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ABSTRACT

This paper expands current debates on governance within corrections by examining the relationship between rationales and technologies deployed in the governance of young female offenders. A detailed examination of formal corrections policies, policy manuals, and interviews with administrators and primary counsellors challenge the notion that there is a preoccupation with risk in contemporary penal practice and that risk rationales and technologies have displaced discipline as dominant strategies of governance. It is certainly true that the logic of risk is present in both discourse and practice and that their development has added a new dimension to the governing process. However, the extent to which risk practices have overtaken disciplinary strategies is less certain. Various heterogeneous elements need to be examined when attempting to understand the complexity of the governing process. While several studies show that risk rationales currently guide correctional practice, the technologies of governance are not homogenous in nature nor do they only reflect one rationale. An investigation of an open custody facility in Ontario reveals an uneasy coexistence of strategies of discipline, risk, and responsibilization. These findings suggest that there is a need to reflect further on the relationship between governing rationales and technologies: on the inability of one set of rationales to dominate all aspects of correctional practices.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

To what extent has risk thinking and practice infiltrated open custody facilities for young female offenders? This research question will be investigated through interviews with primary counsellors, analyses of correctional law and policy, organisational manuals and administrative forms of an open custody facility for young female offenders in Ontario. In order to ensure confidentiality the term Youth House is a pseudonym designated to the site selected for this study.

Much of the literature on penalty, within the governmentality framework, provides analytics concerning the changes within corrections in light of risk technologies and neoliberal strategies of governing. However, there is a lack of empirical research on the actual operations of correctional policies and practices and the place of risk in these operations. Moreover there is a general lack of attention to the relationship between risk, age and discretion in these matters. This research will begin to address this critical gap through a detailed empirical investigation of the operations of administrative discretionary power in the application of risk technologies at a community based correctional facility for young female offenders.

This case study unpacks the complexity of the governing process by analysing the interplay between risk technologies and other governing technologies that shape the strategies deployed to control and treat young female offenders. The focus of this study is to explore and investigate if risk thinking, predominant within both the discourses of corrections and governmentality literature, is actually at play in this site, or is it the case that discourse is
more prevalent than actual practice? This investigation on the rationales and technologies that govern young female offenders and the specific strategies used to negotiate the various elements that infiltrate the discretionary process will provide new insight on how young female offenders are governed.

Contemporary scholars drawing from the insights of Foucault and working from the general framework of governmentality studies argue that the dominant logic and practices of contemporary penalty have shifted; that there is an emerging pre-occupation with risk, its prediction and the management of risk through actuarial technologies (Hannah-Moffat 1999; Culpit 1999; Dean, 1999; Lupton 1999; Ericson and Haggerty 1997; Pratt 1997; Parton, 1996; Simon and Feeley 1995; Feeley and Simon 1992: 1994; O'Malley 1992; 1998; 1999; Ewald 1991; Defert 1991; Castel 1991; Simon 1988; 1987). These authors provide various analytics and discussions concerning the current states of governance. The work of Feeley, Simon and Hannah-Moffat are particularly relevant in this context.

According to Feeley and Simon’s 1995 study, the now dominant governing logic of actuarial modes of justice characterises current penal practices in contrast to past approaches that centred on discipline, treatment, and punishment (Feeley and Simon 1992). To explain this shift, Feeley and Simon coin the term “new penology”, to identify a conceptual framework of “salient features” (Feeley and Simon 1992: 452) of new penal regimes. These include new objectives, discourses and techniques that centre on risk, prevention and prediction. This view is premised on the notion that infiltration of risk technologies within penal practices is indicative of a broader shift, one that is consistent with neo-liberal regimes. For Feeley and Simon, the proliferation of risk thinking and risk technologies in western penal regimes is evidence of a general shift in the governing logic from discipline to risk.
For example, the analytic of the new penology suggests that current penal practices are moving away from “normalising offenders and towards trying to manage them…” (Feeley and Simon 1992: 455). The concern with risk prediction and managing aggregate groups has replaced past objectives that centred on reforming, rehabilitating and reintegrating the offender. This suggests that risk rationales and technologies have displaced disciplinary rationales and technologies.

Disciplinary technologies aim to rehabilitate offenders by training them to adopt lifestyles, habits and routines that mimic that of the un-institutionalised individual, or in other words, ‘normalise’ the offender. It is presumed that by instilling norms such as attending schools, gaining employment and managing aggressive behaviour, offenders will be more likely to engage in non-criminal lifestyles upon release. In contrast, risk technologies aim to reveal the offender by collecting and organising information making the offender ‘known’ in order to predict future criminal behaviour. As observed by Pratt, “lives that remain unknowable are thereby unpredictable…” (Pratt 2000: 39). Discipline and risk are distinct technologies. Discipline technologies aim to rehabilitate offenders through *individualised* treatment programs where as risk technologies aim to identify the risky and are pre-occupied with prediction, and management of *populations*. Actuarial risk technologies are persuasive, in that, they are described as objective, and therefore precise, technologies that remove the subjective nature of non-actuarial factors increasing public safety by predicting and managing those identified as risky. The extent to which the presence of risk technologies represents a real shift in the governance of penal regimes remains a contentious and debated issue within the literature.
Despite the prevalence of risk practices under neo-liberal regimes, discipline as a mode of power has not disappeared. Hannah-Moffat (1999) argues risk technologies, in and of themselves, do not reflect the full complexity of current governing strategies. These given strategies are characterised by a “mixed model of governance” and the “hybridisation of risks and needs” (Hannah-Moffat 1999). In the context of women’s prisons, Hannah-Moffat found that currently there are three modes of governing deployed simultaneously. These include traditional disciplinary, sovereign modes of governance, and risk technologies. Risk technologies are used to classify offenders in terms of their criminological needs, which are defined by the absence of normative structures such as education. The relationship between identifying needs and assessing risks suggests that a “substantial slippage between the concept of risk and need” exists (Hannah-Moffat 2000: 4). Identifying criminological needs involves, as argued by Foucault (1977), constituting the individual as an object of knowledge. In this context the offender is disciplined through the techniques of normalisation that “correct” the offender. Risk technologies require the identification of offenders’ criminological risks/needs in order to predict their future behaviour and identify the appropriate level of supervision. The interdependency between these objectives suggests that risk thinking, as a mode of governance, has not replaced traditional disciplinary strategies that attempt to correct an offender’s behaviour based on the assignment of criminological needs. This suggests that needs assessment has not displaced risk assessment. In contrast to Feeley and Simon, Hannah-Moffat concludes “penal governing reflects a combination of fragmented and flexible exercises of power that often co-exist and are interdependent” (Hannah-Moffat 2000: 510).

The overlap between risks and needs suggests that risk is not a new concept but rather
a re-articulation of dangerousness. In the nineteenth century “dangerous” offenders were managed and treated through identifying criminological factors based on assessments by experts, professionals, and clinical intuition to “maintain order and facilitate moral reformation, through physical separation and crudely identifying reformable offenders” (Hannah-Moffat 1997: 202). In neo-liberal regimes, actuarial risk technologies are employed with the intention of predicting and preventing criminality by identifying an offender’s risk level in addition to their criminological needs (Hannah-Moffat 2000: 3). For example the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI), a risk tool used by Corrections Canada, is described by the designers as an “actuarial tool...used to both identify security...and criminological needs” (Andrews, Bonta and Hodge 1990: 22). Thus the distinction between risk and dangerousness may not necessarily be rooted in a new approach but rather advancement in technologies and shift in language. Historical shifts in penology, changes in governementality, and advances in technology have moulded and transformed the utility and design of classification systems. Risk thinking, risk technologies and actuarial technologies represent a shift in language and are symbolic of computerisation (Jones 1996). Computerisation lends itself to risk practice in that it captures, stores and allows access to information used in risk assessments.

Hannah-Moffat argues that the framework used under the ‘new penology’ expands upon Bottoms (1983); Peters (1988); and Tuck (1991) to describe changes in the penal system by examining the growth of what Bottoms (1983) describes as “mangerialism”. Whether the development of these technologies indicates a more general shift in the object of governance is a matter for empirical investigation. Is risk simply a new way of talking about danger? Despite the emphasis on risk, prevention and prediction, identifying criminological
needs remains a central part of corrections. This suggests that disciplinary punishment is not displaced but rather integrated with risk technologies. As suggested by O'Malley risk and discipline “are not hostile to each other…rather within the framework of risk and freedom, disciplinary and actuarial techniques are a set of variable relationships” (2000: 21).

The fact remains, however, that risk thinking is increasingly dominant as a rationale of punishment and risk technologies are increasingly employed within the field of corrections. The extent to which these technologies are truly actuarial is less certain. Risk technologies, although described as objective statistical probabilistic technologies, allow for the infiltration of subjective non-actuarial factors. As noted by Ericson and Haggerty, “morality is embedded in risk technologies and in systems of risk” (1997:123). Fraser (1989) suggests that the politics of needs interpretation is considered in the management of risk. As noted by Dean. “risk is a way—or rather, a set of different ways—of ordering reality. of rendering it into a calculable form” that necessitate a form of knowledges that make it thinkable” (1999:131). These arguments support the notion that the practices and processes of governance within penal regimes cannot be adequately understood solely by examining risk technologies. In order to understand the ways in which young offenders are governed, the application and operation of risk technologies needs examination.

Risk practices have added a new dimension to the governing process. The development and application of risk technologies certainly expresses a different approach to governance and a different conception of the objects of governance, now framed as the responsible citizen. Past governing strategies emphasised the responsible offender. As argued by Feeley and Simon, the “old penology” was “occupied with guilt, responsibility, and obligation, as well as diagnosis, intervention and treatment of the individual offender” (1994:
State intervention attempted to alleviate and remedy criminal activity and criminal circumstances with the intention of reformation. The responsible citizen approach requires the offender to take responsibility for both their actions and to actively participate in their own rehabilitation. Current practices of governance are reflective of self-governance, where offenders are expected to take care of themselves (Pratt 2000). As suggested by Garland, “prisoners are treated ‘as if’ they were free, rationale and responsible individuals responsive to rewards and benefits” (1995: 190). Although the governing process does not leave individuals ‘free’, per se. it does however include “strategies for the responsibilization of the citizen” (O’Malley 1992: 73).

Responsibilization strategies are less intrusive techniques and methods that render offenders knowledgeable consumers (Garland 1996). According to Garland, “there is a criminology of the self, that characterise offenders as rationale consumers just like us; and there is a criminology of the other, of the threatening outcast, the fearsome stranger, the excluded and the embittered” (1996: 461). The “criminology of the self” constitutes the offender as rationale and responsible. The offender as a “rationale consumer” is perceived to have the ability to make choices, to know the difference between right and wrong, thereby justifying punishment. Responsibilization strategies of control lend themselves, particularly in the context of women, to the deployment of empowerment strategies.

Empowerment, according to Young (1994), for service providers and activists can mean “the development of individual autonomy, self control, and confidence” and/or “the development of a sense of collective influence over social conditions in one’s life” (Young 1994: 49). In the context of federally sentenced women, Hannah-Moffat (2000) found that Corrections Canada deploys empowerment strategies that are technologies of self-
governance. Given that this research site deals with a female population, examining the extent to which empowerment strategies are evident speaks to the gendered nature of governing strategies. The interesting question raised here is: Are empowerment strategies evident at this facility and, if so, how are these strategies deployed or modified in light of risk technologies?

This thesis explores the extent to which risk technologies are utilised in practice and the ways in which other governing strategies play out in light of risk. Scholars like Hannah Moffat provide an important insight in this respect. However there is a need for the examination and elaboration of the workings of risk technologies at the local, concrete level. I argue that the proliferation of risk techniques and the empirical confirmation of their existence can only tell a partial story. To fully grasp the complexity of governance and the actual workings of governance at the local level other factors must be considered. These elements include the political rationales, administrative policies and technologies and the ways in which these are mediated by discretionary agencies.

The processes and practices of governance cannot, therefore, be understood outside the field of their application. With this in mind, this study examines the governance of young female offenders at a specific site with the aim of illuminating and specifying how governance actually works at an empirical site: and in a specific field of governance. To often governance is addressed in the abstract (Rose and Miller 1992; Feeley and Simon 1992, 1994). Like Hannah-Moffat, I intend to apply this framework to an existing site in order to understand the specificity of modes of government as the articulation of the various elements that constitute its functioning. Following the paradigm shift in Foucauldian theory
from *episteme* to *dispositif* (Shields 1991), governmentality can be seen as comprising a heterogeneous assemblage of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, the said as much as the unsaid. Such are the elements of the apparatus. The apparatus itself is the system of relations that can be established between these elements . . . whether discursive or non-discursive (Deleuze 1992).

The nature, application and impact of these elements may vary from site to site and do not necessarily act in a consistent manner. The analytic of governmentality thus provides a valuable framework for understanding governance but at the same time it is important to recognise that each site of governance is infiltrated and guided by different elements at different times; specific sites of governance are spatially, culturally and historically specific. Therefore, in order to get a full understanding of governance particular empirical sites need to be examined through the lens of actual practice. This close and specific examination allows for the accounting of the various heterogeneous and contradictory elements that are negotiated on a daily basis and translate into practice through the discretion of counsellors. The importance of these various elements exemplifies the notion that the “field of governance” encompasses a network of heterogeneous elements that interplay, overlap and are at times contradictory. Thus while it is certainly true that the logic and technologies of risk enjoy considerable prominence in neo-liberal regimes and that this shift is increasingly evident in the penal regimes, close inspection of a particular empirical site and the actual processes and practices at play is likely to reveal further complexity.

The conception of “technologies of government” is developed by Rose and Miller who define technologies as: “the complex of mundane programmes, calculations, techniques, apparatuses, documents and procedures through which authorities seek to embody and give
effect to governmental ambitions" (1992: 175). They distinguish technologies from political rationales, which are

the changing discursive fields within which the exercise of power is conceptualised, the moral justification for particular ways of exercising power by authorities, notions of appropriate forms, objects and limits of politics, and conceptions of the proper distribution of such tasks among secular, spiritual, military and familial sectors. (Rose and Miller 1992: 175).

Political rationales and technologies form complex relationships that are diverse and multiple. Policies represent administrative and operative guidelines and are, in part, reflections of political rationales. They are broad and general in nature, yet facilitate the development and implementation of various specific technologies. It is important to acknowledge that these elements overlap, intersect and sometimes contradict one another and therefore do not operate in a necessary coherent, unified manner. For example governing rationales, which are expressed in administrative policies, are informed by a multiplicity of discourses and their application is affected by institutional and organisational imperatives. They are given practical effect through diverse and multiple technologies, which are mediated and given practical effect by the operation of discretionary power of local agencies and staff.

The examination of risk by governmentality scholars tends to obscure this conception at the local level. They therefore ignore or side step the rather messy question of agency and discretionary power. The present study aims to fill this gap between analytical conceptions and concrete practices of governance. The primary purpose of this project is to investigate how, specifically, the governance of young female offenders is actually carried out by governing agents: by counsellors, administrators and the directors of a specific correctional institution for young female offenders within the framework of policy. These agents are
actively engaged in the transformation of official law and policy into individualised programs and treatment initiatives. Thus, these individuals can provide insight concerning how and why populations, in this case specifically young female offenders, are governed through governing agents and agencies in producing "symbolic capital" (Swartz 1997).

Symbolic capital "is a form of power that is not perceived as a form of power" (Swartz 1997:43). It is attained by participants of the "intellectual field", which consists of individuals who compete for symbolic capital (Swartz 1997:117,8,9,). It is these individuals and groups who are able to make distinctions and determine value thus legitimising "demand for recognition, deference, obedience, or the service of others" (Swartz 1997:43). The counsellors, directors and administrators at this particular site constitute symbolic capital through placing value on the elements within the field that governs through integrating, emphasising, and prioritising some or all of these elements in the development of disciplinary programmes for these youth. These programs treat, rehabilitate and normalise youth using risk technologies that assist in identifying both needs and risk. These technologies include the Level of Supervision (LSI), Youth Management Assessment (YMA) and the Level Offender Designation (LOD). For example, if upon reviewing a file the counsellor is informed that the youth has in the past been described as having documented violent tendencies, she/he distinguishes the importance and value of that information. In light of the existing risk assessment and technologies the designation of this youth's risk level will be increased and the programme designed to rehabilitate and normalise this youth will be modified to include anger management. In short, the counsellors distinguish what "counts", and are able to both build symbolic capital and legitimise the value of specific information through their discretionary power and ready-made discretionary structures. These discretionary practices
operate as normative filters and are therefore key to the strategies of normalisation and
control that work through these sites. As Fiske argues:

norms are crucial to any system of surveillance...Norms are what enable it to decide
what information should be turned into knowledge and what individuals need to be
monitored. The massed information that is recorded about the majority may never be
known in all its details. but it is still used to produce the norms that are necessary to
identify the dissident and the dangerous. The power to produce and apply norms, as
Foucault tells us. is crucial social power (1998:155).

Thus, norms guide and direct the decision making process. The pre-arranged categories of
risk technologies serve as indicators of specific normative behaviours and lifestyles that are
presumed to reduce the likelihood of re-offending 1.

The idea that discretion is not merely the absence of law. or law like rules. but rather
is a form of power is developed by Pratt who argues discretion and power are intricately
interrelated. In the context of the administration of the Canadian immigration system Pratt
proposes that “discretion can be regarded as a form of constitutive power, the workings of
which cannot be adequately understood in the abstract” (Pratt 1998:199). Building on this
insight. I argue that discretion shapes and articulates the practices and relations of
disciplinary power. For discipline to work it has to be seen without being seen and heard
without being heard. Discipline’s virtual gaze and hierarchical system of flows could not be
invoked without a screen to filter and control the flow of light and information. to bring some
objects to light and hide others (O’Connor 1997). Such discretionary screens and selective
filters work to privilege certain objects and aspects of information. Discretion therefore both
mediates the relations of disciplinary power and specifies its functionality.

1 Norms are gendered. raced and classed. The category of woman. a constructed subject is historically and
socially specific. There are various discursive constructs of woman that are contradicted and contested (Smart
1992). These issues are recognized but no meaningful conclusions can be drawn without a comparative study.
Engagement with Bogard’s (1996) work on the “screen” provides further insight into the interrelationships of discretion and discipline. Bogard argues that in the context of public and private spheres, “the screen is a better figure of the imaginary in simulation systems” (1996: 46). Furthermore, he suggests that “all our machines are screens, and the interactivity of human has been replaced by the interactivity of the screens” (Ibid). This abstract concept of the screen is the mechanism for filtering information and its transformation into knowledge. It is this screen that allows us to make sense of what we see. In the context of the present study, agents are mediators of the various information/data elements that move through this field. They negotiate, filter, and emphasise aspects of these elements through their “screen” of discretionary power. The screen, “does not ‘watch people’, or ‘invade’ their privacy” (Bogard 1996:131), it transforms information. It is the mechanism that places value and interprets meaning. In this conception, it is the screen that allows for producers of symbolic capital to assess information and data, and to devise programs that are largely uncontested except through youth strategies of resistance.

In the context of youth governance I consider the intersection of disciplinary power with the discretionary agencies within this field of governance: an intersection not captured by current scholarly literature pre-occupied with risk technologies. Information flows specify the modern mechanisms of power, which are further transformed by discretionary agents, such as counsellors and administrators, who occupy critical junctures in the field. It is through discretionary agents that current disciplinary mechanisms function. Direct evidence of this discretion takes the shape of programming such as the plans of care (POC) (the program to rehabilitate) that are designed for each individual youth. Each Plan of Care (POC) requires that agents in the field come to “know” the youth in their charge. This

2. Throughout this paper the terms agent, counsellor and administrator will be used interchangeably.
knowledge is assembled from various information and data sources (risk technologies supply one data element in the construction of the youth's risk and needs). The Plan of Care is a knowledge product that can be considered a key output of the operation discretionary power and the related process of screening information.

Summary

In summation, the purpose of this thesis is to investigate the diverse elements at play in the governance of young female offenders at a particular site. I intend to explore how known female youth are constituted and managed within open custody. I am interested in understanding the elements that are emphasised, prioritised, those that are pushed aside, or allowed to pass; in sum. the ways in which these elements are negotiated in governing young female offenders. What form do the elements take? What role do political rationales and administrative policies play? To what extent do these governing agents develop specific strategies which interpret apply or even subvert governing rationales? How do governing agents manoeuvre through the various elements? What technologies of government are actually applied to what ends? Has the logic of risk really displaced disciplinary practices in penal regimes? I am intrigued by the relationship between discretion and discipline, which has ignited my interest in examining the complex relationships between the various elements in the “field of governance” in this particular social and historical juncture.
CHAPTER 2

The Risk Hypothesis

Recently a large body of literature known as ‘Governamental’ studies has emerged. This work investigates political rationales, technologies and they ways in which these relationship shape the governing process. The literature within governmental framework provides an opportunity to analyse the ways in which power is exercised over persons and to explore the complex relations between state power and other modalities of governance (Hudson 1998: 585). The extent to which risk management, practices and technologies are evidenced in sites and apparatus of governance suggests that risk management organises neo-liberal governance. The aim of this chapter is to highlight the main arguments and ideas of the risk literature.

The literature on governmentality builds on the work of Foucault. According to Foucault, a shift in governing has occurred, one that moves away from “government” and towards “governance” (1991: 89). He describes this as a shift away from sovereignty and towards governmentality (Foucault 1991). The work of Foucault contextualises both the governmentality literature and the deployment of risk technologies. He argues.

populations now represent more the end of the government than the power of the sovereign: the population is the subject of needs, of aspirations, but it is also the object in the hands of the government, aware vis-à-vis the government. of what it wants, but ignorant of what is being done to it (1991: 100).

Governmentality then, is a theoretical framework that addresses how populations are controlled under neo-liberal regimes. A theoretical framework that has grown out of governmentality literature includes the risk literature. Governmentality literature speaks to penal practices, in that it provides a framework for understanding the ways in which
offenders are managed. Coinciding with the new form of governance risk strategies and technologies attempt to govern through the management of populations. Risk technologies construct subjects, predict behaviours and isolate the risky.

Salient features, practices, as well as the prevalence of discourses, rationales, objectives and technologies are used to locate risk strategies in specific sites. According to Garland:

risk management is forward-looking, predicative, oriented to aggregate entities and concerned with the minimisation of harms and costs rather than with the attribution of blame or the dispensation of individual justice. It relies upon actuarial knowledge of populations and statistically produced risk groupings not upon clinical knowledge of individual (Garland 1997: 182).

O’Malley identifies four characteristics associated with the risk framework. These are: the management of potential harm, risk identification: risk reduction; and risk spreading (O’Malley 2000:17). Crudely put, the managerial strategy of risk, controls populations rather than individuals; it constitutes subjects through the transfer and sharing of information; it promotes security; it facilitates a new form of surveillance; and it governs through prediction and prevention rather than intervention and treatment.

Governing through risk is evidenced in the following areas: the criminal justice system, psychiatry, health, industry, unemployment and the environment (O’Malley 2000:17). Various scholars explain “governmental planning... issues such as the dangerous criminals and the mentally ill. environmental risk. traffic and industrial accidents, [and] the centrality of insurances...” (O’Malley 2000:17) through analytics of risk (for example Adams 1995; Green 1997; O’Malley 1998; Ericson and Haggerty 1997; Feeley and Simon 1992; Simon 1987; Beck 1992; Douglas 1992). Although features of risk management can be identified
risk practices take different shapes, different technologies are deployed and different criteria develop (Ericson and Haggerty 1999). Evidence of risk management has also been documented in the financial planning like pensions, where populations are managed through actuarial techniques (Simon 1987).

Risk practices are evidenced in various fields of governance (O'Malley 1998). Risk management techniques have become increasingly central throughout the criminal justice systems of many nations (for example Feeley and Simon 1992, 1994; O'Malley 1992 as cited in O'Malley 1999: 193). In the context of Corrections, the move towards risk has been identified through a shift in discourse, objectives and technologies (Simon and Feeley 1992). This shift according to Feeley and Simon's (1992) "new penology" framework is concerned with managerialism rather than transformation (Cohen 1985; Garland and Young 1986; Messinger 1969 as cited in Feeley and Simon 1992). Feeley and Simon (1992) compare current penal practices to past governing approaches which they coined the "old penology". Evidence of this shift from the old to the new penology includes the integration of risk technologies in correctional practices.

One feature of the "new penology" is actuarial justice. O'Malley defines this term as

the deployment of statistical probability in sentencing and parole decisions, in which the length of sentences is determined by risk that offender represent to others, rather than the moral wrong they have committed (punishment), or the nature of the correction needed to remedy their pathology (the welfare sanction). (2000: 24).

In corrections various risk technologies, like the Level of Supervision (LSI) are deployed. This actuarial technology contributes to creating an offender's dossier by collecting data and organising it through what is presumed to be meaningful categories that predict risk levels of offenders. These technologies aim to identify offenders needs and risks that are defined in
the absence of key normative structures. Assessing an offender’s risks identifies their needs. It is through these identifications of needs and risks that decision concerning the treatment and supervision of offenders is made. For example an offenders level of custodial security is decided using the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI). In addition to identifying risk level, the offenders needs are defined that subsequently contribute to the design of their treatment program.

Risk management techniques also provide justification for incapacitating offenders. According to Feeley and Simon (1992), the new penology is apparent in the move towards incapacitating offenders. Incapacitation contributes to the reduction of crime through detaining offender rather than releasing them. “thus delay[ing] the resumption of criminal activity (Feeley and Simon 1992: 458). This aligns with risk practice in that it selectively removes those identified as risky from society through the use of actuarial risk technologies. These technologies provide insight into the offender’s character through assessments and risk profiles. This process “sorts individuals into groups to the degree of control warranted by their risk profiles. (Feeley and Simon 1992: 459).

The use of actuarial technologies requires information. To predict and identify risks, information is shared, produced and gathered by various governing agents. In corrections this includes an array of experts, such as psychiatrists, or like-experts. Like-experts include probation officers and counsellors. The information they provide is legitimatized by virtue of their affiliation with the criminal justice system. Information they gather or generate is legitimised through the process of revelation. Green (1997) refers to such information as revelatory knowledge, that is information legitimised through being revealed in the investigation stage. Reliance on information and it central role in knowing the offender has
altered the relationship between the offender and the professional. For example, probation
officers and counsellors have offenders files. that contains an array of information, at their
disposal. Therefore, they do not need to interact with the offender in order to be informed of
their crime. circumstances or personal history.

Another signifier of governing through risk is the ways in which offenders are made
known through information. files and databases. In the context of corrections, professionals,
including probation officers. counsellors and administrators, and the offender no longer
engage in face-to-face interactions. Information has replaced the subject. Hannah-Moffat
(1999) refers to the construction of the subject through information as the “actuarial subject”
that has replaced the “moral subject”. The new practice of transposing information into
actuarial risk technologies aims to remove the subjective nature of personal diagnosis and
assessments producing diagnosing and constructing offenders’ without the judgement of
the ‘expert’. This change in the relationship between the professional and client is evidenced
elsewhere.

In the context of medical practices. Castle argues that the “site of diagnosis” has
changed “dissolving the notion of the subject or concrete individual, and put in place a
combinatory of factors. factors of risk” (Castle 1992: 281). In line with this argument
Stone’s, who in the context of insurance. argues “individuals rarely have any face-to-face
contact with managers and virtually never any contact with other policy holders” (1999: 8).
Constructing the actuarial subject is not only evidenced in corrections but has infiltrated
other client relationships.

By constructing dossiers through combining characteristics, comparisons can be
made through the creation of “data doubles” (Haggerty and Ericson 2000). In the managerial
process large groups of individual data bases are created that are integrated and arguably create "‘datadoubles’ as the body is reassembled in a different setting through a series of data flows…resulting in a decorporalized body, a data double of pure virtuality” (Ericson and Haggerty 2000: 611). Similarities between groups of individuals are used to reveal, what is presumed to be accurate characteristics about like offenders. The process is one of dedication, where information is gathered in order to group types of offenders (Ericson 1994:153). The common factors among these groups of individuals are considered indicators of those at risk of committing similar crimes. It is this predictive capacity that makes this approach appealing and persuasive.

Perhaps risk governing is most evident in privatised insurance industry. As argued by Simon, “the effectiveness of the insurance system depends upon the aggregation of the experience of a sample of the populations at risk” (1987: 63). The level of risk associated with insuring particular individuals is determined by comparing characteristics and circumstances with like populations. Thus, both insurance and the insured are governed through risk. Managing populations through compiling, organising and transposing information into statistical calculations displaces individual identities with the probability of aggregates.

Risk technologies are accredited for their objective nature however they tend not to represent individual lived experiences. Risk practices that integrate actuarial techniques create a "form of power that divides the population into statistical and behavioural categories organised around risk. that tend not to correspond with lived experiences” (O’Malley 1992: 73). Actuarial modes of governing involve a “method of organising social life…regime of truth and exercise power” (Simon 1988: 772). Actuarial techniques “allow the exercise of
power to be targeted quite precisely" (Simon 1988: 772). Thus, a space is created for new forms of surveillance.

A residual of risk management is surveillance. Surveillance as understood by de Lint is "a medium in which differences of subjects are captured [and] crystallized...it unravels facets of individual biography or identity through techniques of identification, classification or registration" (2000: 24). Under neo-liberal regimes, monitoring and watching populations is accomplished through the collection and maintenance of information. In the context of the Criminal Justice System, information is used to treat, predict and prevent the potential for re-offending by comparing like-characteristics amongst groups rather than examining individuals (Feeley and Simon 1992, 1994). This approach contrasts to that prevalent under welfare liberalism where offenders individual treatment needs were identified through personal diagnosis and not calculated through comparing information of like-populations. Coinciding with neo-liberal governing actuarial risk technologies categorise and store information and provide a new way of defining and identifying groups of governable populations. They produce paper trails that construct subjects thereby facilitating surveillance strategies. In corrections, actuarial risk technologies also provide profiles for types of individuals most likely to commit specific types of crimes. The information produced and maintained through actuarial risk technologies serves as a means of communication. It provides the agents of the correctional field with information needed to identify and watch potential lawbreakers. Thus, information and the sharing of information give way to a new form of surveillance: one that watches the offender in an attempt to catch them before or while they commit a criminal act, essentially producing usual suspects.
Ericson and Haggerty argue that “young people are governed through numerous communication systems in different situations [that] produce and distribute knowledge” (1999: 187). They find risk practices in school based programs in which “police officers function simultaneously as security educators, informant system operators, counsellors and gatekeepers for special programs that deal with youth at risk” (Ericson and Haggerty 1998:164). Their research illustrates the extent to which risk based technologies facilitate surveillance strategies in multiple sites of governance.

Discourses concerning correctional practices centre on the notion that current treatment initiatives fail to rehabilitate offender. This idea is, in part, based on the perception that crime rates continue to increase. Despite stabilising crime rates in North America, the notion that crime is increasing and that current responses to crimes are ineffective prevails (Garland 1996). The implementation of risk technologies like the LSI, that are designed to manage rather than treat individuals, addresses heightened public concerns and fears. It gives the perception that community safety is paramount and displaces the treatment objectives that are expensive to deploy (Feeley and Simon 1992). By employing technologies and strategies that manage risky populations, the perception given to the public is that offenders’ treatment needs are second to public safety and government funds are being spent on providing services for law-abiding citizens and are not wasted on the unruly citizens of society.

The implementation of risk practices can also be understood as a response to the new problem of overload that is brought on by perceived high crime rates (Garland 1996). As stated previously, the persuasive nature of risk lies in its ability to predict criminal behavior; it acts as a proactive rather than reactive approach. Risk strategies and technologies provide “system integration and systems monitoring, which seek to implement a level of process and
information management which was previously lacking" (Garland 1996: 455 see also Morgan 1985; Moxon 1985; Lugo 1991).

Governing through risk also lends itself to a larger neo-liberal governing strategy. Neo or advanced liberal modes of governing involve responsibilization strategies. According to Garland, responsibilization strategies involves the central government seeking to act upon crime not in a direct fashion through state agencies (police, courts, prisons, social work, etc.) but instead by acting indirectly seeking to activate action on the part of non-state agencies and organizations (1996: 452).

By employing private agencies to govern populations under the authority of the state reflects what Rose has characterised as governing at a distance (Rose 1993). The state manages controls and governs populations inadvertently through other agencies and organisations.

Although the partnership between the state and agencies is not new, the techniques and methods used to by these agencies to govern populations are. According to Hannah-Moffat “this neo-liberal technology and its related knowledges and objectives are representative of government at-a-distance” (2000: 514). Responsibilization strategies hold offenders accountable for their actions and for their rehabilitating the self. For example offenders are provided opportunities to participate in programming that transform “deviant” behaviours their success or failure to discipline the self indicates the extent to which the offender has responsibilized the self.

Summary

It is certainly true that risk practices have infiltrated the governing process however the extent to which these practices have overtaken past practices and the degree to which they represent a new form of governing has not been examined at the empirical level.

Through a genealogy of risk, O’Malley argues that “risk is a...characteristics of all modern
liberal and capitalist societies, dating back to...about the end of the eighteenth century” (2000: 17). He argues that risk is shaped by a multitude of discourses, developments and other issues (O’Malley 2000: 18). Furthermore he claims that features of risk can be evidenced in the penal welfare period, for example the prevalent discourse of dangerousness that prevailed in the welfare period resembles the current rhetoric of risk. However the identifying the ‘dangerous’ under the welfare period developed for different reasons, had different meanings and was talked about differently. In sum, O’Malley makes the convincing claim that governing through risk has changed based on individualism and the new market focus on neo-liberalism (2000: 27). He states

Risk, now, is not the problem, as under the welfare state. Risk, now, is the solution to all manner of problems from the ‘welfare dependency’ and bureaucratic unresponsive, to national economic inefficiency and the scale of state expenditure (O’Malley 2000: 26)

This study builds on the idea that while risk practices and technologies are a new form of organising information they do not necessarily represent a new form of governing.

This chapter has provided a brief overview of the current literature concerning penal practice and the place of risk in these practices. It broadly identifies the range of sites in which risk practices have been evidenced. The extent to which these practices play out in actual sites requires empirical investigation.
CHAPTER 3

Operations of the Youth House

As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, the scholarly literature suggests that current penal practices are moving away from disciplinary strategies and towards risk strategies of governance. To reiterate, governing through risk involves managing groups of individuals and is pre-occupied with security and less concerned with the individual treatment needs of offenders. Disciplinary modes of governing aim to identify the individual treatment needs of offenders and to modifying and normalise behaviour. A review of policies, day-to-day operations and programming of Youth House, operated by the Elizabeth Fry Society, reveals that both risk and disciplinary strategies are employed in the governing process.

The existence of both of these strategies can in part be explained by the complex relationship between technologies and rationales (See Chapter 1). Examples of technologies that govern offenders at this site include programming such as Plan of Care, Level of Supervision (LSI), Youth Management Assessment (YMA), Behaviour reports and Daily reports. The rationales that guide technologies form complex relationships that are diverse and multiple. At this site the working relationship between the Ministry of Corrections and the Elizabeth Fry Society, in part, explains the deployment of both disciplinary and risk strategies.

This chapter will first contextualize open custody facilities in the larger correctional framework. Secondly it will detail the operations of the particular site that I studied; and third, it will outline the governing technologies deployed at Youth House. This chapter will
serve as a precursor to the analysis that follows in that it raises important relationships and it begins to illustrate the complexity of governing strategies deployed at this site.

**Contextualizing Private Agencies: The Elizabeth Fry Society**

Contemporary modes of governing includes what Garland has characterised as “responsible strategies” (1996: 452). These strategies involve new techniques and methods “whereby the state seeks to bring about action on the part of private agencies and individuals—either by stimulating new forms of behaviour or by stopping established habits (Riley and Mayhew 1980 as cited in Garland 1996: 452). Youth House, contracted by the Ministry of Corrections, acts as an arm of the state. Such partnerships thus reflect and apply neo-liberal governing strategies. Although the use of private agencies is not a new governing approach, the relationship developed between the state and private agencies such as the Elizabeth Fry Society has changed (Hannah Moffat 2000). For example, the custody facilities (Youth House) operated under private agencies and are expected to apply programming that not only encourages reformation but that also requires the participation of offenders and the community at large. This approach coincides with responsible strategies, a component of neo-liberal strategies of governing. Responsible strategies thereby involve the state in the delegation of responsibility to private agencies, to the community, and to the offender suggesting that the state cannot control or handle crime and criminality on its own (Garland 1996).

Following the trend of the central state, the Elizabeth Fry society also relies upon the participation of the community to assist in the governing process. The Elizabeth Fry Society’s main objective is to “eliminate conflict between women and the criminal justice system” and “the society acknowledges the need to work with all members of the
community” in order to accomplish this mission (Mission Statement-Youth House Manual).

The Elizabeth Fry Society, like the state, governs through responsibilization strategies, which is reflected in one of their central principles that reads:

Because the community and all its members have the ultimate responsibility for the response of the system and the handling of offenders, it is essential that the community be involved in all aspects of the criminal justice system (www.elizabethfry.ca/directory/page01.htm)

Consistent with the objectives and principles of Elizabeth Fry Society, Youth House mission statement reiterates the importance of community relationships. It states, “the resolution of youthful conflict with the law is most appropriately afforded through the development and use of community based programmes” (Youth House Manual-Program Statement). Reflecting this philosophy, an objective of Youth House is to have offenders “begin positive integration into the community”. The location of the open custody facility in a residential area further illustrates this point. The involvement of non-state agencies in corrections and extended community involvement by these agencies evidences the extent to which the trend toward governing at a distance (Rose 1993) involves non-state agents and agencies in the reduction and prevention of crime. Moreover this governing strategy places the responsibility on the offender to govern the self, by this I mean to reform, rehabilitate and discipline the self.

The Expansion of Open Custody Facilities

The implementation of the Young Offenders Act (YOA) in 1984 instigated change all across Canada. Each province adopted different principles of the YOA. As such the effects of this policy cannot be discussed as a homogenous process. In Ontario, the implementation of the Young Offenders Act lead to a significant increase in the number of young offenders
sentenced to open custody facilities (more than doubled) (Markwart and Corrado 1989) necessitating the development of more open custody facilities. The provincial government turned to community organisations and requested their immediate participation in the development and operation of open custody facilities. Elizabeth Fry Society’s experience with female offenders, and their corresponding ‘women centred’ philosophy thereby qualified this agency as a strong candidate to operate young female offender open custody facilities (Interview). Subsequently they received funding from the federal government to purchase property to operate such facilities.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the direction of independent agencies to organise and operate correctional facilities is representative of neo-liberal governing strategy. Also consistent with a commitment to privatization, de-centralization and community based governing the Elizabeth Fry Society “acknowledges the need to work with all members of the community” (Mission Statement). For example, they employ the services of community organisations like Family Guidance International (FGI) to counsel and assess each offender in their care. Coinciding with the Elizabeth Fry philosophy, an objective of Youth House is to have offenders “begin positive integration into the community”. This goal is accomplishing in several ways. a few examples include: permitting offenders to gain employment in the community; allowing them to enter the community unsupervised; and providing them with the opportunity to participate in positive activities such as attending the YMCA. The co-operation of community members and agencies assists in meeting Elizabeth Fry Society’s objective to reintegrate women who have come in conflict with law into society. Youth House’s mission statement reiterates the importance of community relationships: it states, “the resolution of youthful conflict with the law is most appropriately
afforded through the development and use of community-based programmes" (Youth House Manual). The involvement of non-state agencies and other community services highlights the prevalence of neo-liberal governing that employs private agencies to assist in governing populations.

**Elizabeth Fry Society and Youth House Philosophies and Policies**

The Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies was formed in June 1969. Currently there are five agencies in the Greater Toronto Area. Elizabeth Fry funds both female adult and youth facilities. Elizabeth Fry was a Quaker penal reformer in the 1800's and her initiatives reflect this historical period in which social and economic changes led to a surge of moral reformers and "Ladies committees" (Hannah-Moffat 1997). Central to her efforts was the goal to implement different facilities for male and female offenders. Elizabeth Fry used her "maternalism, enlightenment principles and her Quaker beliefs to gain access to prisons and to promote the employment and voluntary reform efforts of other women" (Hannah-Moffat 1997: 26). In short, Elizabeth Fry concentrated on "what she perceived as the most important needs of the women: to be treated like human beings rather than animals, to be given some change in plans for the future, and to get help for the children in jail with them" (Youth House Manual).

Elizabeth Fry's mission statement reads as follows:

The Elizabeth Fry Society of Peel mission statement is to eliminate conflict between women and the criminal justice system. In order to accomplish this mission, the Society acknowledges the need to work with all members of the community.

The overall philosophy of the Elizabeth Fry Society was adopted by Youth House and is reflected in their mission statement that reads as follows:
We believe it is necessary to provide and healthy environment for young female offenders. The residence provides a therapeutic setting, which enables young women to develop self-esteem and life skills. These are needed to not only address issues that have brought them into conflict with the law but also to begin positive integration into the community.

The goals and objectives of the Youth House, articulated within the mission statement, are to "encourage behavioural modification and deterrence" (Youth House Manual). Reflecting Elizabeth Fry Society's role as an agent of Corrections, the facilities under their operation also adopt practices and policies outlined by Corrections Canada.

At Youth House, the policy and procedural manual is referred to as an operations manual. It stipulates guidelines and standards for both the staff and residents (Youth House Manual). The implementation of policy must adhere to the standards of the Ministry of Corrections while incorporating the principles of the Elizabeth Fry Society. According to one staff member:

> the Ministry of corrections...establishes for us policy and procedures, the minimum requirements for running a facility. We have to meet those standards and guidelines. The guidelines....[outline, in part.] what the security looks like, what the meals are going to look like, how you can treat the kids, how you cannot treat the kids, what programs you provide for the kids...Then there is the whole YOA procedure that [we] follow

Youth House policies and procedures also integrate the Elizabeth Fry Society women centred philosophy. When asked to outline the policies and procedures of the Elizabeth Fry Society, an administrator responds: "they are very very similar to the Ministry" except for their "women centred approach". Another administrator stated: "our guidelines focus just on women...we do a lot of advocacy for women". This advocacy role is centred on the belief that there are differences between female and male criminality, as an administrator claims:
women become involved in the criminal justice system for very different reasons than men. For example crimes are often poverty driven, and their needs are very different. There are issues of victimization including past and often current abuse....[it] simply does not work to take programming for men and apply it to women

The Elizabeth Fry Society deploys women centred programming in order to, as one administrator describes. “address the specific needs of women and the issues that have brought them in conflict with the law”. This is achieved, in part, by deploying “client driven programming” that addresses individual needs. In the context of the Youth House, women centred programming arguably pursues the goal to “develop self-esteem and life skills” that are presumed “not only [to] address issues that have brought them into conflict with the law, but also to begin positive reintegration into the community” (Youth House Manual).
Governance at the Youth House: Punishment, Treatment and Discipline

Life Skills: A Form of Programming

The offenders, or ‘residents’ 3 maintain the facility that resembles a home, as part of a “life skills program”. The incorporation of life skill programs is part of the Ministry of Corrections’ directives. With the implementation of the YOA, the Federal Government funded a one-year life skills program. The Elizabeth Fry Society was required to adopt life skills programming by the Ministry of Corrections. This program serves the rehabilitative objectives of the Youth House.

“Life Skills” programming is a treatment program that aims to instil or re-instil ‘normalisation’ routines and habits that are presumed to reduce the potential of re-offending. This program incorporates the daily routines of non-institutionalised citizens such as cooking, showering, cleaning, daily chores and attending school or jobs” essentially ‘training’ the youth for a ‘normalised’ lifestyle. Each offender builds life skills by completing everyday chores in the facility and by following a regime that details, for example, when and how often they shower and brush their teeth. Each offender is assigned a specific chore that is rotated weekly. The chores that constitute daily programming are outlined in the Youth House Manual for staff. Each offender’s weekly chore is posted in the facility.

These daily routines are essentially schedules that structure the offenders’ activities and movements. The regiment of these schedules is emphasised through its specificity. For example, the offenders are told what time to wake up, what time to eat, and what time to sleep. The rigid routine results in specific amounts of time allowed for completing each task.

3 The literature uses the word offender however the staff and policies of the research site employ other terminology such as kids, resident, youth and offender; therefore, they will be used interchangeably.
For example, breakfast preparation begins at 7:20 am and breakfast begins at 7:45 which allows 25 minutes to prepare breakfast. A modified routine is enforced during the weekend. For example, wake up and bed times are both extended. In light of the later wake up time and programming breakfast and lunch merge into brunch. While daily chores remain a part of the weekend routine, offenders receive more "personal time" (Youth House Manual).

The daily programming deployed at this site reflects disciplinary strategies. The time intervals and accountability of movement throughout the day provide regularity and efficiency. "the body is constantly applied to exercise" (Foucault 1977: 151). Enforcing routines that mirror a lifestyle of those who are not institutionalised regulates offenders' activities, and contributes to normalisation. Systems that regulate and dictate movement sustains a controlled and structured environment. Subjecting offenders to routines is a form of control that regulates movement and reinforces speed and efficiency (Foucault 1977). It is through this process that offenders learn self-discipline and the ways in which the non-institutionalised citizen functions within society. At the Youth House programming initiative such as life skills aim to enforce lifestyle change. Offenders are not only punished for their offence but also for their lifestyles and behaviours that are presumed to create conditions for delinquency (also known as criminological or treatment needs). This form of control reflects disciplinary strategies in that they attempts to change and modify the offenders' behaviours and punishes them for their lifestyles rather than for their offences.

Establishing routines that mirror those of the "good citizen" contributes to addressing the offenders' needs/ risk factors consequently reducing the possibility of re-offending. It is presumed that acquiring such skills will help offenders to develop a lifestyle that maintains specific habits and routines. In short, the life skills program exercises discipline through the
“normalisation” process, which “imposes a particular form of conduct on human multiplicity” (Bogard 1996 also see Foucault, 1979:205 also Deluze, 1988:34).

**Designing Individual Treatment Programs: The Plan of Care (POC)**

Upon arrival at the facility, the offender is accompanied with a file, a warrant of arrest and a few personal belongings. The “file” contains information concerning the offender’s history. This includes past convictions, treatment programs and success in these programs, expert assessments and medical reports. In addition to this information, the facility completes an intake form.

**The Intake Form**

The intake form is another valuable technology. Administered through personal interviews, this form solicits information concerning the status of the youth’s relationships with their family and friends, personal intimate relationships, past convictions, behavioural tendencies and problems. The Intake form is used, in part, to identify the youth’s needs. This form is completed within 48 hours after admission to the residence (Youth House Manual). Despite the personal interaction between the youth and the counsellor during this process, arguably the “identity” of the youth is already constructed through the assemblage of information contained in the files, forms and documents. It is this predetermined framework that frames the youths’ reality and determines how they will be acted upon despite their input or resistance to these constructs. Upon completion of the form, all information and “stories” told by the offender are verified through consulting official Ministry records, which can be found in the offender’s file.
At the time of admission each offender is assigned a primary counsellor who is responsible for co-ordinating their Plan Of Care (POC) (Youth House Manual). The POC is an individualised treatment program that identifies three goals and means by which to achieve these goals. For example, if the goal is to address anger, the offender attends anger management. The aim of the POC is to address the offender’s treatment needs. The POC is completed by the primary worker and is reviewed for approval by an administrator. In the development of a POC all available information is examined including verbal and written reports (completed by past probation officers and psychiatrists); information provided by those who have experienced the offender such as counsellors, parents, and guardians is also taken into account: the residents’ background information, medical reports, and any other documentation regarding their behaviour and attitude is also included. In addition, observations made by counsellors at Youth House are also considered. This information usually comes in the offender’s file that is supplied by the Ministry of Corrections. In many instances however, the file provides minimal information with incomplete or outdated reports. In such cases the counsellor conducts her own investigation, gathering information by contacting previous custody facilities, friends, and family members. Through gathering this information the staff get to “know” the offender. Having a sense of the offender’s past behaviours, problems, and general history assist in identifying the offenders’ needs, risk level and developing their Plan of Care (POC). In addition, when designing the POC the services available to the Youth House and the length of the offender’s sentence are also considered. The Plan of Care is designed within thirty days of the residents’ admittance date and each POC is reviewed weekly “to ensure that they are achieving their purpose” (Youth House Manual).
To use the words of Bourdieu, this process attempts to gain insight on an offender’s “habitus”. This requires the youth to reveal information concerning their friends, family, past criminal offences and personal experiences. The information in the “file” suggests patterns of previous behaviour and is used to determine the youth’s risk level. The justification for this assessment is three fold: to ensure the safety of the staff and other offenders, to identify if the offender has in the past harmed herself, and to identify the offender treatment needs and risks (Interview). It is presumed that these assessments not only accurately and objectively identify offenders’ needs and risks and therefore assist in the deployment of programming, but also that they effectively assist in the management of offenders. For example by identifying offenders’ treatment needs and risks, the staff become aware of the potential of an offender to commit specific acts or act in specific ways. Knowledge of past behaviour is presumed to predict future behaviour. This knowledge allows staff to justify increasing surveillance and is presumed to contribute to increasing safety of staff and the community, an objective that parallels larger correctional rationales. In sum, the agents, practitioners and administrators at this institution govern these youth through assessing and addressing their needs and risks through the application of treatment programs. However it is important to note that agents are required to interpret and give meaning to both the information in the offenders file and to their personal interactions with the offender. The discretionary power of staff allows them to interpret the information, provided within the youth’s file, and the additional assessments made by the staff upon the residents’ arrival and throughout the program. Implicit within this process is discretionary power; a process that “involves people in interpretation and choice” (Hawkins 1992:1).
The treatment approach of the Youth House, which centres on life skill programming, the Plan of Care, and individual treatment programs, reflects the care and treatment initiatives, both rationales within the welfare approach that dominated the JDA (1908). The JDA has been characterised as a child welfare policy (Caputo 1987). The rationale that guided the JDA reflected the belief that the "primary responsibility for criminal behaviour [lay] in the conditions of the social order rather than in the characteristics of the offender" (Reid-MacNevin 2001: 132). More specifically, the lack of parental guardianship and a nuclear family environment were considered key signifiers of delinquency. Discourse concerning the importance of the family institution prevailed and the re-creation of this, or a proximate social order was identified as a means to achieve moral regulation, specifically reducing delinquency. Urbanisation forced working class, men, women and children to enter the labour force (Urse1 1989). This resulted in the absence of guardianship for those children whose parents were forced to enter the labour force, which left children unattended, and at times neglected. Thus, working class children were presumed to "be...delinquent because of the absence mothers and bad home environment" (Urse1 1989:151). Thus, a very specific construction of delinquency and precipitating factors that led to conditions of delinquency prevailed. The nuclear family was viewed as the "building block of society" (Urse1 1989: 146). Reflecting the belief that the idealised household would decrease the potential for delinquency, youth who were not consistently supervised, or were seen loitering in town, (this was determined by visibility) were found to be in a condition of delinquency and placed in reformatories, training schools, or foster care. By placing offenders in these sites the state was attempting to provide them with idealised environment that were presumed to reduce the potential of delinquency through parental-like supervision and the exposure to routines and
lifestyles that normalised behaviour. Efforts to prevent future criminality by designating specific factors as indicators of criminality and attempting to transform offenders by providing structure, supervision and training, all disciplinary strategies, is evidenced in current penal approaches.

The organisation of the Youth House reflects childcare and welfare principles that guided the Juvenile Delinquent Act (JDA). Coinciding with these rationales’ the Youth House provides a home, a “therapeutic setting” (Youth House Manual). This facility is centred on the belief that offenders require care, supervision and support. This is reflected in their program statement that reads:

the care provided for the young offenders in the program includes the provision of food, shelter, protection, supervision and guidance, as well as the promotion of physical, emotional, social and educational well being (program statement).

Thus, treatment initiatives at this site suggest that the Elizabeth Fry Society understands delinquency as the result of offender’s environment, specifically lack of training, supervision and guidance. It is the lack of structure and supervision that brought them into conflict with the law. Reflecting this belief Youth House is an environment that provides offenders with the opportunity to build life skills, and transform the self. Offenders are responsible for actively participating in changing their behaviour, however “delinquent” or “criminal” behaviour is presumed to be a stage that can be outgrown or influenced. According to the program statement:

acting out, illegal and anti-social behaviour often exhibited by young offenders is a “symptom” rather than a “disease”. Although these activities may seem entirely inappropriate, they are rooted in immaturity and limited life experience (Program Statement)
Responsibility/Choice: The Consequence of ‘Knowing’ your Rights:

Upon entering Youth House, the offender receives a “Residents Handbook” that outlines the rules and regulations of the facility. It is the offender’s right to be informed of the rules (Resident Handbook). The offender is expected to read and understand the manual provided. This handbook details the residents’ rights, complaint procedures, information concerning temporary releases, routines, expectations, house rules, restrictions, choices, inappropriate behaviour and it details appropriate dining and bedroom etiquette (Residence Handbook). It serves as a means by which the rules and regulations are clearly defined and communicated to the offender. The offender’s acknowledgement of the rules and regulations establishes a contract. Awareness of the rules and the consequences for violating these rules creates a “responsible” offender, whereby violating or breaking the rules becomes a choice, an informed choice. Therefore, implicating the offender as consciously engaging in unacceptable behaviour, the responsible subject is acting irresponsibly. The irresponsible offender is one who fails at self-discipline and also creates the need for punishment to be imposed. Removing privileges, a form consequence reinforces the importance of modifying behaviour and is expected to encourage self-discipline in the future.

Responsible offenders reflects neo-liberal governing strategies and reflects a central principle of the Young Offenders Act. This policy emphasises the “responsibility-punishment dichotomy” (Clark and Fiemming 1993: 190). Coinciding with this rationale the programme goals in the Youth House manual states, “the control of behaviour is more effectively achieved when the youth assumes and exercises individual responsibility for the control of her behaviour” (Programme Statement). The importance of the individual
responsibility at this site illustrates the incorporation of the YOA principles and neo-liberal strategies (See Chapter 2).

The rules and regulations provide an example of appropriate and acceptable behaviour. In order to reinforce (the importance of) behaviour modification, when offenders violate the rules, a “behaviour report” is written. This report is referred to as a BR, by both staff and offenders. This Ministry of Corrections’ document provides a space for a description of the inappropriate behaviour. Some examples of behaviours that may result in the completion of a BR are: swearing; fighting with other residents; speaking disrespectfully to staff; failure to complete chores; or refusing to participate in programming. The report also has a section to document the disciplinary action: this is referred to as the “consequence”. Punishment for inappropriate behaviour includes: loss of privileges: behaviour reports; loss of junk food privileges; or the loss of programming, which includes community activities. This form is intended to make note of both positive and negative behaviour. However, the understanding amongst residents is that this form is completed to document negative behaviour. Staff members also acknowledge that the BR is primarily used to document negative behaviour.

In addition to Behaviour Reports, a Daily Report, a form referred to among staff as the “Daily” is completed at the end of each shift. A Daily is completed for each offender. It briefly discusses the offender’s mood, their behaviour and makes notes of any personal dilemmas or issues the offender may have encountered that day. This form is placed in the offenders’ file along with all other information that has accumulated since her arrival. In the event that the offender is “given a BR” this report highlights the offender’s failure to govern themselves.
Who is Sentenced to Open Custody?

According to the Young Offenders Act, the following factors are considered when deciding if an offender should be sentenced to open custody or secure custody reflects:

that a young person should be placed at the level of custody involving the least degree of containment and restrain, having regard to: the seriousness of the offence in respect of which the young person was committed to custody and the circumstances in which that offence was committed; the needs and circumstances of the young person, including proximity to family, school, employment, and support services; the safety of other young person in custody; and the interest of society. (section 24.1(4) as cited in Temporary Release Guide p2)

Other factors considered are the “best possible match of programs”, based on the offenders needs and behaviour. “the potential for escape from the open custody, and the recommendation, if any, from the youth court or provincial director” (Temporary Release Guide p2).

Correctional institutions for young offenders include open and secure custody facilities. Open custody provides a rehabilitative setting unlike secure custody that resembles adult prisons. Under the Young Offenders Act (YOA), those sentenced to open custody facilities are generally repeat offenders (between the age 16-18) who require a degree of correctional supervision beyond that which can be provided by probation supervision and or other community services. Nonetheless, open custody facilities do not have bars on the windows, the offenders do not reside in cells, nor are the facility doors locked or guarded. Furthermore, residents are not monitored through surveillance equipment and interact with staff and each other on a daily basis. The minimal security measures employed within open custody facilities suggest that offenders do not pose a risk to society, a flight risk to escape or a risk to other offenders. However, both serious and non-serious (level-1 and level-2) offenders are sentenced to open custody facilities.
The Level Offender Designation (LOD) is a technology used by the Ministry of Corrections to classify offenders upon conviction according to the type of crime they have committed. Offenders are designated as either level-1 or level-2 offenders. Level-2 designation is assigned to those offenders who have been convicted of less serious offences. Any offence that is not classified as a Level-1 offence is classified as Level-2 offence. Level-1 offences include more serious or violent crimes such as causing injury with intent, manslaughter or robbery (See Appendix C). The designation of level-1 status identifies high-risk clients. As a result, the administrators and staff of the Youth House as well as Probation and Parole monitor these offenders’ movements more closely. Level Offender Designation (LOD) status directly affects the level of surveillance at the Youth House and intensifies the process by which privileges, such as temporary releases, are granted. The process for attaining temporary release passes differs based on offender Level Designation 4.

A Touch of Risk: Risk Technologies deployed at Youth House

In addition to the LOD, young offenders at the Youth House are governed through the application of risk assessment and management technologies, in particular the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI), and the Youth Management Assessment (YMA).

The Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) (See Appendix D)

The LSI is an “actuarial tool... used to both identify security (and)... criminological needs” (Bonta, Andrews and Hoge 1990:25). This tool is a form completed by probation and Parole officers upon conviction of an offender to assist in the determination of the appropriate level of custodial care. The Ministry of Corrections requires the use of the LSI for all offenders, adults and youth, males and females. The implementation of this risk technology is based on the belief that it accurately “match(es) levels of treatment service to

4 More detailed discussion of this process appears later in this chapter. See pages 45-50.
the risk level of the offender” (Bonta, Andrews and Hoge 1990:24). This form is a quantitative survey that translates qualitative information into numerical data producing a number that is presumed to accurately indicate the appropriate level of supervision required for each individual offender and their treatment needs.

The LSI is based on available official information. For those youth who have a previous record, their Ministry of Correction file is consulted. As previously discussed, this file contains information concerning the youth’s criminal history including past convictions, behaviour, success in treatment programs, expert assessments and medical reports. For those youth who are first time offenders, personal interviews are used. The items within the LSI are grouped within the following categories: criminal history, education/employment, financial, family, marital, accommodation, leisure/ recreation, companion, alcohol/drug problems, emotional, personal, probation conditions, and attitudes/orientation (LSI). This information is collected through “standardised interviews and a review of the official information which is subsequently scored in the 0-1 format” (Bonta 1996:21). The combination of these categories is presumed to create an accurate and detailed portrait of the individual offender’s treatment needs and risk level. The LSI coincides with the current penal philosophy, to increase governing through the logic of risk prediction and prevention alongside rehabilitation and reintegration.

The LSI was designed based on male adult populations but is deployed in both adult and youth facilities which include both male and female populations. The ability of this tool to accurately identify the needs and risks of young female offenders is thus dubious at best (Hannah-Moffat and Shaw 2000). Moreover the systematic problems within these forms often result in a high-risk score for young offenders. The potential of the LSI to over-classify
populations has been raised in the risk literature (Hannah-Moffat 1999: 2000) and is echoed by the administrative staff at Youth House: “this assessment reflects the youths’ age and development level rather than their actual risk level”. For example, the LSI contains a category “less than grade 12 education”. In many cases young offenders’ have not completed grade 12. The fact that the offender has not completed grade 12 is recorded by placing a check mark in the box beside the category. This raises the young offender’s risk score. A space is provided for the probation officer to reiterate that as a young offender they have yet to complete their grade 12 education. One Probation officer claims that this space for commentary adjusts for the over-classification that occurs within this section.

The YMA (See Appendix E)

The Youth Management Assessment (YMA) is used at all open custody facilities. The YMA was designed to address concerns about safety of the public, of the offenders and of the staff in open custody facilities. It was implemented in Ontario (1992) as a result of a report entitled “A Review of Security and Staffing of Young Offenders in Community Residences” (YMA Manual). This review followed the murder of a counsellor at an open custody facility. Her death raised several questions about the safety and security of the employees, staff, and the residences in their care (YMA Manual). In light of these concerns the report identified risk strategies as a means by which security and safety could be addressed. The report suggested:

...that an objective assessment instrument be utilised on a province-wide basis to assist residence in the identification of high-risk clientele and residence staff be trained to utilise the same. These methods continue to be developed that enhance assessment capabilities to delineate high-risk in terms of problematic behaviour, medical needs or other special circumstances (YMA Manual).
It is presumed that the YMA’s capacity to predict offender behaviour, such as the tendency to act violent towards authority figures such as staff, will alert the staff to the potential risk this offender poses.

The YMA is a quantitative form that categorises information. Like the Level of Supervision (LSI), it classifies offenders and identifies risk. However, the YMA are LSI have slightly different goals. According to the Youth Management Assessment User guide, the process is aimed directly at identifying clients who are at risk of inflicting serious personal harm to staff, other clients, the community at large, or the client him/herself. Consequently, the YMA differs from other instruments, such as the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) that are designed to assess the client’s risk for general delinquency (YMA Manual).

The importance of the YMA for in maintaining in-house security is reiterated by one counsellor who stated,

we look at risk for violence, past convictions, present convictions, outstanding charges...assault on authority, suicidal attempts, mental illness or third party influence...[that include] people who are a threat to her, [such as] a pusher...[or] a dominant abusive person...[this] gives us a feel for who is a high risk (Interview).

The YMA is a 12-page survey of yes-no responses, while providing space for open-ended commentary. The completed YMA produces an overall designation of “verified risk” or “not verified risk” (YMA Manual), rather than producing a numerically specific level of risk. An offender is classified as an overall “verified risk” if they have been designated as a “verified risk” in three of the twelve risk factors of the YMA. These are: 1) previous offences; 2) current offences; 3) any outstanding charges; 4) other acts of physical or sexual assault by the client; 5) assault on authority figures; 6) incidents involving the use of weapons; 7) incidents of fire settings; 8) escapes, attempted escapes and serious UAL; 9) suicide attempts; 10) mental health; 11) third party influence; 12) and absence or lack of information (factor 12).

In addition, section IV of the YMA outlines management and intervention strategies for
“verified” risky youth. Within this last category there are four sub-headings- supervision, crisis, restrictions, and plan (YMA Form).

The first page of the YMA provides a summary of the twelve factors. In a chart each factor is listed and requires the agent to endorse yes or no under the heading “potential risk” or “verified risk” (YMA Form). The twelve factors are organised under the following four “assessor” headings: 1) offences; 2) problematic behaviour; 3) personal characteristics, and 4) administrative concerns (YMA Manual). The first category of assessor “offences” includes previous convictions for a violent offence, current offences involving violence and any outstanding charges. The second category assessor “problematic behaviour”, refers to other acts of physical or sexual assault by the client, assault of an authority figure, incidents involving the use of weapons, incidents of fire setting, escape, attempted escape, serious UAL and suicide attempts or self inflicted injury (ibid). The third assessor “personal characteristics.” addresses mental disorder factors, such as clinical diagnosis, and assessor observations and third party influence (ibid). The fourth risk assessor category refers to an absence or lack of relevant information (ibid). It is here that administrators indicate if the information attained about the offender has accurately revealed the offenders risks and needs. A lack of information automatically results in designation of the offender as a risk.

The staff and administrators at all community-based residential facilities are provided with a guide that outlines the “rationale and background behind the instrument” (YMA Manual). In conjunction with a manual that details how to complete this form, participation in a training course is also required. Only staff that have completed the training course are authorized to complete the YMA.
The YMA is completed for every client in the facility’s charge. It attempts to assess potential risk through an initial screening process. As a general principle, the presumption that risk may be an issue requires the personnel whom completes the form to endorse specific risk factors. In this process, a list of violent offences and clinical disorders are consulted. However, it is important to note that a counsellor who completes this form is not limited by official diagnoses that indicate mental disorders, or by previous or current violent offences. There is some room for the counsellors to use their discretion in assessment of risk. Once the potential risk factors have been identified, the assessor must verify these endorsed categories with further probing questions that are outlined in the second part of the form (YMA Manual).

The final step requires the assessor to make an overall assessment of risk; “as a general principle any young offender with three or more verified risk factors should be declared at risk” (YMA Manual). To override this general principle the assessor must provide a written rationale for their decision in the ‘Explanation and Comment section of Part III’ (YMA Manual). Thus the exercise of a counsellor’s discretion must be justified and accounted for and may be contested (YMA Manual). If the client has two verified risk factors “there is no override condition and no special explanation is required for either an ‘indicated’ or ‘not indicated’ decision” (YMA Manual). As a general rule, if the client has no verified factors then he/she should not be flagged as indicating risk (YMA Manual). Counsellors in their decision making are urged to keep in mind that “research has shown that the more verified factors that exists on a young offenders’ YMA, the more likely the client is to be subsequently charged with a violent offence” (YMA Manual).
The justification for the use of the LSI and YMA is two fold: first, to ensure the safety of the staff, other offenders and the offender themselves; and second, to assist in the assigning the type of custodial supervision and the design of a treatment program.

**Temporary Release**

Temporary Release (TR) Passes grant the offender permission to enter the community to visit and re-establish or build relations with family members, guardians or significant others. The guidelines that direct the process for approving these passes are pursuant to Section 35 of the YOA (Temporary Release Guide). In this facility, attaining these passes the ultimate goal of the offenders.

The Temporary Release Guidelines manual, provided to area managers and staff at this facility, identifies the guiding rationale of approval process. In evaluating the application for these passes the following is considered:

...protection of society is the paramount consideration through the temporary release process. While at the same time recognizing that TR decisions must be consistent with principles articulated in the federally enacted Young Offenders Act (YOA). (Temporary Release Guide)

The importance of protecting the public is reflective of the guiding principles of the YOA.

The information necessitated by this approval indicates that assessing the level of risk involved in releasing the offender into the community is a central purpose of the approval process.

According to the guidelines prior to considering any request for TR the director of the facility should have in their possession the following information:

the youths' name and age, the offence, the disposition, the criminal history, details of the offence, if available, pre-disposition report, plan of care, discharge reports from previous custody placements (if consecutive), YMA or the result of the YMA, LSI (must be completed for any overnight passes, TR supervision plan, destination
checks, and any additional information available through the probation officer (Temporary Release Guide).

In addition to this information, the behaviour of the offender while at the Youth House is considered. This involves reviewing behaviour reports and daily reports. The requirement for various information prior to the decision making process indicates the importance of “knowing” the offender, a principle consistent with risk practices. Reviewing the offender’s criminal past, their past behaviour, progress and supervision while in the community is presumed to indicate the probability that the offender will harm themselves, or violate conditions of their probation order by, for example, consuming alcohol or drugs while in the community. The temporary release decision making process is different for level-1 and level-2 offenders.

As previously mentioned, this facility houses offenders who have been convicted of committing either level-1 or level-2 offences. The application procedure for a temporary release pass varies based on the offender’s level status. For level-2 offenders, applications for passes under 12 hours can be approved by the director of the facility. In contrast, a request from a level-1 offender requires the authorisation of the area manager (Probation and Parole). The probation officer assigned to monitor the offender is consulted. If the probation officer supports the request the area manager of Probation and Parole’s will likely approve the temporary release pass.

All requests for passes over 12 hours (overnight passes) require the facility to review and consult the applicants LSI. It is made clear in the manual that “while a high score on the LSI does not exclude eligibility for an overnight pass, it should be considered along with relevant information” (Temporary Release Guide p6). Awareness of the risk level thus plays a key role in the release decision making process and therefore signifies that risk thinking
affects the operation of this house. This reflects the larger correctional rationale: to protect
the public. According to a probation officer ensuring that community members are not
placed at risk by the release of an offender is her primary objective.

Temporary release requests by level-1 offenders begins with the completion of a
“Level-1 temporary release application” (Temporary Release Guide p6). The very existence
of a separate form for these offenders indicates an interest in managing this population
differently than others. As mentioned, these cases’ only the area manager (of Probation and
Parole) can approve these passes. However, it is expected that the house staff conduct
interviews with those who supervise the offender during her release (Temporary Release
Guide). Administrators and the offender’s primary counsellor are also expected, to make
recommendations and to indicate support or non-support for the request. It is also important
to note that in the case of requests made by level-1 offenders the probation office in the
community is often consulted prior to approval. Upon approval the probation officer is
informed that the offender will be in the vicinity, with the potential result of increasing
surveillance. In contrast to level-2 offenders, level-1 offenders are supervised by their
sponsors and the larger community. Consistent with the supervision approach, overnight
passes for both level-1 and level-2 offenders are entered into the Offender Management
System (Temporary Release Guide p6). This system serves as a tracking device: it locates the
offenders’ movements and criminal history. It serves as an information database within
corrections. Currently LSI forms are entered into this database, which has increased the
information available through this system. Moreover those who have access this database is
also increasing. A probation officer explained that currently Probation and Parole officers are
authorised to enter the database. However, eventually all correctional officers, meaning guards and other correctional employees will also be able to access this database.

All requests for passes begin at the local level. The offender submits the request to her primary counsellor at the Youth House. The counsellor then submits the request, with a recommendation and rationale to either approve or deny the offender the pass, to the director of the Youth House. The decision to approve or deny the pass is also discussed at the weekly staff meeting where all counsellors, the director, and the assistant director of the facility as well as a probation officer is present. At the staff meeting both the director and the probation officer provide a rationale for whether they feel the offender should or should not receive the pass. This decision is based on: a review of the offender’s conduct in the Youth House; the ability of the sponsor to provide adequate supervision; the offender’s in-house behaviour; their conduct on previous releases; the length of time spent in custody; their involvement in programming; and their plan of care goals (Temporary Release Guide). The decision to approve or deny the pass is made by both the probation officer and the director of the Youth House. According to the interim directive, if the two parties cannot agree on a decision a meeting with the director of the Probation and Parole is arranged. At this meeting the probation officer on the case, and the director of the Youth House provide a rationale for their position to the director of Probation and Parole in an attempt to resolve the difference of opinion. The director of Probation and Parole makes the final decision.

A staff member, usually the primary counsellor, informs the offender as to whether her temporary pass is granted. The offender is informed through verbal or written communication. Employees of the facility are asked to be consistent in the form upon which they inform the offender of the approval or denial of their pass (Temporary Release Guide).
In addition to these passes, there are also reoccurring, or ongoing day passes (Temporary Release Guide). These passes are used for frequent and regular visits into the community, for example to attend counselling appointments, fulfill employment or family visits. For level-2 offenders these passes do not require supervision however contacts are established with those at the offender’s destination. For level-1 offenders all passes are escorted and “require the authorisation of the provincial director” (Temporary Release Guide 4). Probation and Parole are aware of all movements made by a level-1 offender. Under no circumstances are level-1 offenders permitted to leave the facility without supervision.

Level-1 offender who need to attend appointments in the community (i.e counselling, doctor appointments) are required to attain a pass, approved by probation and parole. These passes “should be endorsed in writing on a formal pass request by the area manager once a clear pattern regarding destination times is established” (Temporary Release Guide). Temporary Release Requests are placed in the offenders file and serves as a reference for future requests. Both the Ministry of Corrections and Youth House practice producing and gathering information.

The Youth House contributes to the knowledge pool by completing several other forms that become a segment of the youth’s reality and are permanently added to the file. This includes reports or documentation concerning the behaviour of the youth while at the residence, which are included in the youth’s active file. The youth’s progress and behaviour is monitored though the POC, progress notes, journal reports and behaviour reports that are included in the active file. Parts of this file remain at the facility upon the youth’s discharge date, other segments of this file are released to the Ministry of Corrections. This information will be added to the Ministry file. This paper trial contributes to “knowing” the offender and
is considered an efficient way for governing agents at a facility to become familiar with the offender's history in order to better able assess their needs. It is also seen as administratively efficient way of tracking offenders, predicting future behaviour and most importantly preventing future offending. However, according to the procedure manual, this information is necessary to identify the needs of the offender and the risk level of the youth. This rationales contrast that of Probation and Parole that accumulates information to ensure that public safety is maintained.

Summary

This examination of the program and operations of Youth House highlights the various heterogeneous rationales at play. Various rationales intersect and overlap revealing the complexity of the governing process at this site. This site deploys risk, responsibilization and disciplinary strategies. The technologies at this site reflect the philosophies and objectives of the Elizabeth Fry Society and integrate the requirements of Corrections Canada. The integration of these various rationales result in the re-configuration of governing technologies and demonstrate that technologies and rationales are flexible. Further reflection and examination of the decision-making process and formal policies of this site re-emphasises the complex relationship between rationales and technologies and details the various ways in which these multiple rationales are negotiated and play out within technologies and strategies that govern. The proceeding sections, using interviews with administrators and counsellors, formal policies and manuals, will exemplify the co-existence between the various strategies deployed at this site.
CHAPTER 4
Classifying the Risky

Actuarial risk technologies aim to accurately and objectively predict risk. Proponents of risk technologies argue that it is through these means that the needs and risks of individual subject are identified in a ‘scientific’ objective manner, free from the subjective, individual judgment. This claim assumes that there is an objective truth to be found. It also ignores the discretionary process embedded within the completion of risk technologies. Despite the actuarial nature of these classification systems, the Level of Supervision (LSI) and Level Offender Designation (LOD), like other actuarial risk technologies, encompasses “an assembly of forms of knowledge” and “requires the inculcation of a form of life” (Rose 1999: 54). Risk technologies produce risk scores through organizing and categorizing information. Practices at this research site reveal that this process necessitates knowledge gathering via investigation and discovery. The processes, through which this information is collected, calculated and given meaning when applied requires the interpretation and judgment of the individual who completes the relevant forms.

As argued by Dean (1999) “what is important is not risk itself, but the forms of knowledges that make it thinkable… (131). It is through the transposition of information by the counsellors and administrators at this site that risk is defined and redefined. My investigation reveals that the information is used to mobilise different governing strategies depending on the agent’s responsibilities as a counsellor, probation officer and administrator. According to Garland (2001), the experiences, working ideologies and structural boundaries of policies, procedures and rules are trained dispositions and practices of expertise that he
coins the “penal welfare habitus”. Discretion allows for consideration of these various elements. Hence, the decision to use and apply of risk technologies in specific ways are made while considering structural boundaries, like policies, and individual responsibilities. As put by Garland, decisions are filtered through the screen of the habitus.

In this chapter I will examine the ways in which the Level of Supervision Inventory and the Level Offender Designation (LOD) are deployed at this site in order to explore the different ways in which risk is taken up and the dispositions that shape their meanings. Actual practices also demonstrate how this knowledge is made sense of and articulated in different ways by the agents working within the field. My research thus examines risk “as a component of assemblages of practices, techniques and rationales concerned with how we govern” (Dean 1999: 132). The determination of supervision levels for offenders reveals that the non-actuarial dimensions of risk classification technologies used at this site. It also highlights the ways in which an agent’s habitus shapes the decision making process and reflects other governing strategies through the habitus to structure discretion.

Level Offender Designation (LOD)

As discussed in Chapter 3, the LOD is defined by the offence committed. However, actual practices reveal that the process by which offenders are classified as level-1 or level-2 is more complex than simply referring to a list of offences. A probation officer, while acknowledging that level-1 offences “are laid out” defines Level-1 offenders more broadly as “...anyone who has committed an offence that involves harm or potential harm to people”. The Level Offender List provides for the flexible nature of this classification, it states, “level-1 offences include but are not limited to the following” (See Appendix).
In designating offender status, the probation officer may consider other information known about the offence or the offender. Indeed, they may even utilise additional information to “upgrade” level-2 offenders to level-1 “based on the offender’s history” (Interview), or if based on their perception that the offender poses a “risk to themselves or the community” (Interview). A probation officer provided the following illustrative example:

The offender has been charged with attempted robbery. This was her first offence. According to her parents she has been having family and behaviour problems. She is just about to complete her high school education. Recently she got a boyfriend who has a criminal record, and she had been living on the edge for quite a while. She drinks alcohol and does drugs. She disobeyed her parents when they asked her to stop seeing her boyfriend. Prior to this she had good relations with her parents, and she continues her education, and her offence was not violent. But she did not take responsibility for her actions, was not interested in attending counselling, and failed to show remorse.

Based on these circumstances the officer stated that “she is somebody I who I would put at high risk”. This offender, was one of several assailants who wore masks and had bats, and according to the officer, these features of crime “symbolise the potential of violence” (Interview). Despite the official classification of a non-violent level-2 offence, the presence of a weapon and the attempt to disguise her identity suggested a level of violence that could justify reclassifying her offence as ‘Assault with a weapon or causing bodily harm’ (Section 267), a level-1 offence.

According to one probation officer, disguises and weapons suggests that the crime is organised and planned, a rationale for “upgrading” the risk status of the offender. The circumstances of the crime indicate intent and a level of violence that this probation officer could not ignore. Their decision to “upgrade” the offender’s risk status illustrates how “enhancing public security”, one of the main objectives of Probation and Parole shapes front
line decisions. Thus, probation officers have the discretion to "upgrade" offenders based on additional information made known to them or that they become aware through an investigation process. By increasing the offender's status, the offender is treated as greater risk and is therefore monitored more closely in the community and decisions to approve temporary release passes are reviewed with greater scrutiny. This example illustrates the probation officer's commitment to public safety as well as the discretionary nature of Level Designation process.

The practice of reviewing files and considering information other than the offence reflects risk practices. It is a means by which offenders are made known and future behaviour is predicted. In addition it illustrates a disciplinary approach to governing. The offender's past behaviour is a reason to increase the offender status.

This example also highlights the larger correctional objective to prioritise community safety. According to one counsellor, the tendency to "upgrade" offenders can in part be explained by the mandate of corrections and whether or not the "area manager has bought into the philosophy". The probation officer explained:

you [may] have an area manager who errs on the side of caution because the big thing in probation is community safety,... you have the mandate that says be as punitive as possible...[and] the overall philosophy is institutionalise...so the trickle down effect here would be on the level-1 level-2 designation....

Thus, the larger correctional objectives to promote community safety, political ideologies and to address liability concerns are the backdrop by which the officer decides to upgrade the offender status.

The tendency to increase offender status can also be explained by the emphasis on past criminal behaviour. According to one administrator, "we take into account past charges,
so if you have a level-1 offence in your criminal history you are automatically designated level-1”. The importance of past criminal history is reiterated when one probation officer identifies three priority pieces of information to determine an offenders risk level, the interrelationship of “criminal history”, “response to supervision” and substance abuse patterns”. The probation officer explained:

[If] they’ve had a criminal record that is ongoing, like there is no breaks in it…this is really important as an indicator of risk…. you may have an extensive criminal record, but they have responded well…No breaches, no failure to comply…When they are on probation they do well but when they are off probation then they re-offend again…you are looking at the interrelationship between the criminal record, probation, supervision… the next one that I am looking at is the pattern of alcohol and drug use.

The emphasis on the criminal history reflects the rationale that those with a criminal history are more likely to re-offend. and that crime can be reduced by incapacitating ‘repeat offenders’. Consideration of the offenders past behaviour and criminal offences also indicates a disciplinary mode of governing. In this case the offender’s risk status is calculated using information about the offenders past behaviour, lifestyle, and personal characteristics. This is problematic in that risk technologies are being applied not only for the current offence and past offences, but also, for living a lifestyle that fails to meet normalised notions of the “ideal law-abiding” citizens. Determining offenders’ level of risk includes the extent to which the offender is self-disciplined. Offenders’ risk level increases based on their past behaviour and lifestyle, indicating that disciplinary strategies are deployed through risk technologies.

In the previous example, the offender’s risk category is upgraded for both her criminal offence and her failure to responsibilize and self discipline. The particular attention paid to the offender’s adaptation n to probation and custody highlights the effort to responsibilize and managing individuals through applying appropriate supervision.

Documentation that suggest that the offender has in the past been obedient, displayed
disciplined behaviour while on probation or in custody demonstrates that the offender is actively making an effort to transform themself into a law-abiding citizen by leading a disciplined lifestyle. Displays of responsibilized behaviour also reduce risk.

In this case, the decision of the probation officer to upgrade offender was contested by the administrators at the Youth House. They argued that this was her first offence and that she had displayed positive behaviour within the facility. Contrary to the probation officer's belief that the offender was not interested in counselling, the practitioners at this site observed the offender participating in programming and actively pursuing her treatment program. Their decision to contest the probation officer's action can be explained by various factors. A key objective of open custody programming is re-integration into society. Level-1 designation makes it more difficult for offenders to engage in community activities or programming outside of the facility, and so limits the extent to which they are re-integrated into the community. Level-1 offenders require permission by the Ministry of Corrections to attend any programming or counselling outside of the facility. This hinders programming initiatives that aim to re-integrate offenders, one of the main objectives of the Youth House. The different rationales of Youth House and Corrections, in part, can explain the resistance.

Level-1 designation also has implications for staffing. Two staff members are scheduled for each shift. One staff member must remain in the facility at all times. In the event that programming events outside of the facility are scheduled, one staff member escorts and transports the offenders. The second staff member remains at the facility to supervise those who do not attend. Level-1 offenders, unlike level-2 offenders, require supervision outside of the facility. Therefore, if a level-1 offender has an appointment in the community, as staff member must accompany them. The other staff member is then unable to leave the
facility and remains with the other offenders. Thus, the decision to contest the "upgrade" is shaped by various factors that include fiscal restraints for staffing and meeting the objective to re-integrate the offenders.

A probation officer explained the resistance by the Youth House Staff as a function of the personal relationship that the practitioners develop with offenders while in their care. One probation officer stated "sometimes the people at the [Youth House] get personally involved with the offenders and do not understand that I am doing my job". One of the main objectives of probation officers is to enhance community safety. According to the policy, if there is a difference of opinion, a meeting with the director, the probation officer and the area manager of probation and parole is to commence. Coinciding with this policy a probation officer stated "I always discuss this with the house. I would always solicit their opinions because we need to co-operate". Despite the facility's resistance the risk status of the offender in the previous example was upgraded. This example demonstrates the contested nature of risk classification and the nature of 'non-actuarial' influences that constitute them.

The administrators of the Youth House also have the authority to influence the level designation of the offender who will be in their care. The role of risk management and classification within the open custody facility is to maintain the safety of the offenders and to effectively operate the program. Offenders who disturb the progress of other offenders or who display violent behaviour can be upgraded to a Level-1 offender. The following example illustrates such a case. Upon observing this offender in the program, one administrator stated the following:

She was in on "fail to comply" but she was such a behavioural problem. She was violent. She was a very aggressive violent young lady and while her current charge was failure to comply her prior charges were assault... based on prior history and how she currently displayed in the facility I wanted her raised to a level-1 status so
that we could pull the reins on her... I wanted her supervised in the community at all
times. I didn’t want her out there by herself. I really think she needed to be scrutinised
as a level-I.

The practitioners’ decision to request that this particular offender be upgraded to a Level-I
status illustrates that Youth House administrators, like the Ministry officials, are also pre-
occupied with risk. In this case, the agent considered the offender’s past criminal history and
her behaviour in the facility. Based on these factors, this offender was considered to be
riskier than indicated by her level designation. Although offenders may be upgraded by the
Youth House using the same risk rationale, the process in which this decision is made differs
between the Youth House and the Ministry of Corrections.

In the first example, the probation officer decided to “upgrade” the offender’s level
status after reviewing the police report and contacting the offender’s previous probation
officer who indicated that the offender in question “did not take responsibility for the crime
and showed little remorse” (Interview). The information provided by the initial probation
officer is taken as truth, since probation officers are agents working within the criminal
justice system. To Green (1997), this method of discovery produces “revelatory knowledge”;
meaning information presumed to be accurate and legitimised by the very fact that an
authority working within the criminal justice system presents it. This knowledge is produced
wholly through the investigation stage (Green 1997). Furthermore, Green argues that
“revelatory knowledge” is produced and legitimised when information is made known by
anyone qualified as an expert or authorised to exercise power on behalf of the state (Green
1997). Emphasising the degree to which “revelatory knowledge” is produced and legitimised,
the probation officer agreed to ‘upgrade’ the offender based on the request of the
practitioners at the site, which claimed, that the offender required close supervision after observing her behaviour in the facility.

In the first example, the probation officer’s decision to upgrade the offender was influenced by the information attained from the offender’s previous probation officer and by reviewing documentation. In contrast, in the second example, the practitioners at the facility observed the offender for nearly two weeks in conjunction with reviewing her file and past criminal history prior to making the request to upgrade. Observing the offender prior to making such request illustrates the different approach to ‘knowing’ the offender. The practitioners at this facility attempt to ‘know’ the offender through observations and interviews as well as reviewing documentation and information in the offender’s file. As seen in the probation officer’s decision making process, “knowing” the offender at this site has not been completely displaced by the construction of an individual’s dossier using actuarial technologies. The ‘datadouble’ of the offender was not the only way the offender is known. The multiple ways in which the offender is known is also seen in the completion of the Level of Supervision (LSI).

The LSI: Supervision and Risk

The LSI guidelines suggest that standardised interviews be used in conjunction with all available information to complete the LSI. However, as will be demonstrated in what follows here, despite the suggestion that the offender be used as a source of information, information attained from other sources is prioritised. One probation officer stated “I use whatever information I have for the LSI”, this includes the “personal file…the predisposition report…police occurrence report and if there is one, the criminal record”. For those offenders with previous criminal records, the file that contains the LSI completed after
the last conviction(s) is reviewed (See Chapter 3 for details). According to one probation officer, repeat offenders’ LSI “may be updated”. However, the new score does not override the first LSI score: “both LSI scores are saved independently” (Interview). The probation officer also noted that they use the previous LSI as a guide. In addition to the information in the file that contains various types of documentation, the probation officer solicits information from other authorities within the field to make the offender known.

In the case where the offender is not known to the system, or little information is available in the offender’s file, the probation officer relies on other governing technologies and on other authorities within the field to assist in identifying the offender’s needs and risks. When asked: “how do you complete the LSI when there is little information”, a probation officer responded:

If the offender is completely unknown, then the staff will sit down with [the offender] and will do a Youth Management Assessment (YMA) so that they will get information and then [the probation officer and the staff] would discuss [the information].

Through consulting and discussing the meaning of particular pieces of information, the subject is constructed: subsequently the offender’s risks and needs are determined. This process of revealing the offender by consulting with other authorities in the field creates an opportunity for subjective interpretation, judgement and the individual habitus to filter information provided to the probation officer. The transposition of this information, by probation officers, into the LSI, illustrates the subjective nature of risk and needs assessments.

According to LSI guidelines, personal interviews are also a way in which information is gathered. However, when a probation officer was asked “do you speak to the offender before completing the LSI”, the officer responded,
It is very informal. I don't go, if one has never been done before. I may go formalise it but usually I take my information from the meetings, from primary workers, CAS, parents input, what the plan of work says about the parents, how they are doing on passes, how they have done previously, each specific area I would go through...

Thus, information gathered from counsellors and other technologies such as the POC are prioritised over the information offered by the offender herself. The reliance of information that is transferred and legitimised as expert knowledge is symbolic of governing through risk and the changing relationship between the offender and the professional. Personal interaction with the offender is not necessary for diagnosis of risks and needs. Although probation officers do solicit information from other authority figures and rely on governing technologies like the YMA to complete other governing technologies like the LSI, these technologies have not completely replaced face-to-face interactions with offenders. The practice of consulting other experts in the field illustrates a different way of knowing. The staff members at Youth House, who have interacted and observed the offender, contributes to the construction of the offender. Thus there input stems from observing the actual subject rather than reviewing information about them. This process allows for offenders' actions to be interpreted and given meaning through the habitus of the staff member and also illustrates the extent to which information gathered to know the offender is not free of the staff members judgement.

The information used to inform the LSI illustrates a complex way of knowing, one that is not completely actuarial or new. This challenges the notion that risk technologies are objective ways of knowing and that risk governs solely through the actuarial subject. Practices of completing the LSI by probation officers illustrate an emphasis on certain types of knowledges. These include that which is produced by authority figures in the facility; information available in the offender's file; as well as information gathered by probation
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the time increments between past offences or drug use and the current offence offenders “can
never work past it”. For example, an administrator explained,

...a woman.... had an addiction issue ten years ago.... and her record indicates
alcohol or drug use, if she had a previous offence then she is scored just as highly
now, whether she has used (drugs or alcohol), whether she is using now or if she quit
eight years ago. It does not matter.

Over-classification becomes an even greater issue when offenders entering the adult system
have a criminal record as youth:

...if you (committed) a violent act as a young offender...you enter the adult system...
don’t believe for a minute that those records disappear because they don’t...they will
come through on the LSI scoring, so then you will be considered a dangerous violent
offender...

The Elizabeth Fry Society as an advocate that broadly address issues of social justice and
specifically concentrates their efforts on women in conflict with the law they are concerned
that the LSI over-classifies offenders. Subsequently, counsellors at this site are not exposed
to or obligated to refer to the LSI when making decisions concerning offenders needs and
risks. The Youth House does not incorporate the LSI score within the governing process. One
administrator stated “I don’t really think that the LSI has too much weight in determining
anything”. When asked about the LSI, counsellors at this site, had varied responses. One
practitioner responded. “I think I have seen the score once”. Another stated, “I do not use the
LSI, I have never seen it. Another counsellors when asked responded, “what is the LSI?”

The counsellor’s minimal awareness of the LSI illustrates the discretionary power of
the Elizabeth Fry Society to incorporate the LSI in making decisions concerning the
governing of offenders in their care. The decision not to refer and include the LSI score when
making decisions concerning the governing of the offender at this site can, in part, be
explained by the belief that the tool over-classifies offenders, specifically female offenders,
because it was designed for an adult male population. The LSI is criticised by various scholars and practitioners for failing to account for gender differences (Hannah-Moffat 2000 see also Dawson 1999; Bhui 1999: Lupton 1999). Hannah-Moffat argues that the LSI does not account for the different treatment needs of male and female offenders and therefore misrepresents the treatment needs and risk level of female offenders. The ease by which needs are transposed to risks, and the degree to which the LSI score dictates supervision and treatment contradicts one of the main objectives of Elizabeth Fry Society, to deploy gender specific treatment.

Contrary to the administrators of the Elizabeth Fry Society, probation and parole officers consider the LSI an objective technology that accurately identifies the needs and risk level of all offender male and female, adult and youth. When asked, do you think the LSI should be re-designed to reflect gender differences, one probation officer responds, “the boxes [within the LSI] that allow for explanation address that, they adjust the score to account for such differences”.

The over-classification of offenders is sometimes countered through the discretion of the probation officers who are able to incorporate and account for pieces of information generated from various sources in the completion of the LSI. For example, a probation officer acknowledged that offenders’ progress and “present situations” are not reflected in their LSI score. One probation officer stated that:

you may have somebody who has done really well for three years since a long-term criminal record and this is a letter offence, maybe shoplifting offence and they have been clean for three years. But they still have a high LSI-OR because of their past record. So I think you have to take the LSI-OR and peg that to what their present circumstances are...
In cases where the probation officer feels as though an offender’s present situation should be considered, they are able to manipulate various information and data elements. They are able to filter and emphasise information about the offender through their screen of discretionary power.

This is evident in the practice of “upgrading” and “downgrading” offender scores. The LSI categorizes static and dynamic factors. Static factors are unchangeable such as age and criminal history. Dynamic factors include categorizes such as attitudes, emotional/personal states. The rating within these categorises can be altered based on offenders success or failure in their treatment programs (Hannah-Moffat 2000: 4). The presence of a criminal history increases an offender’s risk score. Despite the length of time between past and current offence, offence history remains an important part of assessing risk scores. However, the probation officer has the discretionary power to downgrade. “you can say no… I am going to treat this person as a medium rather than a high risk”.

“Removing ticks” modifies an offender’s risk score. The LSI is completed through endorsing boxes with ticks. In completing static factors such as previous criminal history, if the offender has previous convictions the box is endorsed using a tick. In completing the static categories, such as criminal history, probation officers are obliged to incorporate all known criminal activity leaving little room to exercise discretion. However, the dynamic categories that include items such as anti-social patterns, can be altered, or in the words of one probation officer, “ticks can be removed by lowering the offender’s risk score” in order to “downgrade” the offender LSI score. Although the criminal record cannot be changed, according to a probation officer,

you can... put on a long criminal record a positive tick and clarify that by saying that it has been three years since this person has been before the court. This is a lesser
offence than it was previously ... and they have done this, this, and this since they have committed the offence... There is always a way on the LSI that you can clarify your decisions.

Modifying dynamic categories to counter the effects of static categories highlights the space for agents to exercise their discretionary power. It also illustrates that some probation officers assess risk based on the offender's current circumstances rather than their past behaviours. Probation officers identified some of the rationales for downgrading include the following:

if they [the offender] have a long criminal record but it has been a long time since they have committed their last offence; if they have dealt with a lot of their problems since they were charged for the offence, such as attending counselling and if they [offender] have changed their attitude, they have taken responsibility for their offences.

The practice of downgrading offenders illustrates the extent to which discretion is exercised. Moreover, it exemplifies the space for personal judgements in completing the LSI. Similarly, Hannah-Moffat found that “correctional officials frequently used “overrides” to adjust risk assessments to what they feel was most appropriate” (2000: 17).

The persuasive nature of risk classification tools such as the LSI lies in their claim to objectivity. However the discretionary practices of “upgrading” offenders to level-1 status and “downgrading” offenders’ overall risk scores to adjust offenders’ LSI scores resembles “categorical risk classification” (Brown 2000:98). Brown defines this method as a process “grounded in non-scientific (common, philosophical, legal) understandings of human characteristics and the indicative signs of threat and danger” (Brown 2000: 98). Thus, level status designation is categorical in that it “appears in the criminal justice as an imputed value or as something determined as much by the methods used to assess it as by an independent characteristic of the person whom it is thought to reside” (Brown 2000: 100). Actual practice illustrates that designating risk involves a decision making process informed by the
offender's past behaviours, progress in the treatment program, personal circumstances as well as the offence and is shaped by correctional objectives to remove those with the potential to pose a risk to the community.

Summary

The LSI coincides with the current penal philosophy. Its proponents claim it is an "actuarial tool... used to both identify security (and)... criminological needs" (Bonta, Andrews and Hoge 1990:23). The LSI labels offenders by assigning a risk score that is used to determine the extent to which offender are allowed into the community. However, despite the risk rationale that guides the assigning and assessing of risk and waving in the direction of actuarialism actual practices demonstrate that risk is taken up in various ways. Classifying offenders as risky involves a decision making process. Information is given different meanings: the different interpretation of information reflects the habitus of the agent completing the LSI. The various ways in which risk is assessed highlights the discretionary nature of the deployment of risk technologies and the factors that guide the decision making process.
CHAPTER 5

Youth Management Assessment: Care, Discipline and Risk

Coinciding with the conservative ‘get tough’ regime and the political climate, the identification of dangerous offenders and the objective of community safety have risen in prominence. In accordance with this goal, risk assessment tools have become increasingly central to the correctional process. As already discussed, managerial risk tools include the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) and the Level Offender Designation (LOD). In addition to these tools, open custody facilities employ a Youth Management Assessment (YMA), another risk technology. The extent to which these risk tools have become an important way of dealing with offenders has led various scholars to argue that rehabilitation goals have been replaced by risk technologies designed to manage and predict risk (Feeley and Simon 1992). The notion that risk has displaced disciplinary governing strategies is challenged in light of the complex relationship between risk and disciplinary strategies.

The Youth Management Assessment (YMA) reflects the objectives of risk technologies. The YMA is a security tool that classifies offenders by identifying their needs and risks. Alongside these objectives, this technology facilitates disciplinary technologies such as treatment programs in open custody facilities. The information transposed by the YMA technology not only assesses risk it also identifies offenders needs. Those needs are then transposed into treatment programs such as the individualised Plan of Care (POC). The Plan of Care is a disciplinary technology. The YMA is in turn informed by offenders’ progress in meeting the goals of their Plan of Care. The offenders’ progress is also assessed by various responsibilization technologies (behaviour reports, dailies, and progress reports).
that document the offender’s behaviour and their achievement of their treatment goals. Information generated from various governing technologies is reflected in the YMA. While the YMA reflects risk thinking, its capacity to govern through risk is limited without the information produced through disciplinary technologies (i.e. POC). Moreover, disciplinary technologies also rely on other governing strategies, such as responsibilization. The information generated through disciplinary (POC) and responsibilization strategies are transposed into risk technologies (YMA) and used to govern through risk. The information generated through disciplinary strategies not only informs risk strategies but also mobilises risk practices suggesting that governing through risk involves a variety of alternative strategies. An examination of the YMA’s role in the governing process illustrates the complex relationship between disciplinary strategies, risk governing strategies, and responsibilization strategies of control and challenges the totalitising argument that risk is the dominant governing strategy.

The aim of this chapter is to further unsettle the idea that risk regimes are dominant and largely uncontested technology of governing this population. The conflation of needs and risk is further evidenced by this local research. Various governing technologies not only encounter one another, but feed off of and into one another. The assessment process and technologies, such as the Plan of Care, inform the Youth Management Assessment, a risk tool, that is itself updated and revised based on information generated through technologies of responsibilization such as progress reports and daily reports. This relationship between these varying strategies indicates a complexity in governance that is not represented in current risk literature.
Completing the Youth Management Assessment (YMA): An Actuarial Tool

The YMA makes the offender known. Constituting an offender’s subjectivity through knowledge is essential for governing through risk (Rose 1999). It is through the collaboration of information and transposition of this information into risk technologies that an offender’s subjectivity is constructed and acted upon through managerial and supervision decisions. At the Youth House various types of information are gathered and transposed into the Youth Management Assessment (YMA). The transposition of knowledge in the YMA serves as a technology that assembles various sources of information to “paint an overall picture of the offender” (Interview). According to one counsellor, the YMA helps to “gain an understanding of who you are dealing with”.

The YMA is completed using all available information known about the offender. Some information arrives in the offender’s file, but it “can come from all sorts of sources, especially if the girl has no parents” (Interview). According to one counsellor, valuable documentation includes the Pre-Disposition Report (PDR), expert assessments and documents generated from other facilities and past probation officers. One counsellor explained that expert diagnosis and clinical assessment, when available, are valuable for identifying “psychiatric disorders because you cannot diagnosis [them]...”. However, according to another counsellor, “a lot of the time paper work is missing”. This requires the counsellor to generate information, by calling parents, prior custody facilities and current and past probation officers. In addition, counsellors also rely on other sources, including intuition, observations and interviews. The selection and inclusion of various types of knowledges challenges the presumed ‘objective’ nature of risk assessment.
The process by which information is gathered to complete the YMA is a method of
discovery producing “revelatory knowledge”. Green defines “revelatory knowledge” as “no
more than a way of knowing and produced wholly in the investigation stage” (1997: 17).
Information obtained by contacting probation officers and parents when revealed by an
authority figure of the state, such as probation officers is legitimised and seen as truth when
discovered by an authority of the state. The ways in which an offender is made known
remains a way of knowing that prevailed in the welfare period. Under the welfare regime,
probation officers were authorised to “go to the home, to the school...and anywhere else
where information ...could be got” (Scott 1931:72 as cited in Hogeveen 2001: 56).
Managerial technologies, like the YMA, are intended to remove the subjective nature of
‘knowing’. However, risk technologies necessitate information in order to assess risks and
needs and thereby create a discretionary space for various forms of knowledge gathering,
including intuition, to reveal the offender. Thus, the objective nature of risk assessment is
questionable.

The persuasive nature and primary purpose of risk technologies is to predict the risky
behaviour of offenders and their potential for re-offending. This requires that the offender is
known. As observed by Pratt, “lives that remain unknowable are thereby unpredictable...
(Pratt 2000: 39). The YMA therefore requires the agent to collect enough data to complete
risk technologies, which may require an investigation. According to one administrator,
“without an active staff [who] makes the effort to engage in an exhaustive search for
information, you may miss something”. Thus, it is common practice that counsellors
investigate an offender’s history by contacting those who know or have known the offender.
As stated in Chapter 3, classifying offenders as unknown in the YMA requires the agent to complete the sections under Factor 12: “Lack of Information”. This includes the subheadings: “Content of Missing Information and Reason for Missing Information”. The agent then endorses the box marked “verified risk”. The tendency to treat offenders as unknown and complete Factor 12, suggests that the offender cannot in fact be definitively known nor can their behaviour or likelihood to re-offend be predicted. As one counsellor stated, “I always put the offender as unknown, you can never know enough about an offender, there is always more you can know”. Despite the amount of information collected and transposed into the YMA some counsellors claim that offenders remain unpredictable and unknown challenging the notion that risk technologies offer a new managerial strategy; one that reveals the offender, predicts probability of re-offending and identifies risky individuals through the categorisation of information.

Additionally, this technology governs administrators and counsellors within the facility. The YMA requires counsellors to retrieve and gather information. This technology manages administrators and counsellors by ensuring that they account for their representations of the offender. In addition it provides a standard to staff at all open custody facilities. One administrator explained:

…it provides a standard that is a good thing. all the front line people are doing the same thing. asking a number of questions that speak to the YMA, [completing] an intake [form]…they sit down and read all the other information they have because they know that they have to compile it all. and take it into consideration and in turn process it through the YMA assessment tool to develop an overall assessment....

Another administrator reiterated that:

the biggest benefit to the YMA is …it forces an individual to sit down and look at everything. It provides a standard. If you didn’t have the YMA then you would have a number of facilities doing their thing…not necessarily looking at everything...
The overall sentiment of the staff was that with the YMA there is a greater chance that the offender’s behaviour will be accurately predicted and managed increasing in-house security and maintaining the “well being of the whole house, other residents and themselves” (Interview).

The YMA also assists in organising and making sense of the various types of data that are at times contradictory. One administrator explained that the YMA, highlights problems, often times the information we get is very scattered. We may get three different things, you might find that you get three different reports…one [assessment] might talk about mental illness or one might talk about suicide. The YMA organises this information.

Organising information prepares and assists staff in “making specific recommendations” and directs their decision making “in terms of security, management and treatment”, consistent with the objectives of the YMA as outlined in the manual (YMA Manual).

The decision to classify offenders as unknown can be explained by the individual habitus of staff members. According to Garland, the penal-welfare habitus consists of a particular set of dispositions, working ideologies, practices and expertise that are enacted in the decision making process (2001: 36). The habitus is the screen through which information flows and by which information is filtered (Bogard 1996). For staff at the Youth House, the decision to classify an offender as unknown is shaped by issues of accountability. The offender’s risk status, in light of the YMA, affects the ways in which the offender is managed and surveilled. For example, an offender’s risk factors and overall risk status as determined by the YMA effects the extent to which the offender is surveilled at the site. This is exemplified in the last section of the YMA entitled “Management and Intervention Strategies for those Youth verified as Risky” (YMA Form).
The management and intervention section has four subheadings entitled supervision, crisis, restrictions and plan. The supervision section is of particular interest. The agent is required to indicate what type of supervision the offender requires. The options are as follows: requires close observation/ supervision (to be reviewed with the plan of care or as required): first search necessary if suspicions arise; resident's property and the room to be searched; other supervision strategies (specify). The agent endorses these categories by placing a checkmark in the box by the category. Thus, this risk technology assists in decision-making concerning the management of the site. By verifying offenders as unknown the agent is able to mobilise strategies of surveillance like searching the offenders' room and her body, and restricting her from access to tools or utensils that can be used as weapons. Counsellors who suspect that the YMA verifications do not reflect the potential behaviour of the offender, due to lack of information or a general "gut-feeling", are able to deploy strategies, such as verifying offenders as risky, to address their intuition. In these cases the agent is required to justify their decision in the space provided in the YMA. This cautionary approach reduces the accountability of counsellors by providing a safe guard for counsellors in the event that the offender engages in behaviours that jeopardises in-house security, safety of the staff, the other offenders or herself.

In-house security is further achieved by sharing information amongst the counsellors relating to the propensity of specific offenders to act or react in certain ways in light of their past life experiences. For example, in the case of a young woman who had been sexually assaulted, counsellors were encouraged to make their presence known, avoid startling the offender and avoid physical contact. Her YMA had revealed that in the past she had acted
violently towards staff when they had frightened her by not making their presence known or
by engaging in physical contact.

This information is communicated to all employees for security reasons via the
communication log. This communication log is reviewed by each employee prior to the their
shift. They are required to read every log entry since their last shift. In addition to the YMA
score, the agent must include in the log any information concerning the offender that they
feel is necessary for other employees to know. The communication log serves as technical
means by which in-house security is maintained.

Coinciding with current penal practice the YMA functions as a risk technology. Its
capacity to govern through risk is evident in managerial and supervision decision by
determining and predicting types of risky behaviour. It categorises information and classifies
offenders. This review of relevant local practices also reveals that the YMA is used to
manage staff and reduce counsellors’ accountability.

In addition to governing through risk, the YMA is used to transform and manage
needs. It requires information produced through disciplinary technologies. Information
generated by disciplinary technologies that measure the extent to which an offender has
transformed and responsibilized the self, is transposed into the YMA. The complex inter-
relationship between risk and disciplinary strategies is explained through the relationship
between needs and risk.

Risk and Treatment Needs: The Recycling of Information

The relationship between risk factors and criminological factors (also known, as
treatment needs) has been examined in by psychologists working in the correctional field
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Reflecting the integration of risk and rehabilitative policy, offenders are managed through the identification of both needs and risks (Hannah Moffat 2000). In the context of adult corrections, "risk and need classification...result in a security classification, as well as allocation of level of treatment or supervision" (Hannah Moffat 2000: 4). Risk technologies are used to classify offenders in terms of their criminological needs, which are defined by the absence of normative structures. The relationship between identifying needs and assessing risk suggests that a "substantial slippage between the concept of risk and need" exists (Hannah Moffat 2000: 4). Identifying criminological needs involves, as argued by Foucault, constituting the individual as an object of knowledge (Foucault 1977). Offenders are disciplined through the technique of normalisation that "corrects" the offender. Risk technologies require the identification of offenders' criminological needs in order to predict their future behaviour and identify the appropriate level of supervision. The interdependency between these objectives suggests that risk thinking, as a mode of governance, has not replaced traditional disciplinary strategies that attempt to correct an offender's behaviour based on their criminological needs. Thus, discipline is actually inherent in risk technologies and needs assessment has clearly not been displaced by risk assessment.

The categories within the YMA assess for the presence or absence of normative structures such as education and non-normative structures such as drug, mental illness, and aggression. The lack of normative structures such as education or strong family relations informs transposed into the offender's treatment needs. Also, the presence of non-normative structures or risk factors such as aggression justify intervention, so even aggression is transposed as into a treatment need. At the Youth House, carrying out the Plan of Care is one of the primary ways through which the offender is transformed through disciplinary
strategies. The ways in which this treatment program is designed reiterates the relationship between needs and risks; moreover it demonstrates an inter-relationship between risk and discipline strategies.

The close relationship between needs and risks is analytically compelling. Identifying risk is intended to address security issues. Identifying needs is used to design treatment programs. Treatment programs are designed by identifying individual needs to be addressed. The aim is to transform ‘unruly’ subjects into ‘ruly’ ones through the deployment of disciplinary technologies that normalise. These two goals, security and transformation, differ in terms of governing strategies. However, at the Youth House both needs and risks are identified through information generated by both disciplinary and risk technologies.

The Plan of Care “is the primary tool for identifying the residents' needs and for planning a ready re-admission to the community” (Youth House-Operational Manual). As a disciplinary technology, the POC identifies three working goals that are intended to address the needs of an individual offender. The POC assesses the residents’ physical, emotional, educational, psychological and social needs (Manual), on the basis of the information in the offender’s file. The file contains past assessments, progress reports, the pre-disposition report (PDR), the YMA, and the intake form, which documents the offender’s past and present circumstances. The intake form is completed by interviewing the offender and by referencing information from the file. In conjunction with the information attained from these documents, the offender is consulted. One Counsellor explained:

I look at any information that is available to us, like the resident’s file, the intake because it is [completed] one on one. a PDR [pre-disposition report] if it is available to gain some insight on their history, and the YMA...
The inclusion of these various sources allows the agent to verify certain pieces of information. For example, if the offender states that she has never had a previous offence, the Ministry of Corrections file can be consulted to “check” that information (Interview). Verifying information is common practice at this facility. Particular attention is paid to the intake form that is initially completed by the ‘offender’ through self-reported information and then subsequently revised by staff upon review of official documentation.

The identification of the offender’s treatment needs is accomplished through reviewing the offender’s risk factors as highlighted in the YMA. The YMA identifies the offender’s as a risk (verified or not verified) by identifying the non-normative behaviours that are presumed to be pre-cursors to criminal activity. One counsellor explained:

If there is a history of drug abuse, violence, and the offender has not finished high school then the POC goals would be to attend drug counselling and anger management and attain x amount of credits [high-school], and that would depend on how long the offender was with us [length of disposition].

An offender’s risky behaviour such as drug abuse and violence also indicates the offender’s treatment needs. These behaviours require treatment to reduce the risk of re-offending and to facilitate successful re-integration into society. Thus, risks and needs are interdependent and reflect a ‘mixed model’ of governance “wherein traditional rehabilitative strategies are reaffirmed and deployed to minimise and reduce risk” (Hannah-Moffat 2000: 4). The YMA, a risk technology, and the POC, a disciplinary technology, inform each other and both govern through risk and needs. Hannah-Moffat speaks of risks and needs. My study points, more specifically, to the dynamics of the process.

The Plan of Care is distinctive from the other governing technologies, as it is reliant on the offender’s individual involvement in the identification of their own treatment needs. One counsellor, when asked how are Plan of Care goals designed, responded, “I ask her what
she wants to work on”. Another counsellor explained that the Plan of Care is “client driven”.

This approach to designing POC goals illustrate the extent to which these treatment plans are individualised and reflect the belief that the offender is “her own expert” (Interview). In the words of one counsellor:

…the most important thing is the resident herself. I sit down and talk to them, ask them what they would like to achieve or accomplish while they are here, what they feel they want to improve on…

Thus, the process of identifying Plan of Care goals for offenders is an individualised process that defines a space for the offender alongside of information networks and bodies of expertise. Counsellors identify POC goals by both referencing risk technologies and personal narratives of the offender. One counsellor stated, “I look at her risk, if there is drug addiction I ask, do you think that you would benefit from drug counselling and we talk about it”. The perceived needs by the counsellor are guided by the risk factors identified in the YMA, however the determination of the offender Plan of Care goals are not completed without consulting the offender.

Including personal narratives in designing the Plan of Care (POC) goals illustrates a way of knowing that is reflective of welfare regimes (See Chapter 1 and 3). This challenges the notion that current governing strategies do not involve individual treatment and the notion that moral agents have been replaced by the actuarial subject (Hannah-Moffat 1999). A distinctive feature of governing through risk is the objective and categorical ways in which subjects are constructed through the transposition of information into risk technologies. According to some risk theorists (Feeley and Simon 1992, 1994) under the current penal regime subjects are primarily constructed through actuarial techniques. Castel argues that the extent to which actuarial technologies have infiltrated the governing process has changed the
"site of diagnosis", where the professional-client relationship is displaced by one that excludes the client and make use of files, computers, and database (1991: 283). However, at the Youth House, as previously illustrated, designing the Plan of Care goals involve consulting individual offenders as part of the governing process. I am suggesting that the "site of diagnosis" has not been changed but rather 'hybridized' to include risk technologies alongside of case-work based narratives of needs and goals. Individual programming and the consideration of the offender's perspective in designing her plan of care goals illustrates the extent to which this facility is committed to the techniques of normalization, treatment and rehabilitation. all objectives of the penal welfare system.

The use of the YMA to inform the Plan of Care illustrates a complex relationship between risk and discipline strategies. On the one hand, the Plan of Care is an individualised treatment program that challenges the notion that current penal practices are moving towards managing aggregates rather than treating individuals (See Feeley and Simon 1992: 452). On the other hand, the Plan of Care is completed using information generated from risk based managerial technologies, like the YMA. Thus the Plan of Care manages offenders through their needs: needs that are determined by referencing identified risks. The offenders at this site are governed through treatment and managed through risk. This demonstrates that risk practices have not displaced disciplinary practice but rather are incorporated within the disciplinary governing process.

Given that there are parallels between identifying needs and assessing risk, Hannah-Moffat suggests that there is a substantial slippage between the concepts of risk and need (2000: 4). Identifying criminological needs involves, as argued by Foucault, constituting the offender as an object of knowledge (Foucault 1977). The YMA is a technology that
constitutes the offender, facilitates treatment plans and therefore facilitates the disciplinary strategies of governing. The progress of offenders is measured through various other disciplinary technologies and is also reflected in the YMA.

The Youth Management Assessment in addition to assessing risk is used to “monitor the progress and deterioration of young offender during the course of the[ir] disposition” (YMA Manual). The YMA works in this capacity through the POC and various disciplinary technologies that monitor the offenders’ treatment progress. At this site the youth’s progress is monitored through the use of progress notes, behaviour reports, daily observations, and the primary workers’ weekly reviews of the POC. The progress of offenders is monitored through these technologies and informs the YMA. It is through disciplinary technologies that responsibilization strategies are mobilised and offenders risk and needs are re-assessed and regulated.

The Responsibilization of the offender for their own transformation and rehabilitation requires that they are constituted as knowledgeable and rationale subjects by informing them of the rules, regulation and expectations. Through this process the offender becomes an “active subject as the entity through which power and the means by which power is exercised” (Garland 1997: 206). The offender is responsibilized and expected to participate in self-governance and is thereby held accountable for their success or failure in managing and addressing their needs and risk. Meeting their treatment goals and engaging in self-governance is guised as an empowerment strategy.

The term empowerment is taken up differently in various contexts. Empowerment for service providers and activists can mean “the development of individual autonomy, self control, and confidence” and or “the development of a sense of collective influencing over
social conditions in one's life" (Young 1994:49). At this site empowerment is closely linked to self-esteem and life skills.

The program objectives reflect empowerment strategies. The mission statement notes: "we believe it is necessary to provide a holistic and healthy environment for young offenders" (Youth House Manual). This open custody facility provides a “therapeutic setting, which enables young women to develop self esteem and life skills” (Youth House Manual). Coinciding with these goals this facility operates a program entitled Preparation for Independence. This program is run by the Peel Children’s Centre, which was “looking for a place to be able to provide their staff with ground work training...they also wanted to provide a community service to the community” (Interview). The program is delivered through modules that “consist of things such as sex education, apartment hunting, anything that you can think of in regards to a life skill” (Interview). An administrator identified the value of life skills programs: “it provides an exchange of services, it’s free programming, and it is certainly a component and an important program for the house”. These programs aim to teach offender life skills that are presumed to contribute to developing self-esteem.

The success of an offender in governing themself is measured by disciplinary technologies that record their progress in various treatment initiatives. Offenders’ achievement of POC goals is evaluated through monthly reviews. Participation in mandatory life skills programming and general behaviour is evaluated and documented by daily reports (dailies). House rules and regulations are outlined and made known to the offender upon arrival via the ‘Residents Handbook’, which they must read in order to make themselves familiar with the regulations and inner workings of the facility. Following the principles of the Young Offender Act, these procedures are intended to ensure that offenders are aware of
their rights. This eight page booklet contains the following sub-headings: Residents Rights and Responsibilities; Youth Advocacy Office; Internal Complaints Procedure; Disclosure of information to staff; Escape/UAL Procedures; Health and Safety Procedure; Procedure for Applying for a Transfer to Another Facility; Procedure for Review of your Disposition; Procedure for a Pre-Release; and Criteria for Temporary Release. The Youth House responsibilizes offenders by giving them information, which make them knowledgeable, rationale and well-informed subjects, and justifies punishing them for not following the rules (Garland 1996: 461).

The last section of the Residents Handbook is entitled ‘House Rules’. The subheadings include: Routines and Expectations: Programming and Chores; Kitchen, Dining Room and Bedroom Etiquette; Phone Calls and Visitors: Resident Money and Allowance; Clothing and Property: Mail; Staff Office: Medication Policy Restrictions: and Inappropriate Behaviour: and Choices. By informing offenders of expected house behaviours they are made responsible for their actions and are therefore ‘deserving’ of the sanctions that result from the violation of these rules and regulations. The sub-heading ‘Choices’ reads:

If a resident chooses to break a house rule consequences will be given: i.e. loss of radio, loss of stereo, visits with parents cancelled, or shortened, phone privileges affected, loss of programming, loss of junk food privileges, time out given, essay assignment due, etc. (length of time determined by staff) (Resident Manual)

The decision to violate house rules is understood as a rational choice made by a rationale individual. Therefore, the punitive consequences for inappropriate behaviour are justified. Violation of house rules, failure to participate in programming and failure to work towards achieving Plan of Care goals may result in Behaviour Reports. a disciplinary technology that regulates offenders through ‘responsibilization’ strategies of control.
Behaviour Reports (BR) are completed by primary counsellors, casual staff, and administrators who encounter or witness behaviour that is inappropriate. In these behaviour reports practitioners outline the offender’s actions that justifies the disciplinary action. Behaviour reports add to the paper trail that tracks and documents an offender’s behaviour while in the program. As previously stated in Chapter 3, Behaviour Reports result in punishment that is referred to as a “consequence”. They symbolise the failure of the offender to transform the self. However, an additional punishment or ‘consequence’ may be imposed. The staff deploying this technology has the discretionary power to decide if and when a consequence is warranted and the nature of the consequence. The counsellors at this site are the local experts within this field. They specify appropriate ways of conduct through punishment (Rose 1999). Consequences include the removal of privileges that can include the loss of a trip into the community. The decision to impose a consequence and apply a punishment deemed appropriate is dependent on the discretion of the counsellor. This decision is shaped by various factors.

Counsellors consider the offender’s past behaviour and present circumstances when determining and imposing a ‘consequence’ for the offender’s action. For example, one counsellor explained, “if the offender was having a bad day because her parents refused to talk to her and she acted out, I would be easier on her than somebody who had been acting out all week”. The decision is also shaped by the counsellors’ personal beliefs and levels of tolerance. Another counsellor explained “some people really hate swearing, so they give out behaviour reports, where others just give out warnings or make them pay a quarter into the swear jar, unless it keeps happening”. Another counsellor stated that “people have certain
things they do not tolerate, like me I don’t tolerate disrespecting staff, I always give
behaviour reports for that”.

The types of behaviour that necessitate the deployment of a Behaviour Report are
outlined in the Operations Manual that states:

(1) Encourage positive behaviour by providing incentives, counselling and opportunities
to improve personal, educational, vocational functioning. Acquiring socially desirable
alternate behaviour as a means of self-control is an integral aspect of personal
development.

(2) Use punitive measures only as a last resort. Those measures specifically sanctioned
by the Ministry under YOA Operation Policy and Procedure Manual, “Behaviour
Management” YOA 04 02 03 and “Discipline Standards” YOA 04 02 04, and
endorsed by [the Youth House] are applied with respect to certain defined
unacceptable behaviours.

(3) Encourage, promote and establish desirable resident behaviour(s) utilising house rules
and a graduated system of behavioural standards and incentives according to [the
Youth House] Behaviour Management, by frequent interaction between resident and
staff in individual and group counselling sessions, and by utilising crisis intervention
and problem-solving techniques.

Despite the guidelines in the manual that detail the types of behaviours that require the
counsellor to deploy a Behaviour Report, actual practices illustrate that there is a broad scope
for discretion in the issuance of Behaviour reports. One counsellor explained:

There is a lot of flexibility in deciding whether to give a BR... it is just one of the
forms of behaviour management or punishment whatever you want to call it. It is
pretty much up to staff discretion. Some staff give [BR’s]... a little easier than others”

An example of this discretionary power is evident in the following scenario:

Basically you have a lot of options... if a resident does a negative behaviour. Say the
resident has done a poor job on their chore and you have told them they need to do a
better job and they do not do it. You can give them a BR. But you can also say, look,
if you finish this chore and you do it well, there is this other chore... I am giving you
a choice either you don’t do your chore, you just say forget it and you can get a BR or
we can work out a deal here.
Thus, the issuance of a Behaviour Report is a discretionary practice that allows the decision-maker to choose how they wish to react to an offender’s behaviour; punishable behaviours include “anything...that we [staff] deem inappropriate”.

Disciplinary strategies assist in the deployment of responsibilization strategies. By implementing disciplinary technologies, such as treatment programs, the offender is provided with the opportunity to transform the self. The practice of monitoring and punishing offender’s for their success or failure to responsibilize the self constitutes the offender as a rationale consumer of treatment. As Garland (1996) explains there is “criminology of the self. that characterises offenders as rationale consumers, just like us” (461). Behaviour reports can then be seen as a technology that documents and indicates the extent to which the offenders’ are successfully governing the self. This reflects what O’Malley calls ‘prudentialism’ (1992). He defines this governing strategy as one that “throws back on the individual the responsibility for managing his or her own risk” (O’Malley 1992: 261). The programming provided at the Youth House is considered a service that provides an offender with the opportunity to transform the self. They make the decision to act in responsible ways and to actively participate in their rehabilitation. Behaviour reports are the means by which offenders are punished for not properly managing their own needs and risks, through a strategy of self-governance.

Self-governance is a neo-liberal strategy that requires the offender to take initiative and participate in his or her own rehabilitation. Deploying strategies that require offenders’ to manage their own needs and risk through participation in treatment programming is a form of governing at a distance (Rose 1993). The incorporation of private agencies in the correctional process responsibilizes the agency and staff within the facility as well as
individual offenders. This governing approach is closely linked to the previous policies relating to young offender, such as the old Juvenile Delinquent Act (JDA), did not hold youth adequately accountable and responsible for their action (Clark and Fleming 1993). This reflects the perceived failure of rehabilitation initiatives to reduce recidivism of young offenders. Reflecting these concerns the more recent Young Offender Act (YOA) outlines both responsibility and rehabilitation as key objectives of correctional legislation (Reid-MacNevin 2001). These two objectives do not work independently of each other. Offenders are expected to display a level of responsibility through rehabilitating the self. Thus, current governing strategies supply the offender with programs that provide opportunities to better govern their own behaviour.

Other technologies that symbolise this self-governance orientation include “dailies” and “progress notes”. “Dailies” are observational notes completed at the end of the day shift by the staff on duty. Their purpose is to document the offender’s mood, behaviour, and attitude during the day. This report is intended to reflect both the positive and negative behaviours of the offender. Positive behaviour is indicative of progress suggesting that the offender is effectively self-governing: that is, governing their own behaviour, modifying their behaviour and generally indicating a reformative attitude. Similarly, progress notes are used to monitor the degree to which the offender is attempting to achieve their Plan of Care goals. Achievement of these goals also indicates progress.

These tools also reflect a disciplinary mode of governing and facilitate risk-based governing strategies. They affect the identification of needs and hence the designation of the risk level of the offender. More specifically, it is through reviewing these various documents that the Youth Management Assessment (YMA) is revised. The YMA manual states:
It is highly recommended that they YMA be updated at least every 3 months in conjunction with a review of the clients’ Plan of Care. However, probation officers, case managers, or institutional staff may decide that it is appropriate to update clients’ YMA more frequently or prior to a Plan of care review. This is particularly the case if important, but previously unknown, information is revealed if the clients’ behaviour deteriorates, or if the client has successfully participated in a program relevant to his/her risk factors. (YMA Manual p12).

Thus, upon reviewing Behaviour Reports, Dailies, and progress towards Plan of Care goals, the YMA is modified, which may in turn change the risk status of the offender. Offenders that were once verified as a risk may be come ‘unverified’. One counsellor explained, “if the offender has been ‘verified’ as a risk to escape based on information we received from other custodial facilities and the offender has been at the Youth House for 3 months and has not attempted to escape. I would ‘unverify’ the offender as a risk for escape”.

The importance of reviewing offender’s progress and ensuring that it is reflected in the YMA is emphasised in the manual that states in bold letters:

Please note while using the previous YMA as an aid or guide, it is important that the assessor, is sensitive to new client information and any developments or changes in the clients environment. The assessor should not get “locked into” the previous assessment nor simply complete the update in an automatic thoughtless fashion. (YMA Assessment).

Updating the YMA illustrates a dynamic, case-work based, welfare approach to governance in which the offender’s well-being their rehabilitation and treatment are prioritised. An offender’s progress towards treatment goals is recorded in the YMA and has the effect of reducing their needs and risk. In contrast, the YMA can be revised to increase the offender’s risks. This practice is intended to ensure that the offender’s treatment needs and risks determined in part by the YMA, are reflected in the offender’s Plan of Care.
Risk governs offenders through incapacitation. Interventionist methods such as treatment programs are used to govern through freedom (Rose 1999). The extent to which an offender is assessed as risky is measured by the extent to which the offender has disciplined and resposibilized the 'self'. An offender’s active participation in managing their own risk factors and needs symbolises the adoption of specific lifestyles and habits that define normative structures necessary to reduce or eliminate the potential of re-offending. The extent to which the offender adopts such lifestyles represents progress in the program and is considered in the approval process for temporary release passes.

As previously stated the YMA is a risk technology that is revised in light of offender’s progress or deterioration. It is also used to determine the approval of temporary release passes. The approval of temporary passes is a reward for working towards and making the transition to 'normalisation': recognition that the offender may act “...freely-according to the rules of the rules of society taken” (Rose 1999: 71).

These passes serve as 'a means by which offenders are re-integrated into society. The approval of these passes symbolises the offender’s success in their effort to transform the self. They are a reward for self-governance. The decision to approve an offender’s request for a temporary release pass is contingent on the level of risk the offender poses to the community. The Interim Directive states “the fundamental need to ensure the safety of the public must be balanced against the principles of least possible interference with freedom in placement decisions related to young persons” (7). The decision to grant a temporary release also requires:

... careful assessment of the request, the criteria to be applied, and the risk, if any, to the community. Temporary release decisions will be used on an assessment of all relevant information. in particular the Plan of Care, the OMS Client Profile, the
institution file, the Pre-Disposition Report (if prepared), particulars of the current offence(s), the YMA, and LSI-OR or comparable classification tool, CPIC/FPS information and information regarding the young persons medical condition (Interim Report 10).

Therefore, the reflection of an offender’s progress, which translates into an increase or decrease of their designated risk level, serves as a way to grant the offender freedom based on their progress. According to Rose (1999).

...strategies which attempt to construct well-regulated liberty through creating practices of normality, rationality and sensibility... are practices [that] govern through freedom to the extent that they sought to invent the conditions in which subjects themselves would enact the responsibility that composed their liberties (72).

The YMA along with other risk technologies are considered in the approval process of temporary release passes. Of particular importance is the YMA. In this analysis, the YMA reflects the degree to which offenders have become responsible, 'ruly' subjects and self-governing. By incorporating offenders' progress in treatment programs into the YMA, the offenders' needs, and subsequently their risk, are decreased. The use of the YMA in this capacity illustrates the extent to which disciplinary strategies inform risk strategies.

The YMA is updated, according to one counsellor at this research site, "every 30 days like the Plan of Care". The continuous review of an offender's progress suggests that the YMA is not only a risk technology but also a venue where an offender's individual achievements can be recorded and acknowledged. The integration of offender progress as monitored through disciplinary technologies illustrates an inter-relationship between needs and risk. More importantly, it demonstrates how disciplinary technologies mobilise risk practices.
Summary

The complexity of the governing process is emphasised through examining the multiple ways in which risk technologies such as the YMA, disciplinary strategies such as the Plan of Care, responsibilization strategies such as Behaviour Reports and risk strategies such as the YMA are applied and utilised. The intersection of discipline, responsibilization and risk governing strategies illustrates that changing penal practices cannot be understood simply by juxtaposing past and current structures or rationalities. As evidenced by this research such comparisons result in totalising arguments that side step the complexity of the governing process.

This analysis illustrates the co-existence of various governing strategies. Disciplinary strategies, such as the Plan of Care, treat offenders by outlining ways in which to alter their lifestyles to reflect that of the disciplined citizen. Behaviour reports are responsibilization strategies. By punishing negative behaviours they reinforce normative behaviours. Success in the program, monitored through progress reports, results in rewards for offenders, if they reduce their needs and risk. Transforming the self creates the opportunities for offender to be re-integrated into society via Temporary Release Passes. The deployment and intersection of these various governing strategies illustrates the complexity of the governing process.

The various governing strategies deployed at this site to govern and treat offenders at challenges the notion that risk has displaced disciplinary strategies of governing. Risk strategies encounter disciplinary strategies and responsibilization strategies, and in that encounter, they, at times, work together and inform each other. The multitude of ways in which these strategies intersect, interact and are negotiated, specifies the complexity of the
governing process and indicate that risk thinking and technologies are not the exclusive or
even dominant form of governing at this research site.
CHAPTER 6

Discussion and Conclusion

In the current literature, risk technologies are considered as indicators of a larger shift in governing strategies (Hannah-Moffat 1999; Culprit 1999; Dean 1999; Lupton 1999; Simon and Feeley 1995; Feeley and Simon 1994, 1992). Contemporary literature on current penal practices suggests that risk technologies are used to increase security for custodial facilities, staff, and the community, as well as to identify offender’s treatment needs and risks (Hannah-Moffat 2000; Feeley and Simon 1992; O’Malley 1994). Little research has examined the actual practices of these technologies. It is through exploring the ways in which technologies are deployed and utilised that meaningful claims can be made as to how these technologies play out and what they represent to those who deploy them. Despite the larger correctional framework that emphasises governing offenders through risk, this research evidences that risk technologies have not displaced disciplinary governing strategies at the empirical site which I studied. My research reveals the intersection of risk, discipline and responsibilization strategies in the governance of offenders. Furthermore, it demonstrates that the ways in which the deployment of these strategies are affected by policies, job responsibilities and philosophies, by experts working in the Youth House field.

This research demonstrates that the deployment and enactment of risk technologies entails discretionary practices. Information is filtered through the screen of discretion that gives meaning to this information in light of ideologies, experiences, expertise, policies, procedures and program objectives. These diverse knowledges form a habitus (Garland 2001) and create a form of knowledge that make risk thinkable (Dean 1999:132). This is evidenced
by the ways in which risk is assessed, via the LSI and LOD. Risk factors differ based on the
habitus and discretion of the agent who is interpreting and defining them. The different ways
in which risk is taken up and shaped reflects Dean’s argument that the way in which the
identification and prediction of risk renders reality calculable and governable through
specific techniques and goals (Dean 1999: 131). These findings contribute a much needed
empirically grounded understanding of the ways in which technologies are deployed to the
risk literature.

The examination of the ways in which risk technologies (LSI, YMA and LOD) are
deployed challenges the notion that they represent a truly actuarial way of knowing.
Information necessitated by risk technologies is produced through an investigative, case-
work based process. Offenders are made known by soliciting and searching for information.
Moreover, the information provided by specific individuals is filtered through discretion and
is shaped by the habitus of the agent. Therefore what is known about the offender is neither
objective nor free of judgement. The transposition of this knowledge into risk technologies is
not an objective process of knowing but rather merely organises it in ways that appear to be
objective.

The different ways in which risk is taken up can also be explained by the discretion
necessitated by policies and laws. Counsellors, administrators, and probation officers are
mediators of law and policy. It is these members of the correctional system that ingest and
negotiate the larger political rationales concerning punishment. while at the same time, taking
into account and applying philosophies and negotiating organisational imperatives of their
local institution. Thus, risk practices take different forms due to the discretionary power of
both the agents and agency.
This is evidenced by the flow of information used to design treatment needs and identify risks. Not only is information used to govern offenders through risk and needs but it is initially and continuously accumulated and manufactured through other technologies that monitor offenders changing needs and risks. Information generated by disciplinary technologies is then recycled and feed back into risk technologies that modify and guide the ways the offenders, governing agents and the institution itself are governed. The interplay between information, risk and discipline illustrates a common dependency on information and a working relationship between these two distinct governing strategies.

Much of the literature on current penal practices addresses the displacement of risk and disciplinary strategies (Hannah-Moffat; Feeley and Simon 1992, 1994). Some scholars provide less totalitising arguments and make the claim that there is an overlap between these two strategies. For example, O’Malley argues that risk has re-shaped governing technologies but maintains, “discipline and risk are… not hostile to each other” (2000: 21). My research illustrates this point and provides further insight concerning the complexity of this relationship. This empirical investigation evidences that not only do risk-based and discipline technologies co-exist, but moreover the extent to which an offender is classified as a risk actually depends on the information generated through discipline techniques and the extent to which the offender has engaged in self-governance. Disciplinary technologies are therefore deployed to reduce risks. To further shed light on the complexity of the governing process, this study reveals that other governing strategies, specifically those designated to enhance responsibility are deployed to monitor the extent to which offenders have modified their behaviour which also feeds back into their risk level.
My research demonstrates that responsibilization strategies assist in mobilising both risk and discipline strategies. Through deploying responsibilization strategies, an offender's progress and participation in self-governance is documented. Offenders are disciplined for their failure to accomplish this goal through the removal of privileges and the application of punishment. This same information is used to evaluate the level of risk. If an offender has not responsibilized the self this will increase their level of risk as it illustrates a lack of self-discipline. Thus, responsibilization strategies play an important role in governing through both the discipline and risk.

In conjunction with risk technologies, this facility deploys several disciplinary technologies that aim to correct and normalise offenders. The extent to which offenders are exposed to treatment programs rather than simply managed through risk challenges the notion that risk has displaced discipline. It signifies the resilience of a care and welfare approach to punishment intertwined with a risk-based governance. On the one hand, offenders are punished for their past lifestyle choices, individual treatment needs are addressed and the facility attempts to provide structured environment in which offenders are trained to adopt normalised routines and lifestyles. A regime clearly grounded in a welfarist approach. On the other hand, risk technologies, characteristic of neo-liberal regimes, are evidenced at this site (i.e. LOD, LIS, and YMA) and are used to manage as well as treat offenders. The governing of young female offenders at this site is complex and reflects both penal-welfare and neo-liberal strategies of governance.

This research further evidences the conflation of needs and risks. Hannah-Moffat's work reveals that assessing treatment needs determines offenders' areas of risk. This research explores and adds to this insight. The YMA, a risk technology, is used to identify
risk and has a direct impact on the designing of treatment programs. This risk technology also documents offender progress and measures it through disciplinary technologies producing treatment needs subsequently reducing their risks. The extent to which an offender disciplines the self or self governs is reflected through achievement of treatment needs that inadvertently reduces risk. Thus discipline is inherent in risk and risk in discipline. This empirical research illustrates the feedback of information between risk and discipline.

The ways in which risk works with other governing strategies is illustrated in Chapter 5, which discusses the application of the YMA. The ways in which the YMA is used illustrates that this risk technology guides managerial and supervisory decisions. The YMA is informed by the information produced through responsibilization and disciplinary technologies. Moreover the YMA serves to inform both discipline and risk technologies. The YMA assists in identifying treatment goals, but also identifies risks that determine incapacitation and access to freedom (i.e. temporary release passes).

Another meaningful conclusion that arose from this research is the importance of information for the functionality of risk technologies. As evidenced in Chapter 4 and 5 information plays a dual role in risk technologies. As discussed previously the lack of information classifies offenders as unknown thereby increasing their level of risk. However, an abundance of information concerning an offender may also result in a high-risk categorisation. In the case where the offender is known via information, it is usually the case that this knowledge derives from the Criminal Justice System. A criminal history indicates that the offender has engaged in a criminal lifestyle prior to their current offence, hence they are classified as high risk based on past criminal behaviour. This is exemplified in the completion of the LSI that punishes offenders for their past offences and behaviours in
conjunction with their current offence and behaviours. In short, offenders are punished repeatedly for behaviours that are presumed to have brought them into conflict with the law rather than the offence they currently committed.

This research demonstrates the need to think about the multiple and complex strategies deployed to govern female offenders. Risk technologies, despite their prevalence within corrections, have not simply overtaken past governing strategies. This research illustrates the existence of multiple governing strategies and begins to unpack the complex relationship between them. My research also suggests the need for future research on the role of gender and age in the discretionary governance of young offenders.
Contributions and Further Research

There are several original aspects to my study. Firstly, the empirical site that I have chosen is unique in that it has yet to be examined or integrated within academic research projects. Little research has examined the governance of young offenders in light of risk strategies. My research has contributed to a broader understanding of the relationship between theoretical conceptions of governance and actual practices of governing. My interviews with counsellors and administrators and my analysis of operational policies bring new insights to actual governing practices of young female offenders.

Questions that have been raised in light of this research include the extent to which the categories of age and gender play out in the governing process. To draw meaningful conclusions about the role of these factors a comparative study must be conducted. Specific questions that need to be addressed are: Is there a link between the identified criminological needs and risks of female offenders and the constructs of women? Is the lack of specific “feminine” qualities considered a criminological need and risk? Are the programs designed by counsellor to reform young female offenders structured around dominant notions of femininity? What are the implications of gender specific programs and policies? What role does discretionary practices play in constructing notions of femininity and masculinity?
APPENDIX A: Interview Questions

Administrators

1. What is your job title?

2. Please explain your responsibilities.

3. How long have you held this position?

4. What are the objectives and goals of this program?

5. Briefly outline the Elizabeth Fry Society Philosophy?

6. What Ministry Guidelines are you required to follow?

7. What are the difference and/or similarities between the Elizabeth Fry Guidelines and the Ministry Guidelines?

8. Do you find it is difficult to integrate the two policies/guidelines?

9. Does the Ministry place any pressure on your facility to increase surveillance in light of moral panics? (perceived increase in crime rates or heinous youth crime that is highly publicised)?

10. What type of training do the counsellors receive?

11. In terms of treatment, are different programs deployed based on the Level of the Offender (i.e. Level 1 or Level 2).

12. What factors do you consider when approving a Temporary Release Pass?

13. Is the agency involved or consulted in designating offender as Level 1 or Level 2?

14. What are some of the constraints you agency deals (in terms of treatment, and management)?

15. Are you held accountable for illegal acts of the offenders while in the community?

16. How is the Plan of Care designed? What is the process?
17. Under what conditions are Behaviour Reports deployed?

18. How is the decision made to deploy a Behaviour Report? How does a counsellor decide what an appropriate 'consequences' is?

19. How is risk level assessed?

20. To what extent does the LSI and YMA influence the way in which offenders are treated and managed?

21. What is the impact of risk assessments?

22. How are staff members made aware of an offenders risk level?

23. What information is used to complete intake forms and the YMA?

24. How is information gathered or attained?

25. What are the benefits and drawback of employing risk assessment tools?

26. Which risk assessment tools are valuable. and Why?

27. What role does the offenders file play in assessing risk and designing treatment?

28. What role does information play in assessing risk and designing treatment programs?

29. What types of information are important when assessing risk and designing treatment?

30. How are treatment needs assessed and identified?
Counsellors

1. What is your job title?

2. Please explain your responsibilities.

3. How long have you held this position?

4. What are the responsibilities of primary counsellors?

5. How many “primary clients” do you have?

6. What are the objectives and goals of this program?

7. How do you communicate with your “clients”?

8. How do you design Plan of Cares?

9. What is the importance of information in designing Plan of Cares?

10. How do you define treatment needs?

11. How do you identify risks?

12. Do family members or guardians participate in designing treatment plans?

13. Do you observe offenders’ behaviour prior to designing treatment plans?

14. What role does medical records, psychological reports and offenders history play in designing treatment and assessing risks?

15. What type of guidelines must you follow when designing treatment plans?

16. What do you do when you have little information on the offender?

17. How do you deal with differences in the offender’s file?

18. How is risk level assessed?

19. Do you find the YMA useful?

20. Do you find the LSI useful?
21. How do you complete risk assessment tools?

22. Under what conditions are Behaviour Reports deployed?

23. How is the decision made to deploy a Behaviour Report?

24. How does a counsellor decide what an appropriate 'consequences' is?
APPENDIX B: Interview Consent Form for Participants

Interview Consent Form

You have been asked to participate in a M.A thesis. This project has been discussed and approved by the Executive Director of Elizabeth Fry. The interviews will be tape-recorded. Anything you say in the interviews is strictly confidential. Your name will not be associated with your comments. I will not include any information that could identify you or other individuals in the transcripts or notes made from the interviews. All audiotapes will be stored in a locked cabinet in my home during the duration of the study. Upon completion of my analysis the tapes will be destroyed.

Your participation in the study is completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions or end the interview at any time. I will make myself available to you at any time after the interview should you require any feedback. Upon completion of the study, if you are interested in the results of the study, I will provide you with a summary of the analysis. If you have any questions or concern about the research you can reach me via email at dballucci@hotmail.com.

This research has been reviewed and approved by my thesis committee and the ethics committee at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Windsor. Please sign the consent form if you are willing to participate.

Thank you for your time and participation

Consent Form

I have read and understood the above, and I am willing to participate in this research under the conditions specified on this page. I understand that participation is voluntary, that I have the right to withdrawal from the study at any time and that confidentially will be maintained.

Name (please print) ____________________________________________

Date __________________ Signature _____________________________

Signature of the Investigator ___________________________________
### APPENDIX C: Level 1 Offence List

#### LEVEL 1 OFFENCES

Level 1 offences include, but are not limited to, the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCC Section</th>
<th>Level 1 Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81.2.A</td>
<td>Causing injury with intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Use of a firearm during commission of offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>Pointing a firearm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Sexual interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Invitation to sexual touching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Sexual exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Incest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Anal intercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Bestiality, compelling, in presence of or by child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Parent or guardian procuring sexual activity by child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Householder permitting sexual activity by or in presence of child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Corrupting children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.1</td>
<td>Living off the avails of prostitution by a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.2</td>
<td>Obtaining sexual services of a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Causing death by criminal negligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Causing bodily harm by criminal negligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Attempt to commit murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Causing bodily harm with intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Overcoming resistance to commission of offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.3</td>
<td>Dangerous operation of motor vehicles, vessels &amp; aircraft causing bodily harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.4</td>
<td>Dangerous operation of motor vehicles, vessels &amp; aircraft causing death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.1</td>
<td>Impaired driving causing bodily harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.2</td>
<td>Impaired driving causing death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Criminal harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Assault with weapon or causing bodily harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Unlawfully causing bodily harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Assaulting a peace officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Sexual assault with weapon, threat to third party or causing bodily harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Aggravated sexual assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Kidnapping/forcible confinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Arson - disregard for human life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434.1</td>
<td>Arson - own property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Arson by negligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465.1.a</td>
<td>Conspiracy to commit murder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRAFFIC NARCOTICS**
**A. GENERAL RISK/NEED FACTORS**

1. **CRIMINAL HISTORY**
   - 1. Any prior y.o. dispositions (number = )
   - 2. Two or more prior adult/youth dispositions
   - 3. Three or more prior adult/youth dispositions
   - 4. Three or more present offences (number = )
   - 5. Arrested or charged under age 16
   - 6. Ever incarcerated upon adjudication
   - 7. Ever punished for institutional misconduct
   - 8. Charge lead, probation breached or parole suspended during prior community supervision

2. **EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT**
   - 9. Currently unemployed
   - 10. Frequent unemployment
   - 11. Never employed for full year
   - 12. Less than regular grade 10 or equivalent
   - 13. Less than regular grade 12 or equivalent
   - 14. Suspended or expelled at least once
   - 15. Participation/Performance
   - 16. Peer interactions
   - 17. Authority interactions

   **Subtotal**

3. **FAMILY/MARITAL**
   - 18. Dissatisfaction with marital or equiv. situation
   - 19. Nonrewarding, parental
   - 20. Nonrewarding, other relatives
   - 21. Criminal Family/Spouse

   **Subtotal**

4. **LEISURE/RECREATION**
   - 22. No recent participation in organized activity
   - 23. Could make better use of time

   **Subtotal**

5. **COMPANIONS**
   - 24. Some criminal acquaintances
   - 25. Some criminal friends
   - 26. No anti-criminal acquaintances
   - 27. No anti-criminal friends

   **Subtotal**

6. **PROCRIMINAL ATTITUDE/ORIENTATION**
   - 26. Support of crime
   - 29. Unfavourable toward convention
   - 30. Poor toward supervision
   - 31. Poor toward supervision treatment

   **Subtotal**

7. **SUBSTANCE ABUSE**
   - 32. Alcohol problem, ever
   - 33. Drug problem, ever
   - 34. Alcohol problem, currently
   - 35. Drug problem, currently
   - 36. Law violations
   - 37. Marital/Family
   - 38. School/Work
   - 39. Medical or other clinical indicator

   **Subtotal**

8. **ANTISOCIAL PATTERN**
   - 40. Specialized assessment for Antisocial pattern
   - 41. Early and diverse antisocial behaviour: Arrested/charged under age 11
     (item 5 ___)
     plus at least one of:
     - a. Offense record of assault violence
     - b. Escape history
     - c. Charge lead, probation breached or parole suspended during prior community supervision

   **Subtotal**

9. **PERSONAL PROBLEMS WITH CRIMINOGENIC POTENTIAL**
   - 42. Criminal attitude: At least one of:
     (item 26 ___), (item 29 ___)
     (item 31 ___)

   **Subtotal**

10. **HISTORY OF PERPETRATION**
    - 43. A pattern of generalized trouble: At least one of:
      Financial problems
      3 or more addresses changes

    **Subtotal**

11. **MISCONDUCT/BEHAVIOUR REPORT**
    - 44. Misconduct/Behaviour Report
    - 45. Current incarceration
      (number ___)

    **Subtotal**

12. **PRISON EXPERIENCE**
    - 46. Administrative segregation
    - 47. Records of misconduct

    **Subtotal**

13. **INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS**
    - 48. Last classification maximum
    - 49. Last classification medium

    **Subtotal**

---

**B. SPECIFIC RISK/NEED FACTORS**

1. **PERSONAL PROBLEMS WITH CRIMINOGENIC POTENTIAL**
   - 1. Clear problems or compliance (specific conditions)
   - 2. Diagnosis of "psychopathy"
   - 3. Diagnosis of other personality disorder
   - 4. Threat from third party
   - 5. Problem-solving/self-management skill deficits
   - 6. Anger management deficits
   - 7. Incest/Controlling
   - 8. Inappropriate sexual activity
   - 9. Poor social skills
   - 10. Feets outside age range
   - 11. Victimization
   - 12. Underachievement
   - 13. Outstanding charges
   - 14. Other (specify: ___)

2. **HISTORY OF PERPETRATION**
   - 1. Sexual assault (extramural)
   - 2. Sexual assault (intramural)
   - 3. Physical assault (extramural)
   - 4. Physical assault (intramural)
   - 5. Assault on an authority figure
   - 6. Weapon use
   - 7. Fire setting
   - 8. Escapes/U.A.L
   - 9. Impaired Driving

---
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**D. RISK/NEED SUMMARY**

Total LSI-OR Score _____
(From Section A)

Total Strengths _____
(From Section A)

Specific risk/need factors _____
(From Section B)

Summary of strengths (Positives: reasons for lowering security/supervision or releasing clients. From Section A)

Summary of added concerns (Negatives: reasons for increasing security/supervision or not releasing clients. From Sections B & C)

**E. RISK/NEED PROFILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>30+</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Category
- Attit. Subj. Pattern

**F. OTHER CLIENT ISSUES**

1. SOCIAL, HEALTH, AND MENTAL HEALTH
   - 1 Financial problems
   - 2 Homeless or transient
   - 3 Accommodation problems
   - 4 Health problems
   - 5 Depressed
   - 6 Physical disability
   - 7 Low self-esteem
   - 8 Shy/withdrawn
   - 9 Diagnosis of psychosis
   - 10 Suicide attempts/threat
   - 11 Learning disability
   - 12 Other evidence of emotional distress
      (Specify reason):

   - 13 Immigration issues
   - 14 Victim: family violence
   - 15 Victim: physical assault
   - 16 Victim: sexual assault
   - 17 Victim: emotional abuse
   - 18 Victim of neglect
   - 19 Other (specify):

2. BARRIER TO RELEASE
   - 1 Community supervision inappropriate

   (Specify reason):

**G. SPECIAL RESPONSIVITY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 1 Motivation as a barrier
- 2 Engages in denial/ minimization
- 3 Interpersonally anxious
- 4 Cultural issues
- 5 Ethnicity issues
- 6 Low intelligence
- 7 Communication issues
- 6 Other (specify):

**H. PROGRAM/PLACEMENT DECISION**

Type of Decision
- Institution, Secure/Open Custody

Recommendation/Decision
- Minimum
- Medium
- Maximum

Program/Institutional Placement
- Yes
- No

Community
- Minimum
- Moderate
- Maximum

Comments

Assessor's Name
Assessor's Position
Assessor's Signature
DD MM YY

Placement Decision
Explanations of different from above

Authorizing Name
Authorizing Position
Authorizing Signature
DD MM YY
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The following is supplementary information which may affect the offender's institution classification/reclassification, release planning or community supervision. The information should relate to factors checked on the LSI-OR form.

### I. DISPOSITION/SENTENCE LENGTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Admission Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Sentence Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Eligibility Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge Possible Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Warrant Expiry Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J. GENERAL AND SPECIFIC RISK/NEED FACTORS

#### CRIMINAL HISTORY

Information Source(s):

#### PREVIOUS OFFENCE(S) (Most Recent Serious Offence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Institution Placement (if applicable)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CIRCUMSTANCES OF CURRENT OFFENCE(S)

Information Source(s):

Details, including date of offence(s), type, planned/actual weapon type, victim's age/sex, extent of injuries, damage or value of goods, motive, remorse, etc.

Court Recommendations (if applicable):

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Information Source(s):
**L. DISCHARGE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Discharge/Completion:</th>
<th>Be</th>
<th>Fine Paid</th>
<th>Parole to Follow</th>
<th>Parole Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probation Complete</td>
<td>Parole Complete</td>
<td>Other (specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY (Recommendations for future placements)**

---

**Summary Completed by (Name/Title):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC MM YY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authorizing Signature:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC MM YY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document to be forwarded to
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### Youth Management Assessment

#### Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Potential Risk</th>
<th>Verified Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Previous Conviction(s) for Violent Offence (pg. 2')</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Current Offence(s) Involving Violence (pg. 3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Any Outstanding Charges (pg. 4)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problematic Behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Acts of Physical or Sexual Assault by Client (pg. 5)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assault(s) or Attempted Offences (pg. 6)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Incidents Involving the Use of Weapons (pg. 7)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Incidents of Fire Setting (pg. 8)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Escapes, Attempted Escapes and Serious OAF's (pg. 9)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Suicide Attempt(s) or Self-Inflicted Injury (pg. 10)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Characteristics**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Mental Disorder:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Clinical Diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Assessor Observations (pg. 11)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative Concerns**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Absence or Lack of Information (pg. 12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Part III

**Overall Assessment**

- Indicated Risk: [ ] Yes [ ] No

**Recommendations and Comments** (Residence Staff/Care Manager)

**Signature of Residence Staff/Care Manager:**

**Signature of House Director:**

**Recommendations and Comments** (Residential Liaison Officer)

**Signature of Residential Liaison Officer:**

*Note: This document is a youth client record and disclosure and use is subject to the provisions of the Young Offenders Act.*
### Part II: Detailed Inquiry

**PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS FOR VIOLENT OFFENCE (FACTOR ?)**

#### A. Type of Violence

1. **Narcotic victim:**
   - Physical: ☐
   - Psychological: ☐
   - Emotinal: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

2. **Use of a weapon:**
   - Yes (specify): ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

3. **Sexual violence of element of sexuality in offence:**
   - Yes: ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

4. **Specific element, weapon aggression, lack of purpose:**
   - Yes: ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

5. **Ritual or cult related:**
   - Yes (specify): ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

6. **Sex of victim:**
   - Female: ☐
   - Male: ☐

7. **Age of victim:**
   - Child: ☐
   - Youth (12-17): ☐
   - Adult: ☐
   - Elderly (65+): ☐

#### B. Situation

1. **Location of crime:**
   - Home: ☐
   - Public: ☐
   - School: ☐
   - Institution/Agency: ☐
   - Other (specify): ☐

2. **Incident that existed:**
   - Violent Offence: ☐
   - Commitment/Assignment: ☐
   - Substance Abuse: ☐
   - Injury: ☐
   - Other (specify): ☐

3. **Presence of others:**
   - Individuals: ☐
   - Groups/Gangs: ☐
   - Specify: ☐

4. **Family, cultural, and environmental context:**
   - Yes (specify): ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

#### C. Pattern of Violent Offences

1. **Number of convictions:**
   - Enter number: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

2. **Severity of offence:**
   - Minimum: ☐
   - Moderate: ☐
   - Severe: ☐

3. **Interval between most recent offences:**
   - Short (weeks): ☐
   - Moderate (months): ☐
   - Long (years): ☐

4. **Changing severity (trend) of the offending:**
   - Increasing: ☐
   - Decreasing: ☐
   - No Change: ☐

5. **Changing interval:**
   - More Frequent: ☐
   - No Change: ☐
   - Less Frequent: ☐

#### D. Motivation

1. **Hostile aggression, acting out, loss of control:**
   - Yes: ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

2. **Degree of planning or premeditation:**
   - Minimum/None: ☐
   - Moderate: ☐
   - Considerable: ☐

3. **Presence of cold, calculating aggression:**
   - Yes: ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

4. **Specific purpose of aggression:**
   - Control: ☐
   - Imposition: ☐
   - Material: ☐
   - Revenge: ☐
   - Self-Defense: ☐
   - Other (specify): ☐

5. **Opportunistic, impulsive aggression:**
   - Yes: ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

6. **Alcohol or drug-related aggression:**
   - Alcohol: ☐
   - Drugs: ☐
   - Other: ☐

#### E. Client Status

1. **Substance abuse status:**
   - Addict: ☐
   - Problem User: ☐
   - Occasional User: ☐
   - Substance: ☐

2. **Shows no remorse:**
   - Yes: ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

3. **Body type:**
   - Thin: ☐
   - Muscular: ☐
   - Average: ☐

4. **Developmental Stage:**
   - Early: ☐
   - Average: ☐
   - Late: ☐

5. **Perceptions of others:**
   - Accepting: ☐
   - Stigmatizing: ☐
   - Accept: ☐

6. **Victim of abuse:**
   - Physical: ☐
   - Sexual: ☐
   - Emotional: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

#### F. Intervention

1. **Response to previous sentence:**
   - Poor: ☐
   - Neutral: ☐
   - Good: ☐
   - Specify: ☐

2. **Response to previous incarceration:**
   - Poor: ☐
   - Neutral: ☐
   - Good: ☐
   - Specify: ☐

3. **Previous assessment result:**
   - Yes: ☐
   - No: ☐
   - Unknown: ☐

4. **Response to previous treatment/counseling:**
   - Refused: ☐
   - Poor: ☐
   - Neutral: ☐
   - Good: ☐

5. **Response to other assistance:**
   - Refused: ☐
   - Poor: ☐
   - Neutral: ☐
   - Good: ☐

**Verified Risk Factor:**
- Yes: ☐
- No: ☐

**Working Notes:**
### Part II: Detailed Inquiry

**ASSAULT OF AUTHORITY FIGURES (FACTOR 5)**

#### A. Type of Assault

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Harm to victim</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of weapon</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sexual violence or element of sexuality to assault</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Socioeconomic element, wanton aggression, lack of purpose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defiance of authority</td>
<td>Verbal Abuse</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Damage</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ritualistic or cult related</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sex of victim</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age of victim</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Youth (12-17)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Elderly (65+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Location of assault</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Instructor/Agency</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Incident that elicited assault</td>
<td>Confrontation/Altercation</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Material Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presence of others</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Groups/Gangs</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family, cultural and environmental context</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Pattern of Assaults

| 1. Charges laid, disposition | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 2. Related to offence against see Factors 1, 2 and 3 | Yes (specify) | No | Unknown |
| 3. Consistent context of assault | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 4. Restrains required | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 5. Number of victims | Unknown | Enter number |
| 6. Relation to victim | Parent | Teacher | Faculty Staff | Police | Other (specify) |
| 7. Most recent assault | Enter number of weeks ago |

#### D. Motivation

| 1. Hostile aggression, acting out, loss of control | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 2. Degree of planning or premeditation | Minimum/None | Moderate | Considerable |
| 3. Presence of date, calculating aggression | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 4. Specific purpose of aggression | Control | Material Gain | Revenge | Self Defence | Other (specify) |
| 5. Opportunity, impulsive aggression | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 6. Alcohol or drug-related aggression | Alcohol | Drugs (specify) |

#### E. Client Status

| 1. Substance abuse status | Accept | Problem User | Occasional User | *Substance |
| 2. Shows no remorse | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 3. Body type | Thin | Muscular | Average |
| 4. Developmental stage | Early Maturity | Average | Late Maturity |
| 5. Perceptions of behaviour | Accept | Neutralization Techniques | Blank | Rationalize | Deny | Minimize |
| 6. Victim of abuse | Physical | Sexual | Emotional |

#### F. Interventions

| 1. Response to sanctions/punishment | Poor | Neutral | Good |
| 2. Clinical assessment results | Yes (specify) | No | Unknown |
| 3. Response to treatment/counseling | Refuse | Poor | Neutral | Good |
| 4. Response to other assistance | Refuse | Poor | Neutral | Good |

**Verified Risk Factors:** Yes | No

**Working Notes:**
### OTHER ACTS OF PHYSICAL OR SEXUAL ASSAULT BY CLIENT (FACTOR 4)

#### A. Type of Assault

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Cruelty to animals</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Inappropriate sexual behaviour (persistent)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Threats, intimidation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assault of children</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assault of adult</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Harm to victim</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use of a weapon</td>
<td>Yes (specify type)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sexual violence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sudden behaviour, wanton aggression, lack of purpose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Location of assault</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Incident described as</td>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>Self-Defence</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presence of prior</td>
<td>Criminal Gangs</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family, cultural and environmental context</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sex of victim</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age of victim</td>
<td>Youth (12-17)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Elderly (65+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Pattern of Assault

| 1. First pattern (see Factors 1 and 2) | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 2. Suspicious | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 3. Documented events | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 4. Reason not changed | Yes (specify) | No | Unknown |

#### D. Motivation

| 1. Hostile aggression, acting out, loss of control | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 2. Degree of planning or premeditation | Minimum/None | Moderate | Considerable |
| 3. Presence of cold, calculating aggression | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 4. Specific motive of aggression | Control | Revenge | Self-Defence |
| 5. Opportunistic, impulsive aggression | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 6. Alcohol or drug-related aggression | Yes | No | Unknown |

#### E. Client Status

| 1. Substance abuse status | Addict | Non-Abuse User | Occasional User | Substance (specify) |
| 2. Shows remorse | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 3. Body type | Skinny | Muscular | Average | Fat |
| 4. Developmental stage | Early | Mature | Average | Late Mature |
| 5. Perceptions of behaviour | Accessible | Neutralization Techniques | Blame | Rationalize | Deny | Minimize |
| 6. Victim of abuse | Physical | Sexual | Emotional | Unknown |

#### F. Interventions

| 1. Response to sanctions/punishment | Poor | Neutral | Good | Other (specify) |
| 2. Clinical assessment results | Yes (specify) | No | Unknown |
| 3. Response to current treatment/counseling | Relaxed | Poor | Neutral | Good |
| 4. Response to other assistance | Relaxed | Poor | Neutral | Good |

**Working Notes:**
### Part IV: Detailed History

#### ANY OUTSTANDING CHARGE(S) (FACTOR 3)

**A. Uncertainty of Outcome**
- 1. Hostility toward antescharge(s)  
  - None
  - Some
  - Considerable
  - Unknown
- 2. Likelihood of lengthy sentence  
  - Minimum
  - Moderate
  - Strong
  - Unknown
- 3. Anxiety or fear about sentencing outcome  
  - Anxiety
  - Fear
  - Unknown

**B. Type of Charge(s)**
- 1. Presence of assault  
  - Violence
  - Sexual Assault
  - Unknown
- 2. Serious property offense  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown
- 3. Drug-related offense  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown
- 4. Related to previous offense (see Factors 1 & 2)  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown

**C. Type of Violence**
- 1. Harm to victim  
  - Physical
  - Psychological
  - Emotional
  - Unknown
- 2. Use of a weapon  
  - Yes (specify)
  - No
  - Unknown
- 3. Sexual violence or element of sexuality to offence  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown
- 4. Suggestive element to victim, aggression, lack of purpose  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown
- 5. Antisocial or cult-related  
  - Yes (specify)
  - No
  - Unknown
- 6. Sex of victim  
  - Female
  - Male
- 7. Age of victim  
  - Child
  - Youth (12-17)
  - Adult
  - Elderly (65+)

**D. Situation**
- 1. Location of charge  
  - Home
  - Public
  - School
  - Institution/Agency
  - Other (specify)
- 2. Incident that elicited charge  
  - Confrontation/Assault
  - Substance Abuse
  - Material Gain
- 3. Presence of others  
  - Individuals
  - Groups/Gangs
  - Other (specify)
- 4. Factor, culture, and environmental context  
  - Yes (specify)
  - No
  - Unknown

**E. Motivation**
- 1. Hostile aggression, acting out, loss of control  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown
- 2. Degree of planning or premeditation  
  - Minimum/None
  - Moderate
  - Considerable
- 3. Presence of cold, calculating aggression  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown
- 4. Specific purpose of aggression  
  - Revenge
  - Self-Defense
  - Other (specify)
- 5. Coercive or impulsive aggressor  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown
- 6. Alcohol or drug-related aggression  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown

**F. Client Status**
- 1. Substance abuse status  
  - Addict
  - Problem User
  - Occasional User
  - Other (specify)
- 2. Shows no remorse  
  - Yes
  - No
  - Unknown
- 3. Body type  
  - Thin
  - Muscular
  - Average
  - Average
- 4. Developmental stage  
  - Early Maturity
  - Average
  - Late Maturity
- 5. Perceptions of behavior  
  - Accept
  - Neutral
  - Deny
  - Minimize
- 6. Victim of abuse  
  - Physical
  - Sexual
  - Emotional
  - Unknown

**G. Interventions**
- 1. Response to custodial/treatment  
  - Poor
  - Neutral
  - Good
  - Other (specify)
- 2. Arrested for assault  
  - Yes (specify)
- 3. Response to current treatment counseling  
  - Reuse/Improved
  - Poor
  - Neutral
  - Good
- 4. Response to other assistance  
  - Reuse/Improved
  - Poor
  - Neutral
  - Good

**Verified Risk Factor:**
- Yes
- No

**Working Notes:**
A. Type of Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Custody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Custody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to previous pattern (see factor 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First offence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Type of Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harm to victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a weapon</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence or element of sexuality to offence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden element, wanton aggression, lack of purpose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritualistic or cult related</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of victims</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of victims</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Youth (12-17)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Elderly (65+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Institution/Agency</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incident that elicited offence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, cultural, and environmental context</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostile aggression, acting out, loss of control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of planning or premeditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of old, calculating aggression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific purpose of aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic, impulsive aggression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or drug-related aggression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Client Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Friction User</th>
<th>Occasional User</th>
<th>Substance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows no remorse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological type</td>
<td>Thrd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development stage</td>
<td>Early Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of behaviour</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Neutralization Techniques</td>
<td>Blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Sexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>*Specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to detention/risc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to current disposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary assessment results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to current treatment/counseling</td>
<td>Retarcd</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to other assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verified Risk Factor: Yes | No

Working Notes:
A. Use of Weapon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Type of weapon</th>
<th>Gun</th>
<th>Molotov</th>
<th>Knife</th>
<th>Explosive</th>
<th>Sharp heavy object</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Means of acquiring weapon</td>
<td>Bought</td>
<td>Earned</td>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>Stolen</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fascination for weapons</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collection of weapons, ammunition and weapon literatures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Foes, or purpose of weapon in incidents of offenses</td>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>Harm</td>
<td>Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Charges laid (See factors 1, 2, and 3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Harm to victim</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Element of sexuality to use</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sacral element, wanton aggression, lack of purpose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ritualistic or cult related</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Location of use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Institution/Agency</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Incident that elicited use</td>
<td>Physical Alteration</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Material Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presence of others</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Group/Gang</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family, cultural, and environmental context</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Pattern of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Total number of use</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Enter number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Frequency of use</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Harm in victim</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship to victim(s)</td>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Changing interval</td>
<td>Less frequent</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Most recent use</td>
<td>Enter number at weeks ago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Motivation

| 1. Hostile aggression, acting out, loss of control | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 2. Degree of planning or premeditation | Minimum | Moderate | Considerable |
| 3. Presence of cold, calculated aggression | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 4. Specific purpose of aggression | Control, intimidation | Material Gain | Revenge | Self Defence | Other (specify) |

E. Client Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Substance abuse status</th>
<th>Acute</th>
<th>Problem User</th>
<th>Occasional User</th>
<th>Substance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows no remorse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Body type</td>
<td>Thin</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developmental stage</td>
<td>Early Maturity</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Late Maturity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fencing of behaviour</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>*Neutralization Techniques</td>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>Rationalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Victim of abuse</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Interventions

| 1. Response to sanctions/punishment | Poor | Neutral | Good | Specify |
| 2. Response to assessment results | Unknown | No | Yes | Specify |
| 3. Response to previous treatment/counseling | Refused | Poor | Neutral | Good |
| 4. Response to other assistance | Refused | Poor | Neutral | Good |

Verified Risk Factor: Yes | No |

Working Notes:
INCI DENTS OF FIRE SETTING (FACTOR 7)

A. Fires

1. Location(s) of fire settings
   - Home
   - Public
   - School
   - Institution/Agency
   - Other (specify)

2. Magnitude of property damage
   - Minimum
   - Moderate
   - Severe

3. Injury to victims
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

4. Intentional impact
   - Physical Injury
   - Financial
   - Emotional

5. Potential for harm to victims
   - Minimum
   - Moderate
   - Severe

6. Situational or culprits related
   - Yes (specify)

B. Situation

1. Incident that sparked the setting
   - Common context
   - Substance Abuse
   - Material Gain

2. Presence of others
   - Yes (specify)
   - No
   - Unknown

C. Pattern of Fire Settings

1. Total number of fire settings
   - Unknown
   - Enter number

2. Severity of fire settings
   - Minimum
   - Moderate
   - Severe

3. Interval between most recent incident
   - Weeks (short)
   - Months (intermediate)
   - Years (long)

4. Changing severity
   - Decreasing
   - No Change
   - Increasing

5. Changing interval
   - Less Frequent
   - No Change
   - More Frequent

6. Most recent incident
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

D. Motivation

1. Hostile aggression, acting out, loss of control
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

2. Degree of planning/organization
   - Minimum
   - Moderate
   - Considerable

3. Presence of co-conspirators
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

4. Specific purpose of setting
   - Revenge
   - Self-Defence
   - Other (specify)

5. Opportunity, impulsive behaviour
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

6. Alcohol or drug-related behaviour
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

7. Concomitant behaviour
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

8. Accompanied by sexual arousal
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

E. Client Status

1. Substance abuse status
   - Active
   - Problem user
   - Occasional user

2. Shows no remorse
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unknown

3. Body type
   - Thin
   - Average
   - Fat

4. Developmental stage
   - Early
   - Mature

5. Perceptions of behaviour
   - Accept
   - Neutral
   - Deny

6. Victim of abuse
   - Physical
   - Sexual
   - Emotional

F. Interventions

1. Response to sanctions/punishment
   - Poor
   - Neutral
   - Good

2. Clinical assessment results
   - Yes (specify)

3. Response to current treatment/counseling
   - Refused
   - Poor
   - Neutral

4. Response to other assistance
   - Refused
   - Poor

Working Notes:
Part II: Detailed inquiry

ESCAPE(S), ATTEMPTED ESCAPE(S) AND SERIOUS UAL'S (FACTOR B)

A. Nature of Escape(s)

4. Duration of escape: ☐ Enter number of days ________
5. Means of apprehension: ☐ New Arrest ☐ Apprehended ☐ Turned self in ☐ During attempt to escape
6. Chances while at large: ☐ Yes (specify): ____________ ☐ NC ☐ Unknown
7. Victims of hostages: ☐ Yes ☐ NC ☐ Unknown ☐ Unknown ☐ Not applicable
8. Harm to victims of hostages: ☐ Yes ☐ NC ☐ Unknown ☐ Unknown ☐ Not applicable
9. Incident that enabled escape: ☐ Fear ☐ Follower ☐ Other (specify): ____________

B. Pattern of (Attempted) Escapes and UAL's

1. Total number of escapes/UAL: ☐ Unknown ☐ Enter number ________
2. Severity of escape: ☐ Damaging ☐ Risky ☐ Threat to others
3. Interval between escapes: ☐ Weeks (short): ____________ ☐ Years (long):
4. Changing severity: ☐ Decreasing ☐ No change ☐ Increasing
5. Changing interval: ☐ Less frequent ☐ More frequent ☐ No change
6. Most recent escape or attempted escape: ☐ Enter number of weeks ago ________

C. Motivation

1. Hostile aggression, acting out, loss of control: ☐ Yes ☐ NC ☐ Unknown
2. Degree of planning or premeditation: ☐ Minimal ☐ Moderate ☐ Considerable
3. Presence of goal, calculating aggression: ☐ Yes ☐ NC ☐ Unknown
4. Specific purpose of aggression: ☐ Revenge ☐ Sex ☐ Other (specify): ____________
5. Opportunistic, impulsive aggression: ☐ Yes ☐ NC ☐Unknown
6. Alcohol or drug-related aggression: ☐ Alcohol ☐ Drugs (specify): ____________
7. Family, cultural and environmental context: ☐ Yes ☐ NC ☐ Unknown
8. Ritualistic or cult related: ☐ Yes ☐ NC ☐ Unknown

D. Client Status

1. Substance abuse status: ☐ Addict ☐ Problem user ☐ Occasional user ☐ Substance ____________
2. Shows no remorse: ☐ Yes ☐ NC ☐ Unknown
3. Body type: ☐ Thin ☐ Muscular ☐ Obese ☐ Average
4. Developmental stage: ☐ Early Maturity ☐ Average ☐ Late Maturity
5. Perceptions of behaviour: ☐ Accept ☐ *Neutralization Techniques ☐ Blame ☐ Rationalize ☐ Deny ☐ Minimize
6. Vicissitudes of abuse: ☐ Physical ☐ Sexual ☐ Emotional ☐ Unknown

E. Interventions

1. Response to sanctions/punishment: ☐ Poor ☐ Neutral ☐ Good ☐ *Specify: ____________
2. Clinical assessment results: ☐ Yes (specify): ____________ ☐ NC ☐ Unknown
3. Response to treatment/counseling: ☐ Refused ☐ Poor ☐ Neutral ☐ Good
4. Response to other assistance: ☐ Refused ☐ Poor ☐ Neutral ☐ Good

Verified Risk Factor: ☐ Yes ☐ NC

Working Notes:

121
### Part II: Detailed Inquiry

#### SUICIDE ATTEMPTS OR SELF-INFLICTED INJURY (FACTOR 9)

**A. Type of Attempts**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Means attempted</td>
<td>Pills/Drugs</td>
<td>Knife/Sharp Object</td>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>Hanging</td>
<td>Asphyxiation/Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venoms</td>
<td>Jump</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Well planned event</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alcohol or drug related</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self-mutilation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ritualistic or cult related</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Pattern of Attempts**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total number of attempts</td>
<td>Enter number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Location of attempt</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Institution/Agency</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family history of suicide or attempted suicide</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interval between attempts</td>
<td>Days (short)</td>
<td>Months (intermediate)</td>
<td>Years (long)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Changing frequency between attempts</td>
<td>Less frequent</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>More frequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Most recent attempt</td>
<td>Enter number of weeks ago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Motivation for Attempts**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attention seeking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Client feels better after self-harm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mood disturbance, depression (see Factor 10)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Situational (event-related) depression</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medication status: prescription, status</td>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Client-related attempt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Presence of others, suicide pact</td>
<td>Fact</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Client Status**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thinking about method of attempt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Threatening, discussing, asking about suicide</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Putting affairs in order</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Written communication (letters, notes, diary)</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Withdrawn, lack of communication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Appeared to be recovering from depression</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spontaneous crying, tearful</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Change in sleep pattern</td>
<td>Too little</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Too much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Change in weight</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Recently incarcerated (72 hours)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Response to advice</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unable to cope with personal problems</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Feels</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Substance abuse status</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Victim of abuse</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Intervention**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clinical assessment results</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Response to sanctions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Response to treatment counseling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Response to other assistance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verified Risk Factor:** Yes | No

**Working Notes:**
### MENTAL HEALTH (FACTOR 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Clinical Diagnosis (Based on report)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental disorder with paranoid features</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressive behaviour disorder</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mental disorder related to aggression</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual deviation</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental disorder related to mood disturbance or self-harm</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental handicap (mental retardation)</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current mental status</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical assessment result</td>
<td>Yes (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Assessor Observations

| 1. History of aggressive or inappropriate sexual behaviour related to mental illness (see Factor 6) | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 2. History of self-inflicted injuries related to mental illness (see Factor 6) | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 3. Inappropriate behaviour | Yes (specify) | No | Unknown |
| 4. Recent thoughts of aggression (assault or sexual assault) | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 5. Drug-induced suspiciousness or paranoia | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 6. Drug-induced violence | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 7. Substance abuse status | Addict | Frequent use | Occasional use (specify) |
| 8. Associations of mental disorder | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 9. Reactivity to mental health interventions | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 10. Refusal of medication | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 11. Refusal to submit to assessment (see Factor 1) | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 12. Refusal to sign Form 14 (see Factor 10) | Yes | No | Unknown |

Verified Risk Factor: Yes | No

Working Notes:

### THIRD PARTY INFLUENCE (FACTOR 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Third Party who poses threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Young Offender: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Self: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Type of influence

| 1. Criminal family | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 2. Deeply entrenched in deviant or drug subculture | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 3. Commitment to violent subculture and/or criminal activity | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 4. Potential for cult related | Yes | No | Unknown |
| 5. Cultural and environmental origin | Yes | No | Unknown |

Verified Risk Factor: Yes | No

Working Notes:
A. Content of Missing Information:

1. Total lack of client information.
2. Specific important material missing.
3. Assessor suspicious of incomplete content.

B. Reason for Missing Information:

1. Preliminary report not ordered.
3. Client not forthcoming or cooperative.
4. Further information requested.

Verified Risk Factor:

Working Notes:

Part IV:

MANAGEMENT AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES FOR INDICATED YOUTH

Supervision:

1. Requires closer observation. Ongoing care to be reviewed at Plan of Care or as required.
2. Risk assessment necessary in subsequent days.
3. Residents present and capable to be reviewed regularly.
4. Other supervision strategies.

Crisis:

1. Resident confrontation - consider other method of interaction with youth.
2. Local crisis intervention procedures (includes calling police if necessary) to be activated immediately in the event of the following behaviors.
3. Staff not to back of prevent escape.
4. Other crisis strategies.

Restrictions:

1. Residents not to have access to potential weapons, tools, knives, etc.
2. Residents not to have access to matches, alcohol, or other hazardous substances.
3. Residents not to be authorized to operate motor vehicles.
4. Residents not to be restricted to property.
5. Temporary restrictions may apply under the following terms.
6. Other restrictions.

Plan:

1. Regular parental or legal guardian contact to be maintained.
2. Immediate response necessary to (specific).
3. Maintain premedication (specific).
4. Other strategies.
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