

Effectiveness of BC Community Corrections

As at February 8th, 2013

Released: [7 December 2011](#)

Discussed by the Public Accounts Committee: [24 April 2012](#)

Self-assessment conducted by Community Corrections Division, BC Corrections Branch, Ministry of Justice

Comments

“BC Community Corrections is pleased to provide this update on our progress to implement the recommendations outlined by the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) in its 2011 report “Effectiveness of BC Community Corrections.”

BC Corrections is recognized nationally and internationally as a leader in evidence-based program delivery, offender supervision and risk analysis. We are committed to enhancing public safety by assessing and responding to the risks and needs of a diverse population of adult offenders. We are also committed to ongoing continuous improvement by using performance measures to evaluate the effectiveness of particular approaches and to measure the overall impact of interventions.

In keeping with our commitment to continuous improvement, BC Community Corrections has placed a priority on addressing the issues identified by the Auditor General and has initiated the implementation of the eight recommendations. To date, we have fully or substantially implemented two of the recommendations and partially implemented the remaining six. It is our goal to fully or substantially implement all eight recommendations during 2013.”

Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY OF PROGRESS

SELF-ASSESSED STATUS

We recommend that the Community Corrections and Corporate Programs division:

Recommendation 1: publicly report its performance in reducing the overall rate of re-offending with a discussion of the role the CCCP plays, as well as the impact a performance measure that can change over time has on confirming program effectiveness.

Fully or substantially implemented

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The Corrections Branch has historically included branch level recidivism statistics in the Ministry’s Service Plan. We have refined this reporting so that the “Ministry of Justice 2012/2013-2013/2014 Service Plan” contains distinct re-offending rates for the Community Corrections Division. Re-offending rates will be reported in this manner on a scheduled yearly basis. Additionally, a plan is in place to provide access to re-offending rates by publishing a link to the Ministry of Justice Service Plan on the Corrections Branch outward facing website.”

All information has been provided by the organization and has not been audited.

<p>Recommendation 2: extend its evaluation framework to understand the effectiveness of contracted service providers and community programs in reducing re-offending.</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p>
--	------------------------------

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The Division is developing measurable key performance indicators to be included in all divisional contracts. Those key performance indicators, in conjunction with the Ministry templates and Ministry/Government policy, will be used to evaluate contract performance.

The B.C. Corrections Performance, Research, and Evaluation Unit conducts research to determine program effectiveness for internally supported and externally contracted programs. We will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of these services on an as needed or cyclical basis, as determined by the program’s evaluation framework.”

<p>Recommendation 3: complete a comprehensive impact assessment to determine if there are any gaps between its staff capacity and caseload level currently and in the future.</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p>
--	------------------------------

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The Division is finalizing the development of an assessment tool to examine staff capacity and caseload level that will inform high level strategic planning purposes, such as treasury board submissions and Capital Asset Management Planning.”

<p>Recommendation 4: confirm the courses required to supervise each case type and then update its policies to ensure probation officers complete the appropriate training before supervising offenders.</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p>
--	------------------------------

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The Division began a thorough review of its training program prior to the commencement of this audit. A key aspect of this review is to clarify guidelines that require a probation officer to complete specific training courses prior to being assigned corresponding supervision responsibilities. These guidelines will be clearly defined and communicated to staff. The Division is also developing tools to assist the Local Manager in tracking staff training.

The Division is presently developing a framework to provide more structure around Quality Management and Quality Assurance within the office. Enforcing policies around training and ensuring that Local Managers are effectively applying the available tools is included in this framework.”

<p>Recommendation 5: strengthen its quality assurance model to ensure it is consistently applied and provides accurate and complete information on the quality of probation officers’ work.</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p>
--	------------------------------

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The Division is strengthening its quality assurance model by incorporating it as an aspect of a larger quality management framework. A structure is being developed for a yearly Quality Management Plan that will be implemented as a method to ensure policy requirements are being met and that the quantity and quality of work is in keeping with existing policy.”

<p>Recommendation 6: ensure that probation officers thoroughly document their rationale for risk/needs assessment ratings and how offenders’ risks and needs will be effectively addressed.</p>	<p>Fully or substantially implemented</p>
--	---

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The Division has developed a new Case Management Form that requires probation officers to clearly document the factors that impact the risk/needs assessment ratings. This new Case Management Form, which is currently completing its final round of field consultation, requires probation officers to indicate the planned intervention(s) and the timeframe(s) in which they will be addressed.

Effective application of this new Case Management Form will be monitored through the enhanced Quality Assurance mentioned in recommendation #5.”

<p>Recommendation 7: ensure offenders receive and complete the interventions required in their case management plans.</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p>
--	------------------------------

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The new Case Management Form outlined in recommendation #6 will provide probation officers further structure in the area of applying interventions. The introduction of this new form coupled with enhancements to policy will support probation officers to properly identify, prioritize and target criminogenic needs through the application of appropriate interventions.”

<p>Recommendation 8: ensures that enforcement guidelines are consistently applied, and that all breaches are documented in compliance with policy.</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p>
---	------------------------------

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“As indicated in Recommendation #5, the Division is strengthening its quality assurance model through the introduction of a quality management framework. Ensuring that enforcement guidelines are being consistently applied and that breaches are documented in compliance with policy will be addressed through this enhanced quality assurance process.”

Managing for Results: Post-Secondary Accountability Framework Audit

As at February 4, 2013

Released: [2 December 2011](#)

Self-assessment conducted by the Ministry of Advanced Education, Innovation and Technology

Comments:

“Working on collaboration with an effective working committee of representatives from the public post-secondary system, the Accountability Framework has been a key component involved in defining the accountability reporting to government of the 25 public post-secondary institutions.

Since the report “Managing for Results: Post-Secondary Accountability Framework Audit”, government and each institution have signed a Government Letter of Expectations (GLE), reflecting agreement on respective roles and responsibilities, including high level strategic priorities and public policy issues. A paragraph about the Accountability Framework and the requirement for an annual Institutional Accountability Plan and Report was a component of each 2012/13 GLE.”

RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY OF PROGRESS	SELF-ASSESSED STATUS
<p>Recommendation 1: The Ministry of Advanced Education provide a clear line of sight and linkage of its strategic communications to institutions, including the accountability framework, to clearly communicate performance expectations for results to be achieved.</p>	<p>Fully or substantially implemented</p>

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The process for linking the accountability framework to other strategic communications was strengthened and made very clear in the development of the Government Letters of Expectations (GLE) for 2012/13.

Of the nine performance measures in the Ministry Service Plan for 2012/13, seven of the measures are drawn from Accountability Framework results, reflecting the centrality of the framework in this key Ministry document and directly addressing an issue identified by the OAG in its December 2011 report.”

<p>Recommendation 2: The Ministry of Advanced Education strengthen its current performance management processes and require that contingency plans be put into place for institutions where performance expectations are not being met. These plans should provide institutions with targets and time lines for addressing performance issues.</p>	<p>Fully or substantially implemented</p>
---	---

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“Institutions are required to address any missed targets in their Institutional Accountability Plans and Reports. During 2012, draft Accountability Plans and Reports were required of all institutions, and the Ministry executive contacted institutions to discuss the draft reports, stressing the need to address any missed targets.

The 2012/13 Government Letters of Expectations signed between the Ministry and each institution includes wording that the Institutional Accountability Plan and Report will demonstrate linkages with government’s goals, strategies and performance measures. Further expectations with regard to missed targets are identified in this letter.

The Ministry’s Fiscal Management Plan provides a framework for managing institutions’ fiscal performance. Institutions at risk of not meeting financial accountabilities are required to provide detailed supporting information, including key drivers of the financial risk, options for resolution and timelines. Four institutions have been through this process since December 2011, and all have had positive outcomes with low- to no-impacts to students.”

<p>Recommendation 3: The Ministry of Advanced Education review its targets for institutions on a regular basis to ensure they are both challenging and achievable. Targets where institutions are consistently falling short, or have consistently exceeded them, should be reviewed as a matter of priority.</p>	<p>Fully or substantially implemented</p>
--	---

Actions taken, results and/or actions planned:

“The Performance Measures Working Group has resumed regular meetings with a comprehensive annual work plan that includes a scheduled review of targets on an ongoing basis. The credentials target (a measure of efficiency) and the loan repayment as a percent of income target (a measure of access) have both been reviewed and changed.

Additional improvements during 2012/13 include refinement of the participation rate measure, development of a system level retention measure, the inclusion of apprenticeship student outcomes data in the assessment of skills development, and improvement to the currency of research funding.

The Ministry routinely reviews individual institution targets and follows up with institutions who routinely exceed or under-deliver on targets. For example, the Ministry has initiated ongoing discussions with two institutions that have not met their Student FTE targets in the area of Developmental programming.”