailed information on ethnicity and culture, rather than on, or in addition to race.

The net result of the discrepancy of what the two organizations perceived the target group to be was that the IC staff member got referrals of a number of men who did not meet the initial admission criteria. After various deliberations, it was decided to provide limited programming to these individuals. For example, they could sit in on a group session the staff member provided, but were not formally admitted to the program and were not asked to take part in the research component. A further complicating factor was that applying the initial admission criteria (i.e., foreign born) resulted in a very small group of potential participants. These developments necessitated revisiting the admission criteria.
It was not until the January 14, 2014 meeting of the Evaluation Advisory Committee that the following, revised definition of the target group and program admission criteria were adopted:

- Any individual of a visible minority (i.e., not Aboriginal or Caucasian)
- Any individual who is not born in Canada (regardless of race)
- Any individual whose parent(s) are not born in Canada

This definition did justice to the perceptions and stated needs of both organizations. However, if CSC decides to continue with a version of the project past the end of the pilot, there is a need to clarify who are the intended future program recipients:

**Recommendation 2:**
That CSC and the IC formally establish admission criteria for future ethnocultural programs.

**Main program activities**

The staff member appears to have invested most of her time in attending CIBs and one-on-one and group work with program participants. The administration of the SHER and the interview schedule took considerable time. While at first glance there appeared to have been a lot of administration time, this individual ‘paper work’ appeared a necessary process as it formed the basis of trust building between the staff and the program participants. Developing this relationship, in an environment that is not very conducive to the spontaneous development of trust between staff and inmates, was critical to the success of the Project.

The SHER was developed and appeared to be a very useful tool, capturing most key aspects of the target population. It can be used in future ethnocultural programming.

Nine evening meetings were held at RI approximately with the group of program participants and some individuals who either did not qualify for the Program or who could not be registered due to limitations on enrollment.

For one of these meetings, the staff member organized two guest speakers to meet with the group of participants. They provided information on the following topics: Employment supports at the IC, CORCAN initiatives, apprenticeship training, creation or expansion of small business opportunities, and diversity and scholarship supports at Red River College. Participants mentioned that they appreciated these guest speakers, as they appeared eager for information, particularly on education/training and employment.

The participants and staff member organized a family/information day on March 24, 2013. This event was attended by approximately 30 people, including 15 program participants and their (adult) family members and significant others. Two people (the
mother and adult son of one of the program participants) were refused entry by security staff. The program staff and the researcher attended also.

Administration and program development took up considerable amounts of time of the staff member. She developed the SHER and the interview schedule and various other ways of tracking participants and activities. She also provided input in the research instruments, and the design of the evaluation. A number of meetings took place between the researcher and the staff member. She organized and attended all the meetings of the Evaluation Steering Group.

The staff member attended 38 CIBs in Winnipeg, RI, and SMI. Through CIB and working with Winnipeg POs, the staff member provided information on such services as the IC, EAL services, and Immigrant Women's Counseling Services.

The staff member did not work with families.

The information portal specified in the contract was dropped from the program. This portal was intended primarily as a resource for POs and for program participants once they were in the community. The staff member did establish a paper binder, stationed at the IC and intended for IC staff. This binder is specific to resources that may be applicable for formerly incarcerated individuals. However, it is only indirectly accessible to POs (see also the Outcomes of the CSC staff surveys and interviews Section).

A volunteer (long term commitment) was recruited for a unilingual French-speaking Haitian inmate at SMI at the request of his PO. This inmate was not registered as a participant. The staff member also provided some assistance with other ethnocultural individuals who were not registered in the Program.

**Description of the Participant Group**

The following are the demographic and other data on the individuals served, derived from the SHERs administered by the program staff member. They are all male. SHERs for two of the 16 participants were not competed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Born in Canada</th>
<th>Born outside Canada</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 23 to 38. Mean age: 30.5 years.

Of the known cases, all but two of the participants were born in Canada. All have Canadian citizenship. The individuals not born in Canada were born in Sudan and Eritrea, respectively. The remainder are all first generation Canadians. Their parents’
countries of origin include Philippines (4), England, Italy, Korea, Laos, Poland, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, and Vietnam. Only two were identified as having an EAL history (estimated Benchmark 5-6 and 8, respectively).

Reported marital status includes 10 single (including two engaged), two common law, and one married. Highest levels of education reported are: some high school/GED (4), high school/GED (5), some university or community college (5).

Many (7) reported some childhood trauma, ranging from violence in the home to witnessing the murder of family members. Most (9) reported a reasonably good to excellent relationship with their family. Most (10) also reported that they had a poor or non-existent relationship with their ethnic communities. Half of the group (7) indicated outstanding debts. Work histories ranged from non-existent or minimal (11) to good (3).

Self-reported sentence lengths ranged from 2 to 9 years, with the majority (9) having received four or fewer years. Current offences were 10 for trafficking/drugs and 3 for assault/manslaughter. For six participants, this was their first time incarcerated, although of these, the majority had earlier brushes with the law. Three reported having been incarcerated before. The information on the remainder was not recorded. Release dates ranged from May 2013 to September 2019.

When asked what kind of service they would like to get from the program, the majority of participants indicated either help finding education\(^6\) (3) or employment (8), while four participants requested help with strengthening family relationships. Two participants requested help with finding out how to get a pardon or help in getting an ETA.

A more in-depth interview schedule was used by the staff member to discuss some of the issues related to the purpose of the project and to explore the backgrounds of each individual. Some of the highlights of their responses are summarized below.

It appeared clear from many of the comments of the participants that their families are their main source of support:

“They give lots of support visiting whenever possible, give money, and talk on the phone all the time.”
“Support emotionally, financially, and mentally, visits monthly, phone calls daily.”
“My family supports me by visiting and they are always there when I need them. My family comes to see me every week.”
“Visits, phone calls, money.”

In sharp contrast is their very ambivalent attitude towards their communities:
“I also don’t feel comfortable going back because of the judgment and negativity that people would say against me.”
“I’d feel things would be awkward and uncomfortable because of what happened. I’d feel like I’m being judged in a way.

---

\(^6\) Multiple responses per individual possible.
“I wouldn’t feel comfortable because it’s such a small community and people are so judgmental and I don’t like that.”
“The hardest part of going back to your community is the judgment, guilt, shame, expectations or lack thereof.”
“I want to learn to help myself. I want to be able to sustain myself. Being in the ethnic community doesn’t help be successful in society.”

In part their ambivalence appears due to the presence of their criminal associates in those communities:
“... because they are my negative peers and it would be a high risk situation because I would be surrounded by negative associates.”
“... because I feel that it’s going to put me back in a bad place and doing bad things.”
“I don’t want to associate with the <specific ethnic> community, because I feel it’s a negative situation.”

Conclusions regarding the Participant Group

As this a small convenience sample, there are no reliable and valid conclusions that can be drawn for the entire eligible participant population. However, there are some patterns in the group that are noteworthy. First, the group is relatively young with only a few hardened criminals. Most were incarcerated for four years or less, for drug related offences, not violence. The vast majority were Canadian born, first generation citizens. Their support networks are their families and they have mostly poor, counterproductive, or non-existent relationships with their ethnic communities.

All participants appeared to meet the eligibility criteria, with the possible exception of one: He was self-identified in the OMS as Metis, but one parent was an immigrant from England.

What was particularly noticeable that none or the participants identified getting help with reintegrating into their communities as a priority. Rather they identified three main areas for which they requested assistance from the program: education, employment, and family relations. However, when this was further explored with them, a complicated picture emerged that suggested that there is a wide range of very individualized needs. For example, not all participants identified with a specific community as their backgrounds were often ethnically mixed. A number also identified community geographically (e.g.: “My community is the Core. I don’t care where you are born.”). This is further discussed below (See Recommendation 6).
Outcomes of Participant Satisfaction Surveys and Interviews

Fifteen of the 16 participants were interviewed by the researcher. The questionnaire (Appendix A) contained 12 questions, but many were followed up by supplementary queries. All respondents answered all the questions. The participant who got released during the course of the program could not be reached in time. His PO did not return the researcher’s phone calls.

Four questions required a numerical response from the participant. The results of these are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How are you doing now?</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is that better or worse?</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did the Program help you?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Getting along with family?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ranges and patterns of responses suggest that there was little response bias (e.g., such as giving identical scores on all questions: only one did). It would not be unexpected that some of the respondents would give unrealistically optimistic answers. However, while there may have been some of that, the respondents appeared to be well reasoned when asked to justify their numerical ratings.

The average score and range for Questions 1 and 2 suggest that participants believed they are doing reasonably well and that things got better for them since the beginning of incarceration. Many attributed this to the fact they were in RI as opposed to SMI, that they got used to the routine and the environment, and that they were working on bettering themselves, such as going to AA groups. Other suggestions were that the end of their sentences were in sight and that they had developed friendship, or support groups since entering the system.

Question 4, enquiring about the help they received from the Program, also met with a very positive overall score. When asked what they found most helpful, the respondents indicated that they had received a listening ear from the staff member, that they were treated “as human beings,” and that someone “from the outside” seemed to care. They also cited the guest speakers as very informative on such topics as job searches and further education. A number mentioned the event of March 24. This appeared to be empowering, largely because they were the organizers and they could do something for their families. The staff member was praised for having obtained permission from ‘the system’ something they felt they could not have done on their own.

Participants had extensive praise for the staff member and the Program and appeared highly satisfied. Even when making suggestions for improvements, many volunteered that these suggestions should not be taken as reflecting negatively on the staff member. As one participant said, referring to the staff member, in response to the question on how things can be done better: “She’s done great.”
While most indicated they could not think of any areas of improvement or change, some respondents had suggestions for the Program (Questions 6 and 7). First among these is that ETAs (Escorted Temporary Absences) should be included in future versions of the Program. They suggested visits to the IC and visits to organizations that provide education and training. It should be noted that one of the motivations –but not the only one- was that ETAs were said to increase one's chances of getting a favourable ruling from the Parole Board. However, this is not necessarily a bad thing and the suggested ETAs also would lower the thresholds to the IC and other institutions. An added benefit would be the normalization of education and training “on the outside.” Moreover, the possibility of ETAs would be a drawing card for future participants, as many may not be eligible for programs that offer these. Staff of a future program may have to be trained to do some ETAs (volunteer escorted ETAs can have a maximum of two program participants).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Escorted Temporary Absences are considered as a viable feature of a future ethnocultural program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other suggestions for improvements included:
- Regular events such as the March 24 family/graduation day
- More guest speakers on different topics related to training, education, getting a job, presenting oneself at the Parole Board, and presentations by different ethnic and service organizations, and by companies that consider hiring former incarcerated men,
- A regular, dependable schedule for when the Program staff member is available for individual consultation and when group sessions take place
- More program time
- More of a self-help component (“It makes you feel good to help others”)

Not all these suggestions may be practical. However, they should be considered seriously for a future program. There particularly appears to be a thirst among these men for information on what to do when they are released. They appear eager to listen to different people who can lead them in the right direction for education and getting a job.

Interestingly, not many respondents volunteered that they would use the IC upon release. When prompted, some indicated that they considered using it in the future. However, few seemed to have concrete plans in this regard. A couple indicated that they would encourage family or others they knew to use the Centre.
The questions (#10 and 11), asking about their families, showed a somewhat mixed, but generally positive response. What was notable was the observation by a number of participants that they were getting along better with their families because their crime was ‘in the open’ and the families had come to terms with the facts. Many also expressed that they appreciated their families and their support more. Several expressed shame for what they had put their families through.

What was of note that not many expressed the need for services to help them get along better with their families. There appears to be resistance among some participants to involve their families in any reintegration efforts. Some volunteered that their families could use the services of the IC for links to education and employment.

The observation that incarcerated men who are convicted of drug trafficking improve their relationships with their families while in prison was also made by a PO. In her opinion, this was more related to the circumstances of the crime (i.e., being very secretive with family over long periods of time) than with the ethnocultural factor. One questions, though, whether many ethnocultural incarcerated men do not have greater initial ties to their families than the average non-visible minority prisoner. As a result there may only be a case-by-case need for a future program to work on family dynamics. However, there may well be a need for other types of support (e.g., education and employment) for many families of ethnocultural offenders. As the family component was largely dropped from the Program, this is something that needs to be explored in the future.

**Recommendation 5:**
That a future program does a more in-depth exploration of the family dynamics of participants and the possible services to their families.

Finally, Question 9, enquiring about their relationships with their ethnic communities resulted in the most mixed responses. These ranged from not being interested in any contacts with the community to expecting to be fully submerged and basically pick up where they left off before incarceration. Some participants expressed disappointment of their community members not having contacted them during their incarceration. Other participants had ongoing contact with community members. One felt that his incarceration would probably improve his impact as people would take him more seriously. Another participant indicated he would like to get away from the community altogether by moving out of province.
There is some indication that shame is a factor in the ambivalence toward ethnic communities in some participants. This shame may be mediated through the families. That is, the families, including the incarcerated man, have lost ‘face,’ not just the offender. Therefore, in order for the offender to reintegrate into the ethnic community, it would be a family effort. Most participants indicated that the only way they and their family can regain respect is by showing that the released individual has become a contributing member of society.

Acculturation, or the lack thereof, may be a factor in the self image and identity of incarcerated men. This is now well recognized in the Aboriginal population, but not as much in the ethnocultural population. First generation Canadians, such as many in our sample, may well be at greater risk of identity confusion. That is, for all intent and purpose, they are born Canadian, but their parents may have raised them much as if they were still in the country of origin. This may explain some of the ambivalence toward their parents’ culture.

In conclusion, reintegration into ethnic communities is as complex as the family matters discussed above. Due to the short time span, these were not explored sufficiently in the pilot project. We can conclude, however, that services need to be tailored to the individual program participant, his family, and his ethnic community. There is no ‘one-size-fits-all solution. Having said that, there may be efficiencies in establishing joint program components with some ethnic communities. For example, typically there are a number of Filipino community members incarcerated in SMI and RI.

Ethnic community integration does not appear to be feasible for a minority of program participants. As this is a voluntary program, some future participants may well refuse to have any involvement with their communities. This should be respected.

**Recommendation 6:**
That plans for reintegration into ethnic communities are individualized and based on the stated needs of the individual program participant.

**Outcomes of the CSC Staff Surveys and Interviews**

We spoke with several supervisors inside the institution and in the community. The researcher also interviewed four POs, both regarding individual participants and their thoughts on the Program in general. One PO, with four participants, could not be reached as she went on a long term leave just prior to the critical data collection period. A second PO, with one program participant, had repeated scheduling problems. A meeting could not be secured in time for including the data in the report. One community PO (with one program participant) did not return the researcher’s phone calls. Questionnaires regarding program participants were administered for each PO (see Appendix A).
Responses from the POs were either positive towards the Program or indicated they had no idea one or more of the inmates on their case loads actually attended the Program. Several indicated that they had not discussed any or only some program participants with the staff member. They indicated that the only communication had taken place at a CIB. This is also reflected in the number of NA (not answered) responses to the question (#2) on whether the Program helped the participant.

Several POs wondered why there had not been an orientation session on the Program. Most suggested that they found out about the Program by either noticing the staff member at a CIB or in another serendipitous manner. Several indicated that they did not understand why no-one had discussed the participants with them. One stated that if the program were to continue, “team work needs to happen.”

This lack of communication may have also had an influence on the type of referrals received. One PO at RI commented that she had two men on her caseload for whom English was not their first language and who she thought would have benefitted more from the program than some of the program participants she was supervising.

Three questions on the pre-discharge PO surveys required a numerical response. These results for these are as follows (for 11 participants):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Prepared for release?</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5-5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Did the program help?</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Participant and family?</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1 asked how well the participant is preparing for release. The responses show that, in general POs thought that the participants were preparing well for release (5 is the top mark). Question 2 (and 3) asked whether the Program helped the participant. Here the responses were somewhat mixed. Most POs were rather unsure about the specific benefits. Those who provided a comment, indicated that the program helped the participants through getting in contact with community people and –as one PO stated succinctly- “These guys don’t get much programming and this <the Program> keeps them busy.” The general impression one is left with is that, had the POs been more involved and aware, they would have been more enthusiastic.

Recommendation 7:
That, if the program is renewed, an information session and a brochure for POs are provided explaining the program, eligibility criteria, and the referral system.
Question 8 asked how well the participant was doing with his family, relative to his time before incarceration. POs rated this fairly favourable, giving similar reasons as the program participants: More openness with the family, taking responsibility for the damage done, and reconciliation.

The option of a Web-based portal or a paper-based binder with referral information was discussed with the POs. Most would appreciate having such a resource for ethnocultural inmates. Most favoured a Web-based platform. Such a portal would need to have easily printable documents and resource summaries that do not take POs much time to research or assemble. Such a portal would only be necessary if the program does not continue, as a specialized staff member would otherwise be available to provide the information in person. Since the majority of POs appear to favour internet over paper, the former would be preferred. A portal is also much easier to keep current and comprehensive. However, keeping PO offices stocked with brochures of newcomer serving and ethnic organizations would be of added benefit.

Recommendation 9:
That, if the Program is not continued, a Web-based portal with ethnocultural resources is developed and kept current.

Outcomes of IC Staff Interviews and Observations

The researcher interviewed the program staff, the Executive Director, and the Newcomer Settlement Coordinator.

As there was only one program participant in the community, it was not possible to ascertain whether referrals to the IC were working well. The system set up consisted of contacting the IC Intake Worker. All participants received the business card of the Intake Worker and instructions on how to contact the worker.

The staff member of the Program spent considerable time attending CIBs both in the community and in the institutions. This served to inform the staff member of how the parole system operates. Suggestions by the staff member offered to the meeting did not appear to have found much resonance. The staff member indicated that, at times, it was difficult to have meaningful contact with POs.
Further details of the observations of the staff member can be found in her final report.

Other Comments and Observations on the Deliverables and the Program

One of the key elements of the Project was the reintegration into (ethnic) communities of participants after release. As only one of the participants was recently released during the time of the Project, this could not be studied. Moreover, this aspect appeared very complex and would have needed considerable more time to be successful.

Section 84

Above we argued that the involvement of ethnic communities is not only complex, but also needs to be tailored to the individual. We explored how the Aboriginal programs of CSC deal with community integration.

The Aboriginal Offender program of CSC has pioneered services to non-mainstream communities. We interviewed an Aboriginal Community Liaison Officer and other CSC staff about how reintegration for Aboriginal released inmates operates. The program is based largely on two sections (81 and 84) of the Reference Manual of the CSC Prairie Region. Of these, Section 84 is pertinent to the current project.

The Section 84 process\(^7\) provides a focused reintegration plan for Aboriginal offenders in order to enhance their ability to reintegrate successfully back into their home communities:

> "Where an inmate who is applying for parole has expressed an interest in being released to an Aboriginal community, the Service shall, if the inmate consents, give the Aboriginal community:
> • Adequate notice of the inmate's parole application; and
> • An opportunity to propose a plan for the inmate's release to, and reintegration into, the Aboriginal community." (Page 3)

The Section 84 process encourages the participation of Aboriginal communities in the release planning process for Aboriginal offenders. Section 84 provides the opportunity for Aboriginal communities to become active partners in the release planning. It is an integrated process of community planning that involves

\(^7\) From: Correctional Service of Canada Prairie Region (2010), Section 84 Reference Manual: "Healing is a journey, not a destination..."
Aboriginal-specific spiritual, emotional, cultural, educational, and employment components for the inmate. This level of planning involving Aboriginal-focused programming and input from the Aboriginal community enhances an Aboriginal offender's ability to reintegrate successfully back into the Aboriginal community. It is also in the interests of the Aboriginal community itself to be involved in the correctional planning and reintegration process for offenders returning to their communities. Section 84 is based on the premise that encouraging community participation in the reintegration of offenders is an effective way to restore balance and make reparation for harm done. (Page 4)

It should be noted that this Section does not just apply to geographically based communities (such as First Nations/reserves). For example, an incarcerated Aboriginal man may be released to Winnipeg under Section 84. There are significant similarities between Aboriginal and some ethnic communities in terms of acculturation, assimilation, geographic disruption, and multi-generational trauma, especially in refugees. However, there are also striking differences. Chief among the latter appears to be the reclaiming of the traditional identity. That is, healing programs in the Aboriginal community focus on individuals regaining their traditions and reclaiming the links to the past. This does not appear feasible in the same way for -for example- first generation Canadians. Arguably, they likely have more of a need to acculturate to mainstream society than regain their family’s traditions and customs. That is not to say that they cannot be proud of their heritage and associate with others from their (parents’) culture, and be part of the ethnic community.

While Section 84 is specific to Aboriginal communities, there are some procedures that may be applicable to ethnocultural parolees. If an individual has had close ties to an ethnic community and this community may be motivated to play a role in the release plan, a version of Section 84 could prove to make more and better resources available to the parolee and reduce recidivism.

Recommendation 10:
That a version of Section 84 is developed for incarcerated offenders with Ethnocultural backgrounds.

The SHER
The SHER, as an intake and assessment instrument proved very useful. It collects information on the background of program participants that can form the basis of a service plan. While it is intended for personnel working with ethnocultural communities, it could easily be adapted to serve as a screening tool for POs to sensitize them to the unique needs of an ethnocultural incarcerated man.

In reviewing the SHERs, it was observed by the researcher that all participants had very similar entries in the goal section of their SHER: “Work with his PO and Cultural Diversity Group and Pilot Project.” Not only is this not a service goal (but a method of service delivery); such a generalized statement does not reflect the individualized goal setting in a model where staff and program participant are both case managers. It could have been that in the early stage of the service relationship between staff and participant, participants were not ready to commit to specifics, but this should have been fine tuned at the first opportunity. The short time frame of the project itself did not help this situation. Some examples of hypothetical goal statements are: “<Name of participant> has spoken on the phone to the Intake Worker of the IC; he understands the service of the IC he will access upon his release” or “A letter is written by <name of participant> with the help of <name of staff member> to explain to <his> family that he is sorry about the trouble he has caused them.”

The researcher also found no evidence that the goals were reviewed at the stated date (March 15). This may well have been the result of the short time frame (most SHERs were dated February 20, 2013), but many of the participants started earlier than that and could have had at least one interim review.

**Recommendation 11:**
That specific, concrete service goals are determined shortly after intake and that these are reviewed monthly or every other month.

Besides the compressed time frame, the generic nature of the service goals may have contributed to a more generic approach to services (e.g., group information sessions as the major means of services). There were some exceptions. For example, one program participant expressed his gratitude for getting information on a brain-damage support group/organization in the community. Another participant was given information on ethnic community organizations.

While the participants very much appreciated the information given to them in the group sessions, providing people with information alone does not necessarily change their behaviour. Incarcerated men can be expected to be institutionalized to a degree, particularly if they have had longer sentences. That is, their ability to take initiative, make decisions for themselves (any, including positive ones), and approach organizations and people who they consider authority figures (such as service providers) would probably not have improved as the result of incarceration. It is for this reason that individual coaching, building workable bridges to services and people, and
activities that require concrete behaviours by program participants are crucial. The information sessions, particularly those with guest speakers, would have lowered the threshold to various services. However, there would also need to be a ‘next step’ for the program participants: to act on the new information.

Supervision for the staff member was provided by the IC, initially on a weekly basis, then less frequently.
CONCLUSIONS

Many of the conclusions are included in the discussions and recommendations made in the Findings section. In terms of the contract for the Project between the CSC and the IC, the following are the specifics regarding the scope, tasks, and deliverables, as specified in the contract (original contract wording in italics).

The following is the scope identified in the IC/CSC contract:

1. To encourage participants in their reintegration process which will be designed with the purpose of:
   • developing their potential for their full participation and reintegration into the Canadian society;
   • understanding and establishing their ethnocultural background and reconnecting with their own community and those resources;
   • receive support from the Immigrant Centre Programs and appropriate social services agencies to assist in their reconnection with their community to ensure better outcomes.

Due to the short time frame, this was only partly accomplished. Only one of the program participants was released to the community during the time of the project. Therefore, the success of this objective could not be measured.

2. To work in partnership with other human service agencies, ethnic community organizations to provide support to clients and their families.

Several organizations were contacted, such as the John Howard Society of Manitoba and Red River College. Ethnic organizations were not involved. The reason for the latter is the short time frame that did not allow for meaningful relationships to be created between the staff member and the ethnic organizations. Moreover, the participants in the program represented a large number of ethnic communities. It would be very worthwhile for a future program to develop these partnerships.

3. Collaboration among criminal justice system and health and human service systems to meet the needs of returning prisoners and their families.

The main collaboration was between CSC and the IC.

4. To reduce obstacles facing the ethnocultural offender (both in the system and in the community) by providing cultural competency workshops.

No cultural competency workshops were provided due to the focus on individual participants. This was an early decision discussed by the Steering Group.

5. To evaluate programs by tracking of client referrals, client outcomes, data base, success stories and to strive to determine client satisfaction.
with the program and to identify points for improvement or expansion. Please see Addendum for Community Based Participatory Evaluation (CBPE). The staff member and the researcher accomplished this through the research design.

6. To evaluate programs to ensure best practise and model for future expansion.
Completed.

The following tasks were identified in the contract:

1. The contractor (Immigrant Centre) will work effectively with CSC staff to schedule and implement the service delivery. This was largely accomplished. Help from the institutions to familiarize the IC staff member with the operations of the institutions was effective. The staff member received a formal orientation and Rockwood made group meeting space available. The IC staff assured the Program met the requirements of CSC and was very flexible regarding her time to assure she got optimal use of it relative to the institutions’ schedules. One of the main issues raised by some POs was their lack of knowledge about the Program. They indicated that a session for them at the start of the Program would have been helpful. The Program staff and POs could have worked together more closely. The staff member indicated that at times it was frustrating getting communication with POs.

2. The contractor (Immigrant Centre) will provide a qualified Social Worker to deliver the above services and shall supervise the Social Worker to assure adherence to CSC’s standards of performance.
Completed. The staff member has a BSW from the University of Manitoba. Unfortunately, there were delays in recruitment, through no fault of the IC.

3. The contractor (Immigrant Centre) prior to the Social Worker delivering any services, will submit to the Manager Ethnocultural Services, for approval the candidate’s name and resume clearly demonstrating the following:
   • Experience in structured intervention with individuals aimed at changing human behaviour
   • Experience in motivating and/or counselling persons in individual and/or group settings
   • Experience in the use of a computer, including the creation of documents and/or reports.
Completed.

The contract specifies the following deliverables:

The Contractor (Immigrant Centre) shall:
   1. The contractor (Immigrant Centre) will identify a qualified Social Worker
Completed.
2. The contractor (Immigrant Centre) will provide a copy of the Social Worker’s provincial licensing requirement and validity
   The staff member is not licensed, but is qualified to practice social work in Manitoba.

3. The Social Worker will execute regular trips to Stony Mountain and Rockwood Institutions to participate in pre-release planning of ethnocultural offenders and to connect with ethnocultural offenders prior to their release
   Completed (See the staff member’s report).

4. The Social Worker will meet with ethnocultural offenders in the community regularly to respond to their needs and connect them with community resources
   No meetings with program participants took place in the community, due to the short duration of the Program. Only one participant was released during the Project.

5. The Social Worker will meet regularly with community Parole Officers to discuss the Offenders’ progress
   The staff member attended a significant number of CIBs in both institutions and the community, and met with a variety of POs, mostly at Rockwood Institution. Some POs indicated they had not much contact with the staff member.

6. The Social Worker will attend joint meetings with the offender and his/her parole officer and/or any other third party involved in the offender’s case such as SCS staff or community organization staff working with the offender
   It does not appear that these meetings occurred.

7. Under the direction of the Contractor (Immigrant Centre) The Social Worker will provide the following documents:
   a. Monthly report on offender’s programs to their Parole Officer
   b. A final report at the time of completion of providing services to the offender
   No written reports were provided on individual participants to their POs.

8. Under the direction of the Contractor (Immigrant Centre) The Social Worker will provide an overall project evaluation at the end of the one year of implementation of the Community Reintegration Project for Ethnocultural Offenders (Community Base Participatory Evaluation). The evaluation report will highlight the outcomes of the projects and recommendations for any future programs.
   This was contracted to CAN Management Consulting (see the present report)

9. Under the direction of the Contractor (Immigrant Centre) The Social Worker will provide a draft of each deliverable for review by the CSC Project Authority (PA), his delegate(s) and/or other individuals the Project Authority identifies. The Contractor shall modify the draft in accordance with comments received from CSC PA and submit a first draft to the Project Authority.
   Did not occur due short time frame of the Project.
10. The contractor shall perform all of the work under the contract in English. Done.

11. Meetings:
   - An initial meeting (face to face at a location in the Prairie Region) will be held with the Contractor and the CSC PA, and or his delegate. The items to be discussed will include establishing/clarifying terms of reference, reviewing the project objectives and identification of CSC branches/divisions that will participate in the project. The training package will also be reviewed at this time.
   - The Contractor (Immigrant Centre) shall plan and conduct the consultation meetings with the Manager Ethnocultural Service at the end of each training session to debrief the training session. The Contractor may propose the meeting format, subject to the approval of the CSC PA.
   - The contractor (Immigrant Centre) shall meet with the CSC PA, and/or his delegate and other parties as requested by the CSC PA following submission of draft of final versions of each deliverable. These meetings will be face to face, or by telephone, at the request of the CSC PA or his delegate.

Several initial meetings took place, but not all meetings occurred as specified, largely due to the medical leave of absence of the CSC representative.

12. All of the proposed personnel (Social Worker) must have security clearance at the level of Enhanced Reliability upon contract award and prior to any work proceeding.

Both the staff member and the researcher received their security clearance.

In summary, the three service delivery goals were met as follows:

1. To connect the client (offender) with the services of the IC, and the community, commencing first while the client is in the system, developing a trust and a framework of needed resources and services and then working with the client and the Community Parole Officers on an ongoing basis upon release.

   Due to the shortened time frame of the project (less than half the originally intended time), this was only partly accomplished (see Findings). Most of the work occurred in the institutions with few participants being released during the Program’s existence.

2. To develop and support a single, easily accessible portal of information to gain access to ethnocultural community resources.

   This was not done.
3. To strengthen the release and parole plan. Often there are no family supports and the client is disconnected from their ethnocultural community. The Ethnocultural Reintegration Project would act as a community mentor and encourage/develop links and family ties.

See Item 1 above. Only one program participant was released. Direct work with families did not occur as the result of prioritizing work with the participants themselves.

How Would a Renewed Ethnocultural Program Work?

Staffing

We recommend that a full time Ethnocultural Reintegration Officer be employed by the IC rather than by CSC. There are advantages and disadvantages in either employment situation. Employment by CSC would mean a) easier acceptance by other CSC staff, the Officer being part of ‘the system,’ and b) easier access to information on incarcerated individuals. Advantages of the IC employing the Officer include a) greater acceptance as a change agent by the (potential) program participants, b) easier access to the resources of the IC, the main community resource for the program, c) the ability to bridge services for a program participant from before release to the community and d) possibly lesser cost as a contracted service. Of these, the potential to develop better counselling relationships with incarcerated individuals that carry over the incarceration and community periods is, in our opinion, the deciding factor in recommending that the IC provide the services.

There are currently roughly 80 individuals at SMI and RI self-identified as visible minority offenders. There is probably another small group of Caucasian newcomers. Once the program is established and the CSC staff have become more sensitized to identifying ethnocultural inmates, there may be some more added to the count. Moreover, the prevalence of black offenders in the system is increasing. Once the program gains traction, potential program participants will also be more likely to choose it as an option. This makes for a sizeable pool of candidates, justifying a significant human resource.

Recommendation 12:
That the Community Reintegration Project for Ethnocultural Offenders is made permanent with 1.0FTE staffing provided under contract by the International Centre.

Early intervention

From our discussions, it became clear that the earlier the program staff becomes involved with the potential program participant, the more successful the outcome will be. We recommend that an assessment occurs at the Intake Unit and that any services
provided by the staff become part of the Correctional Plan. This is particularly crucial for any individuals whose first language is not English. They need to be identified, assessed for EAL benchmark level, and prioritized for education.

Benefits for other early identification are related to family and any ethnic community supports. Related services should also be included in the (updated) Correctional Plan. We recommend that these services are identified no later than 2-3 years prior to the earliest release date.

Finally, one year to six months prior to the most likely release date, community integration planning should start focusing on concrete plans for community services, education, training, and employment. These plans should also be part of the Correctional Plan rather than mere inmate-directed initiatives. The latter is important as it streamlines parole plans with the ethnocultural services provided and aligns CSC and IC staff in working in the same direction.

**Recommendation 13:**
That ethnocultural services planning starts at Intake.

We suggest that the IC could bring in specialized resources for the existing GED teaching staff to facilitate the teaching of EAL. As improved family ties appear to be associated with better outcomes for the ethnocultural offender, this would be another focal point for the staff member at the earliest stage possible.

**Parole and community services**

In planning community services, training, and education, connections to these services should be made prior to release. ETAs can serve to lower the threshold to these facilities. Upon release, the staff member will need to work with the program participant as a case manager to assure that all needed services are established and coordinated.

The IC conceptualizes the intake process as shown on the following page.
Overall Conclusion

This project suffered from a number of forces amounting to a perfect storm. While conceived as a 12-month project, it turned into—effectively—a 4-month program. This resulted in many activities being short-changed or altogether dropped.

Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, the information collected and conclusions drawn appear to provide clear direction for CSC as to what to do, and what not to do, should it decide to provide ongoing specialized services to incarcerated men from ethnocultural backgrounds. In that sense, the pilot project was a clear success despite its truncated tenure.

The IC has expanded its own services during this pilot project to include programs for longer settled immigrants. These and other changes are described in the report completed by the Project’s staff member. These are not repeated in the present report, but suggest that the IC is in a better position to provide ongoing services to future participants referred through CSC.
LIST OF SOME ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AA: Alcoholics Anonymous
CIB: Correctional Intervention Board
CORCAN: Corrections Canada
CSC: Correctional Service of Canada
GED: General Educational Development (“Grade 12 equivalent”)
EAL: English as an Additional Language (formerly: ESL)
ETA: Escorted Temporary Absence
IC: Immigrant Centre Manitoba Inc.
IEC: Institutional Ethnocultural Coordinator
NA: Not Answered
OMS: Offender Management System
PA: Project Authority
PO: Parole Officer
RI: Rockwood Institution
SHER: Social History Ethno-cultural Review
SMI: Stony Mountain Institution
Vis-Min: Visible Minority
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

1) Participant Satisfaction Survey (Pre-release)
2) PO Evaluation of Individual Participant (Pre-release)
3) Social History Ethnocultural Review (SHER)

NB: Alternate post-release interview schedules were also developed for participants and POs. As these were not used, they are not reproduced here. The staff member also developed a schedule for exploring ethnocultural and family issues with the participants.
PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION SURVEY
Pre-release

Name of participant __________________________

1) How are you doing now?

   1      2       3            4     5
   /___________/___________/____________/____________/
   Not too good    So-so        Really good

2) Is that better or worse than when you first got into prison?

   1      2       3            4     5
   /___________/___________/____________/____________/
   Much Worse   About the same        Much better

3) Why are you doing (better/worse/about the same) than when you just got to prison?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

4) Did Alycia and the Immigrant Centre help you?

   1      2       3            4     5
   /___________/___________/____________/____________/
   Not       A bit     Lots

5) How did they help you?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

6) How could they have helped you better?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
7) Are there any things you would like to see changed about Alycia’s program?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

8) Since you came to prison, have you been to any other programs or did anyone else help you?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

9) Are you doing anything with anyone from your (ethnic) community?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

10) Are you getting along better or worse with your family than before you came to prison?

1            2            3            4            5
/___________/___________/____________/____________/
Much Worse   About the same    Much better

11) Why are you getting along (better/worse/about the same) with them now?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

12) Do you have any questions or would you like to say anything else?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

Thank you!
PRE-RELEASE PO EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT

Name of participant _________________________

1) In your opinion, how is <he (name of participant)> preparing for release?

1 2 3 4 5
/___________/___________/____________/____________/
Not too well So-so Really well

2) Did the Community Integration Project for Ethno-cultural Offenders and the Immigrant Centre help him?

1 2 3 4 5
/___________/___________/____________/____________/
Not at all Somewhat Very much

3) How did they help him?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

4) How could they have helped him better?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

5) Are there any things you would like to see changed about the Community Integration Project for Ethno-cultural Offenders?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

6) Has he been to any other programs or did anyone else help him, that you know of?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

7) Is <he> doing anything with anyone from his ethnic community?
8) In your opinion, is <he> getting along better or worse with his family than before he went to prison?

1 2 3 4 5
/___________/___________/____________/____________/
Much Worse About the same Much better

9) In your opinion, why is <he> getting along (better/worse/about the same) with them now?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

10) Do you have any questions or would you like to add anything else?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Thank you!
SOCIAL HISTORY ETHNOCULTURAL REVIEW

DATE COMPLETED:

PARTICIPANT PROFILE

NAME:
DOB:
MARITAL STATUS:

IMMIGRATION STATUS:

LANGUAGE(S)/ BENCHMARKS (if applicable):

EDUCATION

RELIGION:

TRAUMA/ HEALTH:

FAMILY OF ORIGIN/ GENERATIONAL STATUS:

COMMUNITY SUPPORTS (past and current):

RECREATION / LEISURE: Gym

FINANCIAL SITUATION

PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT / WORK EXPERIENCE:

CORRECTIONAL INFORMATION:

CURRENT SENTENCE:

DATE OF RELEASE:

CRIMINAL HISTORY (if applicable):

CORRECTIONAL PLAN / PROGRESS:

ASSESSMENT for Decision (DP/ FP/ ETAs/ SR) (if applicable):

NEEDS ASSESSMENT:

STRENGTHS:
SOCIAL NEEDS:

BARRIERS:

EXPECTATIONS OF ETHNOCULTURAL SERVICE:

FURTHER ASSESSMENT (if required):

CASE MANAGERS: ALYCIA KALISZ AND

RECOMMENDATIONS:

GOAL:

ACTIVITIES / ENROLLMENTS:

REVIEW DATE:

/ ak