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Interview Schedule for Aboriginal Women

Date: Do you consider yourself
Pseudonym: [ ] Registered
Age: [ ] non-Registered
Education level at admission [ ] Métis
Employed at admission [ ] Inuit

Personal History/Background

❖ What First Nation do you belong to?
❖ Where did you grow up?
❖ When you were growing up, what were some of your experiences that shaped your life? With family? With community? With school?
❖ What kind of exposure did you have to your culture? Do you think that shaped your life?
❖ What was your lifestyle like before entering the prison system?

Reasons for you being in the federal system

❖ Was this your first sentence?
❖ When do you think your troubles began?
❖ Were you in the provincial prison system before you went into the federal system?
❖ Do you feel the programming in the federal system was/is helpful to you? If so, in what way? If not, can you tell me why not?
❖ Were you able to participate in programming while in prison prior to your coming to the federal system. Did you find it helpful? If not, can you tell me why not?
❖ How long were/are you in the federal system to date?
❖ What reasons were you given for being classified at the security level that you were given?
❖ Do you agree? Do you disagree?
❖ What are your most important needs and do you think CSC can provide these?
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Perspectives on Programming

✧ Can you tell me about the programmes you participated in the federal system?

✧ What would you say about your relationship with your family? Were you able to have much contact with your family while inside? If not why not?

✧ Do you think the criteria used to classify women in general should be the same as those used to classify Aboriginal women specifically?

✧ Have there been times when you have taken steps to reduce your risk/security level while inside and felt that you were not being supported? Can you tell me a bit about it?

✧ Were/are there things about the staff, or the system in general that increased your risk/security level? Can you tell me a bit about it?

✧ Is there anything else I’ve not covered that you feel is important?
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Aboriginal Women
Consent Form

My name is Nancy Poon. I am a Chinese Canadian. I grew up in a small prairie town named Kerrobert in Saskatchewan. I have my master’s degree in Sociology and have been working a fair bit on Aboriginal Peoples and Corrections. I have also been working a fair bit on issues of violence against women. I have been married for almost four years and have no children as yet.

I am asking for your input in a research project put together by myself under the supervision of Les Samuelson, a professor in Sociology at the University of Saskatchewan. The information gathered from your interview will represent part of the data for a doctor of philosophy degree in Sociology at the University of Saskatchewan, comparing Aboriginal women’s perceptions of risk and danger with those of the criminal justice system. **The interview will be taped provided you are comfortable with this.** You will be asked to sign a permission form so I may tape the interview. The information may also be used for publication in academic journals by myself. The title of the study is *Risky Business: Democratising Success and the Case of Federally Sentenced Aboriginal Women*. The purpose of the study is to listen to your life histories, your definitions of “danger” and “risk” as well as your perceptions of the criminal justice system in general. We want to develop insight into the direction that future corrections/community action should take. I will ensure that the data gathered and reported in this research accurately reflects your views.

Since little research has been done in this area, this study may be a valuable resource to and/or other women. We would like to ask you about the issues listed on this interview sheet. Please look carefully at each area.

This research will involve a series of open-ended questions which will last approximately one to two hours. Procedures will be taken to ensure that your name is kept strictly confidential and responses anonymous. During the interview you can withdraw and choose not to participate in this study. Withdrawal will not affect your status at this residence or as a parolee in any way. **If you are distressed I will stop the interview if you do not want to continue at this time or continue at another time should you wish. You may want to speak with an Elder, or the elder whose contact information I will leave with you, or you may want to speak with your worker. I will inform your worker should I feel the situation warrants it.**

During the interview I ask that you not offer information other than your responses to the interview questions. You may however, wish to volunteer relevant information you want to be included in the research data. As I will be talking to only a small number of women there is a possibility that you may be identifiable by what you tell me. I will however, leave you a business card with my contact information on it. I will also leave a copy of the signed consent forms if you wish. It also has the phone number for an outside Elder who is Cree, named Blue Thunderbird Sitting Woman (Lorraine Penner) from Beardy’s
Okemasis reserve if you feel the need to speak with her. You can call her collect.

Again, if you experience any worrying feelings about risks or discomfort in talking about your experiences or perceptions, ask me to stop the interview. You can also speak to your Elders or you can call Elder Blue Thunderbird Sitting Woman collect if you wish.

If you have any questions or concerns once the interview is completed, you may discuss these with me. Once all the interviews have been transcribed I will return so that you will have the opportunity to review your transcript in a private place and given the opportunity to add, alter, or delete information from the transcript as appropriate. Only anonymous excerpts from the transcripts will be used in subsequent written documents but again you may be identifiable to others on the basis of what you have said. After you have inspected and approved your transcript I will ask you to sign a data transcript release form acknowledging that the transcript accurately reflects what you said in your personal interview with me. I will store for you this Data/Transcript Release Form along with the cassettes, papers, including this consent form securely in a locked cabinet, accessible only by me, in my supervisor’s office in the Department of Sociology at the University of Saskatchewan for a minimum of five years.

I will then return at a later date to meet with all of the women who have shared their perceptions. I will share what I am say in the thesis about Aboriginal women and the criminal justice system. If you have any issues or concerns about how your information was used, we can go over a copy of your transcript. Upon request, either at this later meeting or after if you contact me, a written summary of the results will be made available to you.

If you have any questions about the research or your rights as a participant in the study you can call University of Saskatchewan Research Services at (306) 966-4053.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
____________________

I _________________________________________understand the above-mentioned consent form and have decided to participate in the research project.

Name _____________________________ Name of researcher: Nancy Poon

Signature ______________________________ Signature ______________________________

Date ________________________ My home phone (306) 384-3584
Appendix Two

Elder Blue Thunderbird Sitting Woman (Lorraine Penner) (306) 467-2215 (home)

files: abwomen consent form
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Permission to tape the interview

I, ____________________________, have reviewed the consent form and I agree to allow Nancy Poon to tape this interview for this study with the understanding that I will have an opportunity to add, alter, and delete information from the transcripts as appropriate. I hereby authorize the release of this taped interview to Nancy Poon to be used in the manner described in the consent form. I have received a copy of this Permission to tape interview form for my own records.

______________________________  _______________________________
Participant                                    Date

______________________________  _______________________________
Researcher                                    Date
Data/Transcript Release Form:

I, _________________________, have reviewed the complete transcript of my personal interview in this study, and have been provided with the opportunity to add, alter, and delete information from the transcript as appropriate. I acknowledge that the transcript accurately reflects what I said in my personal interview with Nancy Poon. I hereby authorize the release of this transcript to Nancy Poon to be used in the manner described in the consent form. I have received a copy of this Data/Transcript Release Form for my own records.
Dear ____________,

Enclosed please find a copy of your interview with me. I would be grateful if you would read it over and get back to me either via letter, or telephone (collect) at 306 ** or 306 ** with any additions or modifications.

If you are alright with your interview transcript with me as it is, I would be grateful if you would sign the enclosed transcript release form and send it back to me in the stamped self-addressed envelope.

If I do not hear back from you within 10 weeks I will assume that you are alright with your interview transcript with me.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact either myself at the above two numbers or alternatively, contact the elder overseeing this research at 306 ** by collect telephone call.

Again, I would like to thank you for taking the time to speak with me.

Sincerely,

Nancy Poon

encl. Transcript release form, transcript, business card, stamped self-addressed envelope 
cc: myfiles
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Canada’s federal carceral system is premised upon a system of gradual and controlled (re)integration in the community dating back to the Ticket of Leave Act (1899) (Government of Canada 2005) and is sometimes referred to as community corrections. *Parole* is a programme that allows prisoners to serve the final part of their sentence under supervision in the community, provided that they keep certain conditions\(^1\). As a form of conditional release, parole is premised upon the belief that prisoners have a better chance of not re-offending if they are given “support” and conditions by which they must abide during the final portion of their sentence. These conditions ideally are to become less onerous as their warrant expiry date -- the day they are finished their sentence – draws close.

*Day parole* allows an inmate to gradually re-enter the community before *full parole* eligibility in preparation for full parole, or to take part in programs that would not otherwise be available. Those on day parole are required to report to their parole officer when required to do so and return to a community training residence (CTR), a halfway house or to a carceral institution for the night. Those on full parole live in the community proper and are responsible for retaining and paying for their own accommodations, and must abide by conditions, usually similar in scope but usually less onerous than those who are on day parole.

*Statutory release*, also a form of conditional release, is not the same as parole in that it is a legal provision that automatically entitles *most* prisoners, who have not been granted parole, to serve the final one-third of their sentence in the community. Those on statutory release are said to be at a greater risk of not successfully completing their time in the community than those on parole as they are deemed to have not met the conditions necessary for parole, or have not bothered to apply for parole, for whatever reason\(^2\).

Some prisoners are detained in prison until their *warrant expiry* date because the National Parole Board believes that there is a good probability that they will commit an offense of violence if they are released into the community. Those who spend their entire time inside only being released upon their warrant expiry are not subject to conditions like those on parole or statutory release. Likewise, as they are no longer under the purview of CSC, they are deemed to be not entitled to receive any support or “guidance” from CSC representatives either. Those released on warrant expiry are said to be at the greatest risk of re-offending.

\(^1\) Usual conditions commonly include:

- once released from prison, they must travel directly to their place of residence as set out on their release certificate and report to a parole supervisor immediately and continue to report to the parole supervisor as instructed.
- remain at all times in Canada, within boundaries decided by the parole supervisor
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- obey the law and keep the peace
- inform the parole supervisor immediately if arrested or questioned by the police;
- always carry their release certificate and identity card provided by the releasing authority and produce them on request for identification by any peace or parole officer
- report to the police if and as instructed by the parole supervisor
- advise the parole supervisor of his or her address of residence on release and from then on to immediately report any change of address, occupation, including employment, vocational or educational training and volunteer work, any change in their family, domestic or financial situation and any change that might reasonably affect their ability to keep the conditions of their parole
- not own, possess or have any control over any weapon as defined in the Criminal Code except as allowed by their parole supervisor
- if the prisoner is out on day parole, to return to the penitentiary at the date and time set out on their release certificate. (04.01.98)

2. Such a situation has several potential implications. Firstly, it can be interpreted as lacking the desire to return to the community. Secondly, it can be interpreted as lacking the desire to comply with your release plan. Thirdly and most significantly, it leaves you less time in which to gradually reintegrate into the community with “supports” and “guidance”.

The Custody Rating Scale (CRS)

The Custody Rating Scale consists of two independently scored sub-scales: a five-item Institutional Adjustment scale and a seven-item Security Risk scale. In most cases, item scores increase according to the frequency of incidents and, as scores escalate on either sub-scale, higher security classification is predicted. Security classification is based on the total sub-scale scores, in accordance with predetermined decision rules that specify cut-off values for minimum and maximum security. In the event of disagreement between the sub-scales, the Custody Rating Scale security level designation is determined by the sub-scale assigning the higher classification rating.

Potential scores range from 0 to 186 points on the Institutional Adjustment scale, and from 17 to 190 points (and higher when open-ended scores for release failures are considered) on the Security Risk scale. Item weight and classification cut-off values are, for the most part, empirically derived from a 1987 sample of federal offenders. In some cases, item weights are defined by policy priorities. For example, Offence Severity is weighted to prevent the initial placement of an offender serving a life sentence in minimum-security.

Custody Rating Scale – Instructions

MINIMUM-SECURITY
Inmates with scores less than 79.5 on the INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT dimension, and/or less than 58.5 on the SECURITY RISK dimension are recommended as minimum-security candidates.

MEDIUM-SECURITY
Inmates with scores between 79.5 and 94.5 on the INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT dimensions, and/or between 58.5 and 133.5 on the SECURITY RISK dimensions are recommended as medium-security candidates.

MAXIMUM-SECURITY
Inmates with scores greater than 94.5 on the INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT dimension, and/or greater than 133.5 on the SECURITY RISK dimension are recommended as maximum-security candidates.
# Custody Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPS: COMPLETED</th>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Institutional Adjustment Score</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## History of Involvement in Institutional Incidents

- **a.** No prior involvement  
  Score: 0
- **b.** Any prior involvement  
  Score: 2
- **c.** Prior involvement in one or more incidents in greatest" or "high" severity categories  
  Score: 2
- **d.** Prior involvement during last five years of incarceration:
  - In an assault (no weapon or serious injury)  
    Score: 1
  - In a riot or major disturbance  
    Score: 2
  - In an assault (using a weapon or causing serious injury)  
    Score: 2
- **e.** Involvement in one or more serious incidents prior to sentencing and/or pending placement for current commitment  
  Score: 5

## Escape History

- **a.** No escape or attempts  
  Score: 0
- **b.** An escape or attempt from minimum or community custody with no actual or threatened violence:
  - Over two years ago  
    Score: 4
  - In last two years  
    Score: 12
- **c.** An escape or attempt from medium or maximum custody or an escape from minimum or community custody with actual or threatened violence:
  - Over two years ago  
    Score: 20
  - In last two years  
    Score: 28
  Two or more escapes from any level within the last five years  
  Score: 28

## Street Stability

- **a.** Above average  
  Score: 0
- **b.** Average  
  Score: 16
- **c.** Below average  
  Score: 32
### INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT SCORE (CONT'D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Alcohol/Drug Use</th>
<th>a. no identifiable problems</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. abuse affecting one or more life areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. serious abuse affecting several life areas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Age (At any time of)</th>
<th>a. 18 years or less</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. 19 years</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 20 years</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. 21 years</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. 22 years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 23 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. 24 years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. 25 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. 26 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j. 27 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k. 28 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l. 29 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. 30 years or more</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECURITY RISK SCORE</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1 Number of prior convictions | a. none | 0 |
|                               | b. one  | 3 |
|                               | c. 2 to 4 | 6 |
|                               | d. 5 to 9 | 9 |
|                               | e. 10 to 14 | 12 |
|                               | f. over 15 | 15 |

| 2 Most serious outstanding charge | a. no outstanding charges | 0 |
|                                   | b. minor | 2 |
|                                   | moderate | 5 |
|                                   | serious | 5 |
|                                   | major | 35 |

| 3 Severity of current offence | a. minor or moderate | 12 |
### SECURITY RISK SCORE (CONT'D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Sentence Length</th>
<th>b. serious or major</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 1 day to 4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 5 to 9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 10 to 24 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. over 24 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Street Stability</th>
<th>a. above average</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. average</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. below average</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Prior Parole and/or statutory release</th>
<th>a. none</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1 point for each prior parole release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 points for each prior statutory release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 Age (at time of admissions)</th>
<th>a. 25 years or less</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. 26 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 27 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 28 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 29 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. 31 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. 32 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 33 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. 34 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. 35 years or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL SECURITY RISK SCORE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>