——————— Research Report ———————

The Tupiq Program for Inuit Sexual Offenders: A Preliminary Investigation

This report is also available in French. Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Veuillez vous adresser à la direction de la recherche, Service Correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9. Should additional copies be required they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave., West, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0P9.

2004 N^{o} R-153

The Tupiq Program for Inuit Sexual Offenders: A Preliminary Investigation

Shelley Trevethan
John-Patrick Moore
& Leesie Naqitarvik

Research Branch
Correctional Service of Canada

May 2004

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This project examined the Tupiq program, a highly innovative pilot project aimed at providing culturally-appropriate treatment for Inuit sex offenders incarcerated in federal correctional facilities. Inuit offenders who meet the program's eligibility criteria are transferred from throughout the federal correctional system to Fenbrook Institution, a medium-security federal penitentiary located in Gravenhurst, Ontario. There, they participate in an intensive 16-week treatment program. Developed in 2000, the program is a cognitive-behavioural, multi-model, high-intensity program designed for federal Inuit offenders who have offence histories relating to sexual violence. The program was developed, based on Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) national program standards for sex offender treatment programs.

To date, 34 Inuit offenders have participated in the Tupiq program. In many respects, the program is a "work in progress". Therefore, it is too soon to consider a comprehensive assessment. However, before the current program model is permanently implemented, consideration should be given to several key program design issues.

The research involved an examination of how the Tupiq program operates and an outcome evaluation of offenders who participated in the program (compared to a matched comparison group of Inuit sex offenders serving time in federal correctional facilities who did not participate in the program). This included an examination of offender files, interviews with 24 program participants, interviews with eight program facilitators, and interviews with other key informants (including 20 staff at Fenbrook Institution and 19 community members involved in the program).

Program Success

Based on the small number of participants who have gone through the program to date, the Tupiq program has shown some success. First of all, 93% of the participants

completed the Tupiq program. This is important since typically many Inuit offenders do not complete programs (Hamilton, 2002). Furthermore, positive changes have been seen in the attitudes of participants who completed the program, including a decrease in need, in particular relating to personal/emotional issues and substance abuse, and fewer endorsements of distortions relating to their crime. In interviews with participants, facilitators and key informants, all indicated that they were satisfied with the program and felt that it had a positive benefit on participants. Positive changes are also evident in participants' risk - including a lower risk to sexually re-offend and increased reintegration potential. It is too soon to see substantial behavioural changes, since only 11 of the participants have been released. Of those released, no significant differences were found in the percent of re-admissions to federal custody between Tupiq participants and a matched comparison group. Three of the eleven participants who were released following the program were re-admitted. Two were re-admitted for technical violations relating to the use of substances and one was re-admitted for the commission of a new offence. The remaining eight offenders released have been safely reintegrated into society for about one year.

The goals of the Tupiq program, as stated in the program manual are very broad. For instance, some goals are that the Tupiq program will reduce the recidivism rate among Inuit federal offenders, the number of` federal Inuit offenders being detained by the National Parole Board (NPB) will be significantly reduced, and Inuit communities will be actively involved in relapse prevention. Because the goals are so broad, not surprisingly, the Tupiq program has not had an impact on these goals. In order to conduct a more fair examination of the program, the program goals should be modified to adequately reflect what changes the program could realistically produce.

Program Design

The Tupiq program was developed based upon a recognized need to address the issues that Inuit offenders are facing (e.g., histories of sexual offending, spousal and child abuse). Furthermore, it represents current “state-of-the-art” content with respect to

the provision of culturally-appropriate programming for Inuit sex offenders (see Marshall & Williams, 2001). Although there is face validity to the program, the aspects of Western and Inuit programming that contribute most and least to the program's effectiveness has not yet been established.

The appropriate participants are being screened into the Tupiq program. With the exception of one session that included non-sex offenders, all other participants are Inuit with at least one federal conviction for a sex offence. Furthermore, participants of the program have been assessed by a psychologist as requiring moderate- or high-intensity sex offender programming, which make them appropriate candidates for the Tupiq program.

Although the research indicates that the involvement of family members and victims would be beneficial to participants, their involvement is absent or limited. Strategies for greater involvement of family members should be sought. However, the issue of victim involvement is complex and may re-victimize the victim. The involvement of community links is clearly an important aspect of the Tupiq program and greater involvement of community links would be beneficial for participants.

It is clear that there are experienced facilitators involved in the program - and the skills of the facilitators complement one another. In particular, the importance of the Inuit healers was stressed. However, it will be difficult to maintain the success of the Tupiq program without a continuing presence of a core group of facilitators. Furthermore, it is necessary to address the problems that staff are experiencing. An initial orientation session that covers information about the institution, offenders and the program should become mandatory. Further, it is important to enhance communication between facilitators, as well as between Tupiq staff and other institutional staff.

This report examines issues the program faces - in particular the cost of delivering the program, and the fact that it is not currently designed to address the needs of non-sex offenders. Suggestions for modifying and/or adapting the program to increase

effectiveness, while achieving overall economies of scale are discussed. Although there may be more effective and cost efficient ways to run the Tupiq program, program delivery is currently based upon a number of practical considerations. For instance, the program may be more effective if spread out over a longer period of time, allowing participants time for reflection. However, the decision to run an intense 16-week program is largely dictated by practical considerations related to the contracting of program staff. A longer and less intense program could be considered if program staff were otherwise occupied in providing different program modules to other Inuit offenders.

Finally, it is clear that the Tupiq program is costly to operate. There are some good reasons why the program costs what it does to operate, however, there may be some options for reducing the costs. These options should be thought through in terms of the impact they would have on the success of the program. For instance, it is important to maintain, and in fact increase, the involvement of Inuit facilitators and healers. Some reductions in costs could be achieved by reducing management costs once the program is more stable. Finally, if the program were structured in such a way that it was run consistently, hiring permanent staff may be a viable option.

Continuum of Care

Another issue raised in this research relates to the provision of a continuum of care for Inuit sex offenders. For many Inuit sex offenders, the opportunity to participate in the program may come early in their sentence, and culturally-appropriate options for maintenance, supervision and follow-up in the community are limited. The absence of follow-up and community components impairs the overall effectiveness of the program.

The creation of community links within the auspices of the Tupiq program is a key to community support upon release. However, these community links do not typically continue once the program is finished. The development of mechanisms to ensure the continued involvement of community links with participants after the program has ended and upon release would help in the reintegration process.

There could be advantages to changing the location of the program, although the support of Fenbrook staff and administrators has been an important factor in the success of the program to date. Offering the program in the North is an option that should be considered. Synergies could be achieved with the programs of the Nunavut correctional service, there would be more opportunities to develop a continuum of institutional and community care, costs of involving external resources would be significantly reduced, and there would be a much larger pool of qualified staff to draw upon.

Suggestions for Program Improvement

Based on the research, the following are some areas to consider for improving the program:

- Revise the goals of program to make them more in line with what the program could realistically be expected to achieve.
- Ensure that the program, as currently designed, focuses on the appropriate offender types. For instance, the program was developed for use with sex offenders and is not appropriate for non-sexual offenders.
- Ensure case managers have a good understanding of the program criteria so that they are referring appropriate candidates to the Tupiq program.
- Further develop the initial assessment process in place for Inuit offenders - to ensure appropriate candidates are being screened into the Tupiq program.
- Ensure the appropriate number of participants in each session (8-12 participants). In order to do so, procedures for more outreach to other institutions should be implemented.
- Examine the possibility of modularizing the Tupiq program to provide flexibility in the programming needs of Inuit offenders. Alternatively, develop components or separate programs that focus on substance abuse and gambling.

- Modify components of the program (e.g., self management) to more fully incorporate Inuit culture. Discuss options to enhance the role of Inuit healers in the program.
- Conduct orientation sessions for new Tupiq facilitators and ensure weekly meetings.
- Enhance the involvement of Tupiq staff with other program staff and institutional staff generally.
- Stabilize the program - including confirming program funding and staff.
- Further discuss the benefits of involving family members and victims.
- Develop procedures to ensure appropriate community links are being chosen; more fully involve community links during, and upon completion of, the program.
- Consider options for reducing the cost of the program.
- Examine additional ways to enhance the reintegration and community component of the Tupiq program, such as the development of a maintenance program in the community, or the possibility of delivering the program in the North.
- Develop appropriate pre/post-test measures for the program. For instance, additional pre- and post-assessment measures of attitude that are sensitive to change.

Furthermore, the following are some suggestions for further research:

- Once the program has run for a longer period of time and more participants have been released - examine recidivism and the long-term development of offenders.
- Conduct further research on which aspects of Western and Inuit programming contribute the most and least to the program's effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the facilitators of the Tupiq program for their assistance and expertise in this project. For the fifth cycle of the Tupiq program, the team included: a program director (Ellen Hamilton), a clinical director (Dana Anderson), three co-facilitators (Pitsula Akavak, Myna Ishulutak, Leena Evic), and two traditional Inuit healers (Meeka Arnakag, Abraham Arnakag). Moosa Akavak was a facilitator in previous cycles of the program.

The Aboriginal Initiatives Branch of CSC partially funded this project. In particular, the authors would like to thank Paul Sonnichsen, Lisa Allgaier and Jim Laplante for their support and assistance in initiating this project. In addition, various people from the Programs Branch provided their expertise. These included Natalie Gabora-Roth, Lynn Stewart and Randy Mason.

A special thanks to CSC staff from the Research Branch who contributed to this project, including: Michael Jeffery, Nicole Mulligan, Collette Cousineau and Christopher Rastin.

The authors would like to thank the staff from Fenbrook institution for all of their assistance. This project could not have been completed successfully without the help of Michael Provan (Warden), Jim Spicer (Tupiq Staff Program Liaison), and Sandra Lewis-DenOtter (Regional Headquarters - Ontario Region). Furthermore, we'd like to thank the staff we interviewed for discussing their experiences and providing valuable insight into the program.

We would also like to thank the individuals who serve as community links for the Tupiq program for taking the time to discuss their perspectives on the Tupiq program.

Finally, we would like to thank the offenders who took the time to take part in the interviews. We appreciate their candour and openness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This project examined the Tupiq program currently being utilized for Inuit sex offenders at Fenbrook Institution in Gravenhurst Ontario. This involved the following components: a process examination of how the Tupiq program operates and how it compares to other sex offender programs in place; an examination of offenders who have participated in the program (in comparison to other offenders); interviews with program participants; interviews with program facilitators; and interviews with other key informants (including staff at Fenbrook and community members involved in the program).

Inuit Offenders

Over the last few years, there has been a growing interest in Aboriginal sex offenders, and more specifically Inuit sex offenders. This is due to the recognition that sexual assault is as serious a problem in Aboriginal communities as in mainstream society. Moreover, it is recognized that the incarceration and recidivism rates of Aboriginal sex offenders are higher than amongst non-Aboriginal sex offenders (Williams, Vallée & Staubi, 1997).

Many reports have illustrated that Aboriginal persons are over-represented within the criminal justice system (e.g., Nunavut Corrections Planning Committee, 1999; Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996; Solicitor General of Canada, 1988; Trevethan, Tremblay and Carter, 2000). As reported by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) (1996) "Reports and inquiries… have not only confirmed the fact of over-representation [of Aboriginal offenders in the criminal justice system] but, most alarmingly, have demonstrated that the problem is getting worse, not better". The January 2001 Speech from the Throne illustrates the priority of addressing issues facing Aboriginal people. It says:

> *…it is a tragic reality that too many Aboriginal people are finding themselves in conflict with the law. Canada must take the measures needed to significantly reduce the percentage of Aboriginal people entering the criminal justice system, so that within a generation it is no higher than the Canadian average.*
> (Government of Canada, 2001)

As with other Aboriginal groups, Inuit people are over-represented within the federal correctional system. Although they comprise 0.1% of the Canadian population, Inuit offenders account for about 1% of the federal inmate population (CSC, 2002). Currently, there are approximately 100 Inuit offenders incarcerated in federal correctional facilities, and another 30 serving time in the community.

It is becoming clearer that Inuit offenders differ fairly dramatically from First Nations and Métis offenders. The differences are reflected in their lifestyle, the offences for which they are incarcerated, and their needs for programming (CSC, 2002; Evans, Hann & Nuffield, 1998; Faulkner, 1989; Moore, 2002; Motiuk & Nafekh, 2000; Nunavut Department of Justice, 2001, Tupiq Program, 2002). Unlike many First Nations and Métis, Inuit offenders tend to be arrested in the north, typically the Northwest Territories, Nunavut, or Labrador (CSC, 2002). Furthermore, Moore (2002) found that the crimes for which Inuit are incarcerated are frequently of a sexual nature. About two-thirds are currently incarcerated for sex offences, which is substantially larger than First Nations, Métis, and non-Aboriginal offenders. The severity of these crimes appears to be reflected in their assessed level of risk. While Aboriginal offenders, in general, are rated as greater to re-offend than non-Aboriginal offenders, larger proportions of Inuit offenders are classified as high risk to re-offend at intake than First Nations, Métis, and non-Aboriginal offenders. Inuit offenders also are rated as having greater overall need for intervention than other groups. Large proportions are rated as having some/considerable need in the areas of personal/emotional, substance abuse and marital/family issues. These differences may indicate a need for different programs or interventions for Inuit offenders.

According to Hamilton (2003), the Inuit offender population is a remarkably consistent group in terms of criminal profile and correctional needs. The vast majority of Inuit offenders are from small, Arctic communities to which they plan to return, and most speak Inuktitut as a first language. They are usually incarcerated for violent offences, predominantly sexual offences, and most are at risk of family violence. They have similar backgrounds, where exacerbating factors include substance abuse, a criminal past, violence in the home and failure to complete high school. Raised in dysfunctional homes, many Inuit offenders did not have the full benefits of their culture when growing up, a deficit that can only be addressed by programming that incorporates pro-social Inuit values and lifestyle. Culturally appropriate intervention at all levels, including at the level of the federal corrections system, is imperative as a means of breaking the patterns of abuse and violence that perpetuate crime.

Aboriginal-Specific Programs

A number of studies have found that many Aboriginal offenders were raised without Aboriginal language, culture, teachings or ceremonies (Ellerby & MacPherson, 2002; Heckbert & Turkington, 2001; Johnston, 1997; Trevethan, Auger, Moore, MacDonald & Sinclair, 2001). However, these core aspects of Aboriginal identity appear critical to the healing process. It is important to provide Aboriginal offenders with the opportunity to participate in programs that introduce Aboriginal culture and spirituality or allow them to continue to develop their understanding. Further, the ability of a program to aid Aboriginal offenders acquire the skills to manage their risk to re-offend may be heightened by a cultural approach. According to Heckbert and Turkington (2001), Aboriginal spirituality and cultural activities are major factors in successful reintegration.

Further, a few studies indicate that programs may be more effective if run by Aboriginal facilitators. For instance, Johnston (1997) found that Aboriginal offenders said they are more trusting and comfortable with Aboriginal facilitators, especially spiritual leaders and Elders. Similarly, Mals, Howell, Day and Hall (1999) found that to enhance the effectiveness of correctional programs and treatment in Australia, it is important to have

Aboriginal facilitators in place. These findings suggest that the treatment effect of programs may be improved if Aboriginal facilitators are in place.

The Correctional Service of Canada is moving towards the utilization of Aboriginal-specific programs. Sections 79-84 of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (*CCRA*) (Department of Justice Canada, 1992) mandate CSC to provide Aboriginal-specific programs and services to Aboriginal offenders. Furthermore, Commissioner's Directive 702 on Aboriginal programming recognizes that "differences in cultural approaches to learning require different techniques" and stipulates the requirement for regions to provide Aboriginal offenders with culturally-specific programs, activities and Elder services (CSC, 1995).

In terms of programming for Aboriginal offenders, the development of a national healing program for Aboriginal offenders in federal facilities is underway. Furthermore, healing lodges under Section 81 of the *CCRA* have been implemented in a number of provinces. Section 81 of the *CCRA* allows Aboriginal communities to provide correctional services. Healing lodges are meant to aid Aboriginal offenders in their successful reintegration by using traditional healing methods, specifically, holistic and culturally-appropriate programming.

In 1999, 13 Aboriginal-specific programs were identified for federal offenders (Epprecht, 2000). These programs address a wide range of issues, including substance abuse, sex offender programming, and anger management. Since that time, other Aboriginal-specific programs have been developed. For instance, a number of institutions are currently providing the "In Search of Your Warrior" program, which focuses on helping Aboriginal offenders break their cycle of violence. The foundation for this program is the culture, teachings and ceremonies of Aboriginal people.

There are also a few Aboriginal sex offender programs operating in Canada, utilizing unique mandates and client group characteristics that reflect unique program histories and approaches (Hylton, 2003). The Clearwater program is one of the oldest and most

well established sex offender treatment programs within the CSC system. The program was not designed specifically for Aboriginal sex offenders but, at any one time, a majority of the participants are usually Aboriginal. As a result, program staff have considerable experience in dealing with Aboriginal sex offenders. The Native Clan Organization of Manitoba delivers blended traditional healing/contemporary treatment program for Aboriginal sexual offenders. The Mamisaq Qamutiik program offered at the Baffin Correctional Centre (BCC) in Iqaluit is a multi-faced program. It consists of a number of separate program modules that address issues related to violence, grief and loss, alcohol and substance abuse, and sex offending. Finally, as will be discussed in this report, Fenbrook medium-security institution delivers an Inuit-specific sex offender program. The "Tupiq" program follows universally-accepted relapse prevention theory, however integrates Inuit culture by utilizing Inuit delivery staff, healing therapy and cultural references.

A few studies have found that Aboriginal-specific programming is more effective for Aboriginal offenders than more conventional correctional programs. For instance, Weekes and Millson (1994) found that an Aboriginal pre-treatment substance abuse program produces significant improvement in knowledge and attitudes regarding substance abuse, general problem solving, and recognition of Aboriginal cultural factors. Ellerby and MacPherson (2002) found that, prior to the introduction of a blended traditional healing/contemporary treatment program for Aboriginal sexual offenders, treatment completion rates were lower for Aboriginal than non-Aboriginal offenders. However, once culturally relevant and appropriate programming became available, this difference disappeared. Sioui and Thibault (2001) found that certain programs are more effective in reducing recidivism if they are Aboriginal-specific.

Both Johnston (1997) and Sioui and Thibault (2001) conclude that there is little access to Aboriginal-specific programs. However, Sioui and Thibault argue that Aboriginal-specific programs provide positive results.

When Inuit offenders enter federal institutions they are typically identified as "Aboriginal", which tends to refer to “First Nations”. Consequently, there are minimal programs and services geared towards the specific needs of Inuit inmates. Due to the lack of knowledge and/or understanding of these specific needs, Inuit inmates are provided with programs and services that include practices that are not part of Inuit culture and way of life. For example, although there are sweat lodges, sweet grass ceremonies, Elders, and healing programs, these programs and services are based upon, or only include, "First Nation" culture, and do not take into consideration the unique cultural differences between Canada's Aboriginal population. Without some understanding of cultural differences between First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultures, the appropriate services and supports for Inuit during their incarceration will continue to be left unmet. This can result in Inuit offenders being unhealthy and not rehabilitated for the successful reintegration back into their community.

Because of their over-representation within the federal correctional system, and because the Aboriginal processes in place may not be appropriate for them, Inuit offenders may require special programs. The Tupiq program was developed in order to address the needs of Inuit offenders, by delivering a sex offender program which incorporates linguistic and cultural aspects of Inuit culture.

Tupiq Program

The Tupiq program is an innovative program that provides culturally-appropriate treatment for Inuit sex offenders incarcerated in federal correctional facilities. Inuit offenders who meet the program’s eligibility criteria are transferred from throughout the federal correctional system to Fenbrook Institution, a medium-security federal correctional facility located in Gravenhurst, Ontario.

The program is a cognitive-behavioural, multi-model, high-intensity program designed for federal Inuit offenders who have offence histories relating to sexual and/or family violence (Hamilton, 2002). The program is based on a social learning model, which

conceptualizes violence against women and children as a learned pattern of behaviour that can be modified. It trains the participants in culturally appropriate cognitive-behavioural techniques that will allow them to identify their abusive behaviours and replace them with alternative skills and behaviours that help to form positive non-abusive relationships.

Key to the program is a holistic approach, bilingual delivery in Inuktitut and English, motivational techniques designed to meet specific learning needs, links to the offender's Inuit community through program content and community counsellors, and highly skilled Inuit facilitators modelling pro-social behaviour. The program is multi-faceted and relies on several different treatment modalities, including therapeutic groups, an Inuit Healing process, links to relapse prevention support in Inuit communities, education, skills training, relapse prevention instruction, and individual counselling.

Present Study

It appears that a program such as the Tupiq program, designed specifically to meet the needs of Inuit offenders, is useful. However, the program is costly and the effectiveness of the program has not yet been examined. Therefore, the present study was conducted to examine the Tupiq program. It should be noted that the program is still quite new and, therefore, it is too soon to consider a comprehensive assessment. However, before the current program model is permanently implemented, an initial examination is warranted. The major research questions for this study include:

1. What is the Tupiq program?
2. What are the characteristics of offenders who have participated in the Tupiq program?
3. Are the goals of the Tupiq program being met?
4. How effective is the Tupiq program?
5. How can the Tupiq program be improved?
6. To what extent can the Tupiq program be adapted?

This information should help CSC to better understand whether the Tupiq program is working as it is intended and can provide information on how to improve the program and/or adapt it for use elsewhere.

METHODOLOGY

In order to address the research questions, a number of data sources were utilized, including:

- Program documentation
- Offender files
- Interviews with program participants
- Interviews with program facilitators
- Interviews with other key informants

Program Documentation

An extensive examination of program documentation was undertaken. This included the program manual, forms completed by participants and facilitators, and any other available documentation. In addition, the researchers met with the Warden and other staff at Fenbrook institution, as well as program facilitators, to discuss the origins of the program, program goals, and the development of the program.

Offender Files

A review of the case files of the 27 participants' of the Tupiq sex offender program was undertaken, using CSC's Offender Management System (OMS). The seven participants of the Tupiq program that were not sex offenders were excluded from the analyses. Information on the socio-demographic characteristics of the offenders, current offence, criminal history, static and dynamic factors, and program participation was examined. This information was primarily gathered through the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process and subsequent assessments. CSC's OIA process collects and stores information on each federal offender's criminal and mental health background, social situation and education, factors relevant to determining criminal risk (such as number, variety of convictions and previous exposure, response to youth and adult corrections), and factors relevant to identifying offender dynamic needs (such as

employment history, family background, criminal associations, addictions, attitudes). While the results help determine institutional placement and correctional plans, a distribution of selected criminal history and case need variables can result in a comprehensive profile of the federal offender population. A program database was utilized to examine program participation.

In order to examine differences in the profiles of participants in the Tupiq program from non-participants, a matched comparison group was utilized. The comparison group was comprised of Inuit offenders, matched on gender, age, most serious current offence, aggregate sentence length and date of admission. Analyses indicated no significant differences between the Tupiq participants and the comparison group in terms of dynamic or static factors at the time of intake.

Interviews with Program Participants

Interviews with program participants provided more extensive information than was available through offender case files. In particular, interviews provided some personal information not available in case files, and allowed for in-depth discussions about the participants' perceptions of the program.

Interview questions were designed to examine five key areas: background information on the offender; childhood experiences; family problems; current relationship with family; and program effectiveness. The structured interviews included both closed and open-ended questions. Respondents were individually interviewed.

The sample for this study consisted of 24 offenders incarcerated at Fenbrook Institution who participated in the Tupiq program. The interview took from 30 minutes to 1 hour to complete, depending on the amount of information provided.

Interviews with Program Facilitators

A structured interview was also developed for facilitators of the Tupiq program. Interview questions examined three key areas: facilitator background and experience; program description; program effectiveness. The structured interviews included both closed and open-ended questions. The eight facilitators included the program director, clinical director, four co-facilitators and two healers.

Interviews with Other Key Informants

In addition to interviews with program participants and program facilitators, interviews were also conducted with other key informants. These included 20 staff at Fenbrook (Warden, Assistant Warden, case managers, Inuit liaison, parole officers, etc.) and 19 community members who were serving as community links. Questions focused on the effectiveness of the Tupiq program.

Process

The project began with a number of meetings with facilitators of the Tupiq program, the Warden and Assistant Warden of Fenbrook Institution, individuals from the CSC Programs Branch and Aboriginal Initiatives Branch. Furthermore, the project was described to an Inuit Technical Working Group.

Following the initial meetings, a set of research questions and interview instruments were prepared and reviewed. Program documentation was reviewed, offender files were reviewed, interviews were conducted and a comparison group was developed.

The information from the interviews were input. Open-ended questions were examined and, where appropriate, themes were developed and coded for analysis. Once a dataset was prepared, analyses were conducted to address the research questions.

FINDINGS

The purpose of this project was to examine how the Tupiq program at Fenbrook Institution is progressing. Since it is a pilot program, it is premature to consider a full evaluation at this point in time. However, it is possible to examine how the program is operating to date, as well as any issues it may be facing. This information should help CSC decide whether the current program model should be adopted, as well as any modifications that could be made. The following discusses each of the research questions described earlier. All tables are included in Appendix A.

Tupiq Program

The Tupiq program is a cognitive-behavioural, multi-model, high-intensity program designed for federal Inuit offenders who have offence histories relating to sexual violence. It is meant to provide culturally-relevant and linguistically-sensitive intervention (Hamilton, 2002). To date, five program cycles have been completed at Fenbrook Institution, involving 34 offenders. One cycle focused on Inuit violent offenders, rather than Inuit sex offenders.

Program Development

The Tupiq program was developed in response to an identified need to provide Inuit-specific programming to Inuit offenders. Based on the over-representation of Inuit offenders and the feeling that many Inuit offenders were not completing programs or being granted parole, it was felt that programming for Inuit offenders was necessary. An examination of their intake assessments demonstrates that 81% of Inuit offenders are rated high risk to re-offend and 90% are rated as high need for programming intervention overall. Further, about 60% have histories of sexual offences, 50% have histories of spousal abuse, and 6% have histories of child abuse (CSC, 2002).

Over the years, many stakeholder organizations raised the concern that culturally-appropriate treatment programs were not available for Inuit sex offenders within the federal correctional system. Given the very high rate of sexual offending in the North, this was perceived to be a serious gap in correctional programming. Additionally, correctional staff and administrators have long observed that Inuit offenders, because of significant cultural and linguistic barriers, sometimes derive little benefit from non-Inuit treatment programs (Hamilton, 2002).

In October 1999, Fenbrook medium-security institution contracted an assessment and review of existing programs relating to the correctional needs of Inuit offenders. The consultations culminated in a workshop in Iqaluit in March 2000 and a second major consultation in October 2000. Extensive input was sought from Inuit organizations, communities and other knowledgeable stakeholders (Tupiq program, 2002).

Comprehensive program manuals and resource materials have been developed covering every aspect of the Tupiq program (Hamilton, 2002). These materials were developed in consultation with many experts and stakeholder organizations, including Inuit Elders, Inuit healers, Inuit community representatives, and Inuit organizations.

Since the largest proportion of Inuit offenders are sex offenders, and the programming in place did not appear sufficient to address their needs, the decision to pilot this program was appropriate. There appears to be a need for a program such as the Tupiq program for Inuit offenders.

Program Content

According to the program manual (Hamilton, 2002), the overall objective of the Tupiq program is to end violence and abuse against women and children by Inuit offenders through early intervention with male perpetrators. Additional objectives are to: help participants assess the impact of their abusive relationships on the family and community; increase awareness and development of interpersonal skills; and, increase

literacy skills in Inuktitut and English. The goals of the program are that: the offender safely reintegrates into the community; the recidivism rate among Inuit federal offenders is reduced; the number of federal Inuit offenders being detained by the National Parole Board (NPB) is significantly reduced; and, Inuit communities are actively involved in relapse prevention.

The program is 16 weeks in length, with a total of 230 contact hours. This includes 75 two and one-half hour group sessions; and 20 individual counselling sessions with primary counsellors, other program staff, and Inuit community counsellors. Offenders participate in program activities on a full-time basis. Program activities occupy four mornings and afternoons each week for 13 of the 16 weeks. Weeks 5, 10, and 16 operate on a modified schedule because they are intended for assessment, feedback and evaluation. If the offender remains in the institution following the completion of the treatment program, he may have an opportunity to participate in the Tupiq maintenance program. This consists of a once-a-week opportunity for program graduates to participate in a refresher session. The idea is to reinforce learnings and skills developed during the Tupiq program.

The program is divided into three poles: self, responsibility, and community. Each participant is challenged to examine everything in the program in context with his awareness of his own experiences, his responsibility for his behaviour, and his relationship to his community. The three poles are broken into three major components: treatment groups, skills groups and individual support. Treatment groups include the "self-management group", a therapeutic group process supervised by a clinical specialist and made culturally relevant by co-facilitation in Inuktitut. Treatment groups also include "Inuit healing", a therapy process led and supervised by experienced and skilled Inuit healers in Inuktitut. Skills groups are co-facilitated in Inuktitut and English and focus on awareness and education related to Inuit cultural values and preventing abusive thinking and behaviour. Individual support includes bi-weekly counselling by Inuit staff in the participant's preferred language to supplement group work and connect program content to the realities of Inuit life. Community links provide further individual

support by connecting participants to an approved community counsellor on a bi-weekly basis.

The three components are divided into major content modules that focus core skills and treatment sessions towards relapse prevention. Modules include: goals, cultural values, problem solving, abuse awareness, abuse disclosure, autobiography, interpersonal communications, victim empathy, emotion management, abuse patterns, substance abuse, healthy sexuality, parenting, and relapse prevention.

The development of the program involved consideration of CSC's national program standards for sex offender treatment programs, as well as the standards for the high-intensity family violence program. The approach has been to cover the program content indicated in CSC program standards and suggested in consultations leading up to the development of the program. Although some adjustments have been made to insure the cultural appropriateness of the program, Tupiq staff believe that the program adheres to the relevant CSC standards. However, the program has not yet been accredited by CSC and the extent to which the program adheres to program standards has not yet been addressed.

In common with all sex offender treatment programs, much of the program content focuses on the presentation of information, the discussion of information, and the development of awareness. The program also aims to promote skill development and behaviour change. Considerable efforts are devoted to addressing these needs and to assessing the progress of each program participant. According to Hanson and Harris (1998), a comprehensive sexual offender treatment program should target cognitive distortions, empathy and awareness of victim harm, social functioning and relationship issues, deviant sexual preferences, and knowledge of the chain of events culminating in offending behaviours and methods for effective prevention of risk. The Tupiq program addresses all of these areas.

According to facilitators and key informants, the Tupiq program targets violent behaviour/aggression, impulse control, personal/emotional difficulties, cultural/spiritual issues, cognitive distortions, self-esteem/self-acceptance, individual self-awareness, family difficulties, interpersonal skills, and substance abuse. However, for the most part, they do not think it targets education or employment issues. According to one key informant:

> *[The Tupiq program] is an Inuit-specific program that addresses sex offending among Inuit. The program is delivered in a way that speaks to the [Inuit offenders]. It replaces core programs, it uses Elders, psychologists, etc.*

Throughout the development and implementation of the Tupiq program, extensive efforts have been made by program staff and advisors to ensure the program integrates Inuit culture and language. The result is a program that, more than any other in Canada, attempts to fully incorporate and integrate Inuit culture, language and values. For example:

- The development of every aspect of the program has been based on extensive consultations with Inuit Elders and healers, and Inuit organizations;
- The program and materials have been developed in Inuktitut and English;
- Program staff include Inuit staff who are fluent in Inuktitut, and every group is co-facilitated by at least one Inuk staff-person. Other staff have extensive experience working with Inuit people and in the North;
- Elders and traditional healers from the North are brought in to begin and end the program; and,
- Offenders are individually linked to community links in their home communities for support while they are going through the Tupiq program.

According to facilitators, key informants and participants, Inuit-specific content is very much a part of the program. According those interviewed, the application of Inuit culture and principles in the program is very beneficial to participants because it enables

participants to better understand the program, and provides them with a sense of identity, and improves responsiveness to the program. According to one facilitator:

> *Inuit offenders see culture as part of their self - much more so than white offenders. They strongly identify. [We] need to tap into their self schema for them to absorb and buy in to the program. It needs to be relevant to you as an Inuk. Need strong, good influences to model appropriate behaviour, respect and Inuit values.*

The program was developed based upon a recognized need to address the needs of Inuit offenders. Furthermore, it appears to represent current "state-of-the-art" content with respect to the provision of culturally-appropriate programming for Inuit sex offenders (see Marshall & Williams, 2001). Development of program elements has been based on program theory, as well as input from experts and many stakeholder organizations, including Inuit organizations. Thus, there is "face validity" to the program. However, the aspects of Western and Inuit programming that contribute most and least to the program's effectiveness has not yet been established.

Program Delivery

According to the program manual (Hamilton, 2002), the process for entering into the program begins with a note being sent to parole officers at Fenbrook Institution informing them that a session has been planned[1]. If a case manager thinks there is an appropriate offender, he/she completes a referral form and sends it to the Tupiq program staff. Program staff complete a file review on the offender to determine if he fits the criteria for admission. For those who fit the criteria, a pre-assessment interview is conducted at the beginning of the first week of the program. This consists of a 1-2 hour semi-structured bilingual interview with the offender by two of the program facilitators. At that point, a final decision about acceptance into the program is made.

[1] From the 5th session onward, other institutions with Inuit offenders have also been contacted.

The offender is then given an orientation to the program and completes consent forms. After this, the program begins.

Referrals to the Tupiq program are typically made by case managers. More than one-half (54%) of the participants said they were referred to the program by a case manager or parole officer. Other referrals were by the Inuit/native liaison, program administrators or other offenders.

The Tupiq program is designed to be 16 weeks in length, with a total of 230 contact hours. Program staff acknowledge that there is no magic to the sequencing of the program content, although there is a logic behind the flow of the major program elements - from self awareness, to taking responsibility, to preparing to live in the community. Many sex offender treatment programs, including those for other Aboriginal populations, do not operate on such an intensive schedule. Many programs involve half-day sessions, with the other half-day devoted to work, education or other programs. It has been argued by some that it is most effective to spread more intensive sex offender treatment programs out over longer periods of time, since it allows participants more time to digest and reflect on the information (Marshall, 1996). In the case of the Tupiq program, this would be difficult due to some practical considerations. First of all, the program is run by contract staff who do not originally come from the vicinity. Therefore, it is necessary to run a shorter, more intense program to accommodate their schedules. Furthermore, facilitators have noted that it is difficult to find other meaningful activities for Inuit offenders to participate in for part-days.

Tupiq has been operating with approximately nine offenders per session. Although facilitators have said that the number could be increased to 12 without any impact on program quality, due to the small number of Inuit federal offenders, only a limited number of eligible offenders are available to participate in the Tupiq program at any point in time. Although two or three sessions have been run per year for the past few years, now that the list of potential participants has been reduced, there will likely only be a need to run the program once a year from now on.

In summary, although there may be more efficient and cost effective ways to conduct the Tupiq program, program delivery is currently based upon a number of practical considerations. For instance, the program may be more effective if spread out over a longer period of time. However, facilitator schedules have influenced the decision to make the program an intense 16-week program. Furthermore, the program would be more cost effective if it was run with a larger number of participants. However, given the small number of Inuit federal offenders, it is somewhat difficult to find appropriate candidates.

Staff

For each cycle of the Tupiq program, there is a program director, a clinical director, and two or three Inuit co-facilitators. Furthermore, two Inuit healers from the North come to Fenbrook institution to begin and end the session with the Inuit healing component.

There is a broad scope of experience, skills and background characteristics among the facilitators of the program. The program director developed the program and has extensive knowledge about program development, counselling offenders and the North. Although the clinical director did not have experience with Inuit offenders prior to involvement in the program, she has extensive experience with sex offenders. The co-facilitators are all Inuit, from the North, and have experience working with Inuit offenders. The healers are Elders from the North, with extensive experience about Inuit culture and traditions. In addition to the Tupiq team, facilitators note that they work with the Inuit liaison officer, correctional officers and case managers from the institution regarding the program and participants.

There is a range of educational experience among the facilitators, ranging from little education to graduate studies. Most facilitators have formal training in facilitating programs and counselling. Furthermore, prior to involvement in the Tupiq program, all but one facilitator had experience with Inuit communities, and all but two had experience

with Inuit offenders. Currently, the facilitators feel that they have fairly extensive knowledge of Inuit culture and the needs of Inuit offenders. Healers from the North have an important role to play in the Tupiq program. Many have contributed ideas that have been incorporated into the program. In addition, they are responsible for beginning and ending of the program, with a focus on Inuit traditional values, culture and history.

Of the eight facilitators who have been involved in the program to date, two are men and six are women. In all cycles of the program, the majority of the facilitators have been women. A unique aspect of the program is the intermingling of English and Inuktitut. Of the eight facilitators interviewed, six are Inuit and two are non-Inuit. The Inuit facilitators all said that they consider Nunavut to be home. Importantly, the Inuit and non-Inuit facilitators have unique expertise to contribute in the program. While some of the Inuit facilitators may not have as much experience working in a correctional setting, the Tupiq program gives them an opportunity to gain a broader experience of the program. For instance, in the last session, one facilitator was on secondment from Nunavut Justice in order to gain experience with the program. In addition, the non-Inuit facilitators have learned a great deal from the Inuit facilitators about Inuit culture and tradition.

The incorporation of Inuit culture is clearly considered to be a crucial component in the success of the Tupiq program. Ninety-two percent of the participants said that Inuit facilitators were very important to success of program. They noted that speaking Inuktutit and understanding Inuit culture was important to the success of the program. According to one respondent:

> *They understand me, they try their best to understand us. The fact that they can interpret and translate material… if we don't understand they can explain. They have knowledge of Inuit culture and they can find solutions within our culture.*

Because the program involves contracted facilitators, there has been some staff turnover. Of the five sessions run to date, the program director and clinical director have been involved in four (the fifth was in unilingual Inuktitut). One facilitator has been involved in all five sessions, but may not be involved in future cycles. Two other facilitators were involved in the first four sessions, but have since left. The final facilitator was involved in the program for one session but returned to her position at Nunavut Justice. Because they operate as contractors, financial issues have arisen for the facilitators. There are a number of logistical issues resulting in it taking a long time to get paid. This is particularly problematic because the facilitators from the North have to initially pay for travel to Gravenhurst and accommodation while they are involved in the program.

It is clear that there are experienced facilitators involved in the program - and the skills and experiences of the facilitators complement each other. However, it will be difficult to maintain the success of this program without a continuing presence of a core group of facilitators.

Involvement of Family, Victims, Community

The best way to involve family members and victims in sex offender treatment programs is a matter of some controversy and different programs adopt a variety of approaches. Tupiq staff carefully considered these matters and have adopted thoughtful policies based on the input of experts and stakeholders. Generally, key family members are encouraged to become knowledgeable about the Tupiq program and to become involved when it is appropriate to do so. Facilitators note that offenders are very connected to their families and their involvement can help the offender in relapse prevention. Although most of the facilitators and key informants felt that the involvement of family members is beneficial to participants, they noted that family members were not often involved. Similarly, only about one-quarter (29%) of the participants interviewed said that family members are involved in the Tupiq program.

Those who had family members involved tended to be fairly satisfied with their involvement.

Generally, victims are not involved in the program. The main reason that facilitators and key informants gave was that victims may not want to be involved with the offender or may feel re-victimized. However, they also noted that it may be beneficial to offenders to have victims involved in the program because it helps create empathy for the victim, and helps reduce minimization of the crime by the offender.

One particularly innovative aspect of the Tupiq program is the involvement of community links. Working with local community justice committees and other community leaders, program staff identify appropriate and respected resource people from the offenders' communities. Interested community resource people receive information about the program and about an offender's progress. Bi-weekly telephone contacts between program staff, the offender and his community link are then organized. In addition to involving the local community in the program, this approach is meant to insure there are knowledgeable and supportive community resource people available to the offender once he returns to the community. While it is often difficult to identify appropriate resource people in small and isolated Inuit communities, the staff have had some success. According to facilitators and key informants, contact with community links is very beneficial to participants of the program because it provides a support network for them in their home community, helps in relapse prevention and eases displacement of the offender upon his return to the community. According to one facilitator:

> *[Community links] are beneficial because they hold [Inuit] traditions and teach the offenders of their identity - taught one person to another. They know the family tree, they know the right words … and pass down the knowledge.*

All offenders interviewed said that a community link had been established for them through the Tupiq program. The largest proportion of participants (46%) said that their

community link was an Elder. Other community links were extended family members (17%), immediate family (8%), social workers (4%) or other members of the community (21%). Most participants (62%) said that they had contact with their community link a few times a month.

Once the Tupiq program is completed, community links often have little or no involvement with the offender. As a result, contact may be lost over a period of years while the offender completes his sentence. When the offender returns to the community after this break in contact, it is not clear that the offender continues to view the community link as a resource. In addition, after such a break in contact, community links may feel they do not have any role to play in the successful reintegration of the offender.

Program Participants

Characteristics

As of December 2002, 34 Inuit offenders have participated in the Tupiq program across five cycles. However, in one cycle, the program was attempted with non-sexual violent offenders. Because the characteristics of the non-sexual offenders would be expected to be different, they are excluded from further analysis. Therefore, 27 Inuit sex offenders were involved in the Tupiq program.

As illustrated in Table 1, participants in the program tended to be in their mid-thirties at the time of admission to the federal correctional facility for their current conviction. One-half (48%) were single and 33% were married or in a common-law relationship. Few had formal education and large proportions were unemployed at the time of admission. The socio-demographic characteristics of program participants was similar to that among Inuit federal offenders who were not participants of the Tupiq program[2].

[2] Based on a snapshot of Inuit offenders incarcerated in federal correctional facilities on January 2003 - excluding Tupiq participants.

Not surprisingly, since the Tupiq program focuses on sexual offenders, the most serious current offence was a sex offence for 85% of those who participated in the program (Table 2). The remaining 15% had a previous history of sexual offences. This differs somewhat from other Inuit offenders incarcerated in federal facilities. Although the most serious offence for the largest proportion of incarcerated Inuit offenders is a sex offence (49%), 26% were currently incarcerated for homicide. The mean aggregate sentence for the current conviction is 5.9 years for Tupiq participants, which is longer than those who were not participants (3.8 years)[3].

Additional information was also available from a sex offence checklist. As indicated in Table 2, most of the participants were incarcerated for sexual assault (90% of those for the current sentence). Smaller proportions (20% each) were currently incarcerated for incest and pedophilia. Furthermore, the majority of victims were female adults (90%).

Participants have a fairly extensive criminal history. Almost one-half (48%) had previous youth court convictions, and 86% had previous adult court convictions and previous community supervision (Table 3). Furthermore, 76% had a previous provincial term and 29% a previous federal term. This was fairly similar to Inuit offenders who have not participated in the program.

The majority of Tupiq participants have experienced past failures in the correctional system. Almost three-quarters (71%) had failed on a previous community-based sanction and 48% had failed on a prior conditional release. Furthermore, 33% had less than six months since their last incarceration. Fourteen percent received segregation for a disciplinary infraction and 10% had an escape/attempted escape or unlawfully at large. These findings are similar to those who had not participated in the program.

At the time of admission to the federal facility, 88% of the participants were assessed as being high risk to re-offend (Table 4). Since most of the participants are sex offenders,

[3] The mean aggregate sentence is calculated with life sentences removed.

this is not surprising. Furthermore, 85% were rated as being high need for programming. All were rated as having "some or considerable" need for intervention in the area of personal/emotional issues, 81% in the areas of substance abuse and marital/family issues. Smaller proportions of participants were rated as high need than Inuit offenders who had not participated in the program on substance abuse.

Almost one-half (40%) of program participants were assessed as having high motivation for intervention at the time of intake into the institution. This is a larger proportion than Inuit offenders who have not participated in the program (17%).

Information from interviews with the facilitators and key informants confirmed the findings from the files. Key informants said that, at the beginning of the program, Inuit offenders often had issues relating to aggression/violence, substance abuse, and childhood traumas. According to facilitators, the major issues participants faced were depression/anxiety, aggression, self-esteem. In addition, key informants noted poverty/financial issues and facilitators noted learning deficits and gambling issues.

Interviews with the sample of 24 participants provided additional background information not available on the offenders' files. All of the Inuit offenders interviewed (100%) said that they understand or speak an Inuit language (Table 5). Furthermore, 75% said they were very attached to Inuit culture during childhood. However, attachment to Inuit culture appears to diminish during incarceration, since only 38% said that they were attached to Inuit culture while incarcerated in the institution. In contrast, although only 5% of the Inuit offenders said that they were attached to First Nations culture during childhood, this increased to 25% during incarceration. Attachment to First Nations culture may have increased during the time they were incarcerated because they did not have as easy access to Inuit culture.

The largest proportion of the respondents said that they grew up in a small or large town (75%). A further 21% grew up in a large or small village or hamlet. At the time of the most recent arrest, fairly similar proportions of the Inuit offenders were living in a small

or large town (67%). The largest proportion of the Inuit offenders said that they currently considered a small or large town as home (71%). A further one-fifth (21%) considered a large or small village or hamlet as home.

Although they tended to be from less populated areas, the largest proportion of participants who were interviewed thought a small or large city was the best place to be released (41%). The largest proportion of the respondents said that they planned to live in a small or large town upon release (52%). The most common areas where the Inuit offenders planned to live upon release were to Iqaluit, Ottawa and Sanikuluaq.

Table 6 provides information on family background and current relationships. Almost three-quarters (71%) of respondents indicated that their primary caregiver while growing up was one or both parents. The majority said that they had a stable childhood (70%). However, many also experienced problems during their childhood, such as violence and drug/alcohol use in the home (79% and 58%, respectively), as well as violence in their community (79%).

About one-half of the Inuit offenders interviewed who had a spouse or children said that they currently had contact with their spouse/common-law partner (50%) or their children (59%). However, 100% said they had some form of contact with other family members, such as siblings or parents.

Information on programs that participants of the Tupiq program were involved in during the current and past sentences were gathered from the offenders' files. During their current sentence, apart from their involvement in the Tupiq program, 25 of the 27 participants have been involved in one or more program in the institution. As indicated in Table 7, of those involved in other programs during the current sentence, 84% were involved in institutional work programs, primarily carving, during the current sentence. About three-quarters (72%) were involved in educational programs, 52% in vocational skills programs, 32% in cognitive/living skills programs, 32% in family violence programs, and 28% in other sex offender programs. About one-quarter (24%) were

involved in substance abuse and 20% in anger management programs. On average, participants were involved in about six programs other than Tupiq during their current sentence.

Only five participants of the Tupiq program had a previous sentence. All of these had participated in previous programs, including substance abuse, institutional work programs and educational programs.

Currently, many of the institutional work programs are Inuit-specific, such as Inuit carving. A few of the participants took Aboriginal-specific substance abuse programs during previous sentences.

Most of the participants completed family violence programs, psychological/counselling services, cognitive/living skills and vocational skills programs. Small proportions completed educational programs. This could be because the educational program is ongoing.

Appropriate Participants

The Tupiq program employs standardized assessment tools (such as the Static-99) to screen potential program participants and examine factors such as knowledge, attitudes, victim empathy, and awareness of offence patterns. These tools are combined with clinical judgement to formulate an individualized program of counselling and support that runs in parallel with the group process. The carrying out and interpretation of assessments is the responsibility of the clinical director.

According to the program manual, criteria for acceptance into the program are: self-identification as an Inuk person and a documented history of two or more incidents of sexual violence against women and/or children (Hamilton, 2002). Offenders who have very low cognitive functioning or whose language skills are not sufficient to allow for active participation in Inuktitut or English are excluded. Offenders who are very

resistant to treatment but otherwise meet the program criteria are screened out but offered a form of treatment primer and offered treatment later if they are willing to accept the terms of participation. The program is limited to nine Inuit offender participants per program.

As noted above, all offenders in the Tupiq program are Inuit, and most have committed one or more sexual offences. Those who had not committed sex offences were the offenders who participated in the "violence" session of the Tupiq program. In addition, participants in the Tupiq program have been assessed as requiring moderate or high-intensity sex offender treatment. The 16-week program (230 contact hours) corresponds to an intensive level of programming within CSC national standards for sex offender treatment. While program staff note that not all participants selected for Tupiq require intensive sex offender treatment, it is felt that they have a variety of other needs (e.g., cognitive deficits, skills deficits, and literacy issues). Therefore, they believe the additional contact hours are warranted.

As written, the program selection criteria also permit the participation of Inuit offenders who have not committed sexual offences provided they have a history of violence. However, practical experience in the Tupiq program has shown that this approach is not advisable. Tupiq tried a more heterogeneous group on one occasion and it did not work well. Group processes and program content could not be adjusted to be relevant to all program participants. In addition, a number of the violent, non-sex offending participants had to leave the group because of institutional charges. As a result, only Inuit sexual offenders are now accepted into the Tupiq program.

A few offenders with very low cognitive skills, or whose language skills are not sufficient to allow for active participation in the program have been excluded from the Tupiq program. High needs sex offenders who have issues related to deviant sexual arousal have also been excluded, as the Tupiq program has not been designed to address these issues. In practice, very few Inuit offenders (perhaps 5%) who are otherwise eligible are excluded on account of these screening criteria.

The program selection criteria indicate that offenders who are resistant to treatment are not selected for participation. Resistant offenders are those who are unwilling to admit responsibility for their sexual offences. In practice, however, offenders who otherwise meet the eligibility criteria are not screened out if they demonstrate initial resistance prior to commencing the program. These offenders are able to continue for the first third of the program. However, if resistance persists beyond the first six to eight weeks, the offender is not allowed to continue. This is a reasonable restriction. Offenders who continue in treatment when, after a reasonable time, they do not admit to their offences, generally derive little benefit from the program (Marshall & Williams, 2001). Additionally, when other program participants are openly admitting responsibility for their offences, very difficult group dynamics can be created if one or two group members fail to accept responsibility for their actions. Serious issues of trust can arise among program participants and staff. These issues can completely undermine the effectiveness of the program.

During the first four Tupiq sessions, a few offenders were asked to leave because of resistance. Differences in opinions among staff and the program's clinical director have arisen on this issue. Some Inuit staff believe that Inuit offenders sometimes require more time to admit responsibility for their offences. They question whether it is culturally appropriate to discontinue offenders who have not yet overcome their resistance.

Most facilitators said that the program was fairly effective in selecting the appropriate participants. The assessment process was noted as being quite effective. It was also noted that the involvement of many people in the selection process made it work better. In order to improve the selection process, it was suggested that the criteria be made clearer to the institutional staff who refer potential candidates. It was also noted that those doing the selection need to understand Inuit culture. Finally, it was noted that there needs to be more emphasis on offenders past, including interviews with family or community members.

It appears that the appropriate participants are being chosen for the Tupiq program. With the exception of the one session that included non-sex offenders, all other participants are Inuit offenders with at least one federal conviction for a sex offence. As indicated in the program manual, those who have low cognitive functioning or language difficulties, or who are resistant to programming, are excluded from the program. Furthermore, participants of the program have been assessed as requiring moderate- or high-intensity sex offender programming, which make them appropriate candidates for the Tupiq program.

Program Goals

This section of the report examines whether the goals of the Tupiq program, *as stated in the program manual*, have been met. As stated in the program manual (Hamilton, 2002), the goals of the Tupiq program are as follows:

- Offender safely reintegrates to the community
- Recidivism rate among Inuit federal offenders is reduced
- Number of` federal Inuit offenders being detained by NPB is significantly reduced
- Inuit communities are actively involved in relapse prevention

Facilitators, key informants and participants were asked what they thought the objectives of the Tupiq program were. Of the four goals stated in the program manual, only one-half of the facilitators (50%), one-third of the key informants (35%) and one-quarter of the participants (26%) said a goal was to safely reintegrate the offender to the community. Further, 37% of facilitators, 20% of key informants and 22% of participants said a goal was to reduce the recidivism rate among Inuit federal offenders. One key informants, one facilitator and 4% of participants said a goal was to reduce the number of federal Inuit offenders being detained by NPB. Finally, 37% of facilitators, but only 5% of key informants and no participants said that a goal was to actively involve Inuit communities in relapse prevention. Facilitators, key informants and participants

provided other responses such as gaining a better understanding of offenders, changing the behaviour of offenders, and helping offenders heal.

Key informants were asked to what extent the program successfully met the goals in the manual. The largest proportion of key informants (33%) said that the program met the goal of actively involving Inuit communities in relapse prevention. A further one-third (31%) said that the program successfully helped to reduce the recidivism rate among Inuit federal offenders. Twenty-seven percent said that the number of federal Inuit offenders being detained by NPB has been significantly reduced by the program. Finally, one-fifth (19%) said that the program assists in safely reintegrating the offender to the community.

Facilitators tended to feel that the program somewhat met the goal of safely reintegrating the offender to the community and actively involving Inuit communities in relapse prevention. They were less likely to think that the program reduced the recidivism rate among Inuit federal offenders or reduced the number of federal Inuit offenders being detained by NPB.

The following further examines the extent to which the Tupiq program affects each of the four goals stated in the program manual.

Offender Safely Reintegrates to the Community

In order to examine whether the Tupiq program helped the offender safely reintegrate to the community, outcomes for participants of the Tupiq program who completed the program were examined[4].

A large proportion of participants who completed the Tupiq program (11%) were currently assessed as having high reintegration potential. This is considerably higher than the proportion rated as having high reintegration potential prior to program

[4] Twenty-five of the 27 participants completed the Tupiq program.

participation (0%). This seems to indicate that the program is having a positive impact on preparing the participants for successful reintegration to the community.

Almost one-half (44%, n=11) of the participants were released from federal custody at some point after completing the Tupiq program (see Table 14). About one-half of these (55%) were released on statutory release. Smaller proportions were released on a warrant expiry (18%) or were granted day or full parole (18% and 9%, respectively). On average, participants served 3.3 years from the date of their most recent admission to the federal facility until their release.

Of the 11 participants released, three were re-admitted to the federal institution, two for technical violations and one for subsequent offences (the most serious of which was a sexual offence). The participants who were subsequently re-admitted spent an average of 5.9 months in the community prior to return.

Participants demonstrated a great deal of potential for success in the community after treatment, and eight of the 11 released have been able to remain in the community. The remaining eight offenders released have been in the community for an average of one year.

Number of Federal Inuit Offenders Being Detained by the National Parole Board is Significantly Reduced

In order to examine whether the number of federal Inuit offenders detained by the National Parole Board (NPB) has been reduced as a result of the Tupiq program, detention rates were examined for Inuit offenders from 1998-99 through 2001-02. It should be noted that, since the Tupiq program began in March 2001, detention decisions during 2001-02 would not likely be influenced substantially by it.

As illustrated in Table 8, data maintained by the NPB indicate that approximately 50 offenders were eligible for statutory release in each year between 1998-99 and 2001-

02. The number of detentions has remained fairly consistent over the years. For instance, in 1998-99, a decision was made to detain 15% of those eligible for statutory release. In 1999-2000, 18% were detained, in 2000-01, 14% were detained, and in 2001-02, 16% were detained. The proportions of Inuit offenders who are detained is substantially larger than in the general inmate population, where approximately 5% of offenders are detained (National Parole Board, 2003).

These findings are not particularly surprising because, since the program began, only 34 Inuit offenders have participated. However, on any given day, there are approximately 100 Inuit offenders incarcerated in federal correctional facilities. It would be difficult for the Tupiq program to have an impact on the number of Inuit offenders detained by the NPB. In addition, there are many other factors that impact on parole board decisions. Therefore, even if the program were having an impact, it may not be noticeable in parole board decisions.

Recidivism Rate Among Inuit Federal Offenders is Reduced

Similar to the previous goal, in order to examine whether the recidivism rate among Inuit federal offenders has been reduced as a result of the Tupiq program, recidivism is examined for Inuit offenders released before the program began (1999-2000) and after program implementation (2001-02). As is the case with parole decisions, it is unlikely that recidivism rates of those released in 2001-02 would be substantially influenced by the program since it began in March 2001.

Overall, 196 Inuit offenders were released from federal facilities between 1999-2002 (see Table 9). The largest proportions of those released left the institution on statutory release (41%) and warrant expiry (31%). Smaller proportions were released on day parole (23%) and full parole (4%). Differences between years were not found to be significant, suggesting that the types of release have remained stable over a four-year period.

Of those released, no significant differences were found in the proportion re-admitted after one year for those released during 2001-02 than those released during 1999-2000. Among those released in 1999-2000, 39% were re-admitted within one year of release. Similarly, of those released in 2001-02, 32% were re-admitted within one year of release. Since the Tupiq program focuses on sexual offending, an additional analysis examined whether the re-admission rates among Inuit sexual offenders in particular changed. Similar to the findings among Inuit offenders overall, no significant differences were found between those released in 1999-2000 (14% re-admitted) and 2001-02 (20% re-admitted).

In total, three-quarters (75%) of those re-admitted to federal custody returned because of a technical violation. Smaller proportions returned for a new offence (17%) and new warrant of committal (7%). The proportion of offenders re-admitted on a technical violation, warrant of committal and new offence between 1999-2000 and 2001-02 were not significant.

Based on these findings, at this point in time, the Tupiq program does not seem to have had an impact upon the recidivism rates of Inuit offenders.

Inuit Communities are Actively Involved in Relapse Prevention

Although there is currently no formal community follow-up program for offenders who have completed the Tupiq program, a variety of innovative strategies are being used by the program staff to initiate and maintain links between program participants and communities. First of all, there is on-going dialogue with community stakeholders regarding the program. In addition, efforts are made to link each program participant with their home community, through community links.

According to participants and facilitators, the program connected the offender to their home community, primarily through the community link. Although key informants also thought a connection was established through community links, they also noted that

communication issues existed which made the connection more difficult. For instance, offenders only speak to community links a few times a month, and have little connection to others in the community.

Facilitators and key informants said that the program contributes to positive changes in Inuit communities. Fifty percent of the key informants said that the program contributed very much, and 42% said it contributed somewhat, to positive changes in Inuit communities. Some of the benefits include a better understanding of offending behaviour, better knowledge of how to support offenders in relapse prevention upon release, and ultimately - if the program is effective - healing for the offender which can help to heal the community.

It was noted that the Tupiq program could more effectively contribute to positive change in Inuit communities by providing more information about the program to communities, involving community members in the program to a greater extent, and by developing a maintenance program in Inuit communities.

Summary

In sum, the Tupiq program does not appear to have had an extensive impact on the goals as developed. However, the program goals as stated in the program manual are very broad. Even if the Tupiq program were effective, it would be very difficult for it to impact on these areas because many other variables may have an influence. For instance, although the Tupiq program may have an impact on recidivism, once an offender is released into the community, many other factors may influence whether he commits a crime. Furthermore, the number of offenders involved in the Tupiq program is too small to influence such factors as the number of Inuit offenders detained by NPB and involvement of Inuit communities in relapse prevention. In order to examine the program fairly, the program goals should be modified to adequately reflect what changes the program could realistically produce.

Effectiveness of Tupiq Program

In order to examine the effectiveness of the Tupiq program, a comparison of changes in the participants who completed the program was undertaken. In addition, differences on some outcome variables were made with a comparison group. Finally, interviews with facilitators, participants and key informants provided information on satisfaction with, and the benefits of, the program.

Changes in Participants

As a first indication of effectiveness of the Tupiq program, changes in the participants following involvement in the program were examined.

As a first indication of effectiveness, a large proportion of program participants completed the program. Of the 27 participants, 25 completed the program (93%). This is important because it has been found that Inuit offenders, in particular, tend not to complete programming which can impact on granting of parole (Hamilton, 2002).

As indicated in Table 10, participants' need for programming overall decreased significantly from before involvement in the program to immediately after completion of the program (M = 2.8 versus 2.6). When examining individual needs, no significant differences were found from pre-program to post-program in the areas of community functioning, employment, marital/family, attitude, associates/social interaction and substance abuse. However, participants did demonstrate significantly lower scores on the need for programming on personal/emotional issues. This is one of the areas that the program tries to address. Although the program does try to address some of the other needs, many other things may also influence participants' scores on these areas. It is also possible that in the short period of time of involvement in the program, these measures may not be sensitive enough to measure change.

In order to determine whether changes remained stable or improved, participants' most recent need scores were examined. The current overall need scores of participants were even lower than after completion of the program (M = 2.3). Similarly, the significant differences in the area of personal/emotional issues were even lower than after completion of the program (M = 3.3) and a significant difference was established in the area of substance abuse (M = 3.2).

The average score on reintegration potential for participants was not significantly different following participation in the program, as compared to before program participation (M = 1.4 versus 1.5). However, participants' most recent reintegration score was significantly higher than before program participation (M = 1.8). This seems to indicate that the program is having a positive impact on preparing the participants for successful reintegration to the community. Although only approaching significance, participants' motivation for intervention increased from prior to the program to currently (M = 2.0 versus 2.4).

Some additional clinical assessments were administered by the Tupiq clinical psychologist prior to program commencement and immediately after program completion. Assessments included the Sex Offender Need Assessment Rating (SONAR) and the Denial/Minimization Checklist. The SONAR is used to evaluate change among sex offenders. It measures five stable factors (intimacy deficits, negative social influences, attitude tolerance of sexual offending, sexual self-regulation, general self-regulation) and four acute factors (substance abuse, negative mood, anger, victim access) (Hanson, 2001). The Denial/Minimization Checklist, designed for use with child molesters and rapists, examines whether or not the offender denies or minimizes the offence (Barbaree, 1991). Following completion of the program, participants' scores on the Sonar and Denial/Minimization Checklist decreased significantly. This indicates that participants were rated as lower risk to sexually re-offend and were less likely to endorse distortions surrounding their crime after involvement in the Tupiq program.

An examination of institutional incidents that participants were involved in was conducted up to one year before their involvement in the Tupiq program and up to one year after completion of the program. As indicated in Table 11, there were no significant differences in the number of institutional incidents participants were involved in after program completion. Overall, 20% (n=5) of the participants were perpetrators of at least one incident while involved in the federal correctional facility up to one year prior to commencement of the Tupiq program. Participants were perpetrators in assault, contraband and other incidents prior to the program. This was the same up to one year after completion of the program (20%, n=5). These results suggest that the program did not have a substantial effect on incidents while in the institution.

These findings highlight the increase in motivation for intervention, and a decrease in need for programming, specifically in the areas of personal/emotional issues and substance abuse, following involvement in the Tupiq program. Furthermore, the program seems to have had positive effect on reintegration potential, risk to sexually re-offend and distortions surrounding the crime.

Outcome - Participants versus Comparison Group

As discussed in the methodology, a matched comparison group was utilized to compare outcomes of participants who completed the Tupiq program from non-participants. The comparison group was comprised of Inuit offenders, matched on gender, age, most serious current offence, aggregate sentence length and date of admission.

Table 12 indicates that, following the program, Tupiq program participants had significantly lower scores than the comparison group on overall need for programming (M = 2.6 versus 2.9). In terms of individual need domains, Tupiq participants did not differ significantly from the comparison group on four of the seven need domains. However, participants had significantly lower ratings on the personal/emotional (M = 3.5 versus 3.9) and substance abuse (M = 3.3 versus 3.8) domains as compared to the comparison group. However, the comparison group had significantly lower rating on

marital/family issues (M = 2.7 versus 3.3). In addition, following the program, participants in the Tupiq program had significantly higher motivation level ratings, as compared to the comparison group (M = 2.2 versus 1.7). No significant differences were found in reintegration potential between program participants and the comparison group. Similarly, no significant differences were found in involvement in institutional incidents following completion of the program between Tupiq participants and the comparison group (Table 13).

Differences between Tupiq participants and the comparison group remained in current scores. One difference, however, was that the finding that the comparison group scored significantly lower on marital/family issues disappeared. Another important difference was that while no differences existed just following the program on reintegration potential, Tupiq participants had significantly higher current reintegration potential scores than the comparison group (M = 1.8 versus 1.3).

As illustrated in Table 14, although larger proportions of Tupiq participants than individuals in the comparison group were released from the institution (44% versus 24%), this difference was not significant. Of the participants released, the largest proportion (55%) were released on statutory release. Smaller proportions were released on a warrant expiry (18%) or were granted day and full parole (18% and 9%, respectively). The types of release did not differ significantly from the comparison group. On average, participants of the Tupiq program were released earlier than the comparison group (after serving 3.3 years versus 3.8 years), however this difference was not significant.

No significant differences emerged between Tupiq participants and the comparison group on re-admissions to federal facilities after the program. Three of the 11 participants released were re-admitted. Two participants were re-admitted for technical violations (relating to substance abuse) and one was returned to federal custody for a new sexual offence. These participants were re-admitted to federal custody on average

5.9 months after being released. The remaining eight offenders released have been in the community for an average of one year.

These findings suggest that, following involvement in the Tupiq program, those who participated in the program had lower need for programming, particularly in the areas of personal/emotional and substance abuse interventions, than a matched comparison group. They were also more motivated for intervention and had higher reintegration potential. Although there were no significant differences in the time to release, there were also no significant differences in re-admissions between Tupiq participants and the comparison group.

Satisfaction

Facilitators, participants and key informants were asked to rate their satisfaction with the Tupiq program. Overall, facilitators said they were somewhat or very satisfied with the program overall. About three-quarters (77%) of the key informants said that they were very satisfied with the program. The large majority of participants (96%) said that the program was very beneficial for them. They noted that the program helped them better express themselves and control their anger. According to one respondent:

> *I noticed my anger starting to come down. I know how to solve problems. I can now walk away from an angry situation. I learned how to talk to others in a good way.*

Participants noted that the most beneficial aspects of the program were that it helped them confront problems, pulled out emotions, and introduced Inuit culture. According to one participant:

> *I thought I was alone but I was not. I thought I was not loved by family and relatives anymore, but Tupiq made me realize that I am loved. Tupiq assists us in [understanding] the importance of living a non-criminogenic life.*

In terms of specific components of the program, 87% of the participants said that they were very satisfied with the treatment groups, 79% were very satisfied with skills groups, 75% with individual support/counselling, and 74% with self-management. However, it was noted that no one component would be as effective without the others. Facilitators thought the Inuit healing component was the most useful. It was noted that this component had a huge effect on motivation because it gets offenders used to group cohesion. Skills groups and individual support were thought to be very useful. Treatment groups were thought to be somewhat useful.

Overall, facilitators said they were satisfied with the Inuit-specific content of the program. They felt that the involvement of healers and community links helped incorporate Inuit culture. However, they noted that the self-management and skills components could have had a stronger cultural component. They also noted that there needed to be more visits from Elders and the inclusion of country food more often.

Ninety-six percent of the participants said they were very satisfied with the Inuit healers involved in the program. Seventy-eight percent said that they were very satisfied with the program facilitators overall. Some of the strengths of the facilitators that they noted were that they were able to relate to the offenders, want to help, and were knowledgeable. When asked to rate the facilitators' knowledge on various areas, the majority (83%) of participants said that the facilitators were superior at communicating material. Furthermore, 79% said facilitators had superior knowledge of Inuit culture, 78% said they had superior knowledge of treatment approaches. Seventy-one percent said facilitators had superior knowledge of Inuit communities, 69% said they were very sensitive to issues of Inuit, 67% said they were able to stimulate interest, and 61% said they had superior knowledge of Inuit needs.

Facilitators said they were satisfied with their relationship with other Tupiq staff generally. They all felt they were working towards a common goal, shared information well, and had positive professional relations. They were somewhat less satisfied with

communication and sharing of professional expertise between facilitators. All but one of the facilitators noted that they have experienced some issues with other Tupiq staff. This most often included communication problems, tension between staff, and personality differences. It was noted that these issues were resolved through a healing workshop for Tupiq staff and regular meetings.

Facilitators were asked how satisfied they were with their working relationship with other staff at Fenbrook institution. The healers said that they typically did not interact with other staff. Of those who worked with other staff, most said that they were somewhat satisfied. The issue they faced was that they felt a bit isolated from other institutional staff. The same sentiment was echoed by key informants from the institution. To address this issue, it was felt that greater emphasis should be put on working with the Inuit liaison. It was also noted that there needed to be more communication between Tupiq staff and others in the institution.

Participants said that the program met best needs relating to cultural/spiritual issues (87% said very), violent behaviour (87%), emotional problems (86%), negative thinking (78%), and family difficulties (74%). Areas that the program did not meet as well were employment (41% said very), self-esteem/self-acceptance (67%) and substance abuse (68%). According to some facilitators and key informants, substance abuse, gambling, individual Inuit counselling and reintegration are some of the of the offender needs not addressed by the program.

When asked about the extent to which the Tupiq program contributes to positive changes in various areas, 83% of key informants said increasing motivation for intervention, 82% said increasing cultural awareness, 72% reducing institutional incidents, 67% said increasing reintegration potential, 63% said preparing the offender for release to the community, 53% said reducing the risk of recidivism, and 47% said reducing the risk of sexual recidivism. Facilitators provided similar responses.

In terms of reintegration into the community, 83% of the participants said that the Tupiq program successfully prepares offenders for reintegration into the community. They noted that the most useful aspects of the program include anger management and the ability to express their feelings. Similarly, according to facilitators, the most useful aspects of the program for facilitating successful reintegration are the Inuit healing component, Inuit language and tradition, self management, and a focus on understanding the offending behaviour and the harm they caused.

Facilitators generally noted that they were not satisfied with the extent of involvement of family members or victims.

Ninety-one percent of the participants said they were satisfied with their community link and said their contact with the community link has had a positive effect on them. The benefits they noted were a continued link to the community, the ability to talk freely, and incorporating Inuit culture. According to some key informants, the involvement of community links is limited because it is difficult to find appropriate and willing candidates in the communities. Generally, facilitators said they were quite satisfied with the suitability of the community links chosen, their relationship with Tupiq staff, and the support they provided to the offender. However, it was noted by some that family members are not always the best choice for a community link because they are too close to the offender. Facilitators said they were slightly less satisfied with the frequency of contact between the community link and the offender - some thought more contact would be useful. The general consensus was that community links provided a buffer for staff and helped the offenders. According to one facilitator:

> *[Community links] provide incredible motivation for the offender. They feel reinforced for what they are doing. It's important to keep the focus on going home…*

Summary

Overall, based on the small number of participants who have gone through the program, the Tupiq program has showed some success. Almost 90% of the participants completed the Tupiq program. Furthermore, positive changes have been seen in the attitudes of participants who completed the program, including a decrease in need relating to personal/emotional issues, and less endorsements of distortions relating to their crime. Positive changes are also evident in participants' risk - including a lower risk to sexually re-offend and increased reintegration potential. Although it is too soon to see substantial behavioural changes, no significant differences were found in re-admission to custody between Tupiq participants and a matched comparison group. Furthermore, re-admissions were for technical violations rather than the commission of new offences. Finally, participants, facilitators and key informants all indicated that they were satisfied with the program and felt that it benefited participants. At the completion of one session, in a speech by one participant, he said:

> *"…we have come from all over the North to do our time. This program reaches out to you, it makes you think of your ancestor and how they lived in a traditional way. Plus it gives us the tools we need to go back into society. We had a few tears of sadness and a few tears of happiness. The instructors also had a few tears, that's something you do not see very often. The tears are a way of healing; also tears are for joy and happiness. I have been in a few programs since I've been in the system, this is by far one of the best programs that I've attended, and it gives you the insights that you need so you can keep out of jail… The instructors are very experienced at what they do in the program, the Inuit instructors are very good at translating for me, they take their time and explain everything for me. I've got to know every one of the students that are in the program. They are a very healthy bunch of guys - they seem to know what they want in life. If I knew about this program sooner I would have put in for a transfer a long time ago…"* (speech from program participant)

Possible Improvements

As noted earlier, participants of the program are satisfied with the Tupiq program and feel that the program has positively affected them. Also, based on outcome information, the program seems to have caused some positive changes in participants. However, participants, facilitators and key informants also noted some areas that they feel could be improved.

Screening Process

It was noted that the Tupiq program would be most beneficial if the selection process began as soon as the offender was sentenced. Furthermore, facilitators have noted the need for more outreach to other federal institutions in order to make them aware of upcoming sessions, and to describe the purpose of the Tupiq program and the selection criteria. It was noted that it is important that case managers only nominate offenders who fit the selection criteria.

It was also suggested that the assessment process focus more extensively on the offenders' history, including discussions with family and community members. It was also felt there is a need for those conducting the assessments to understand Inuit culture and language.

Program Staff

Overall, participants said they were satisfied with Tupiq staff. However, they said that the facilitators could listen more and that sometimes they went too fast in the program. The importance of Inuit staff was also noted and it was suggested that more Inuit staff be involved in both the program and the institution. In particular, it was suggested that assessments be conducted by an Inuit psychologist, Inuit counsellors conduct individual counselling, and there be more Elder involvement in the program. For instance, it was

noted that the involvement of the Inuit healers throughout the program, rather than just at the beginning and end, would be useful. However, it this would clearly add substantial cost to the program. Finally, it was noted that more of an effort was necessary to ensure that Inuit and non-Inuit staff were considered equals in program delivery.

When asked how the working relationship between Tupiq staff could be improved, many facilitators noted that a proper orientation session prior to involvement in the program is imperative. The orientation session could include information about the program (e.g., goals, approach) and the institution. It was also suggested that on-going training about the program, the institution and offenders generally would also be useful.

It was also suggested that there needs to be better communication between Tupiq staff. Ways to open lines of communication could include weekly meetings, being open about issues and addressing problems immediately. It was also noted that staff dynamics should be addressed when deciding whom to hire. The importance of improving communication was extended to include better communication between the Tupiq staff and other staff in Fenbrook institution.

Because facilitators are not from the area where the institution is located and because they work on contract, it is difficult to maintain their involvement. It is also necessary to address problems that staff experience. An initial orientation session that covers information about the institution, offenders and the program should become mandatory. Further, communication between staff is important - weekly meetings with facilitators should occur. In addition, there should be more communication between Tupiq staff and other institutional staff. This is important so that Tupiq staff are integrated into the institution and are able to learn from other staff.

Program Design

In terms of the program itself, facilitators said that it could be improved by lengthening the program to spread out various components if necessary. It was noted that it was necessary to get away from the strict curriculum and create more flexibility. They also noted that the program would be more beneficial if it was run in the North. Program staff acknowledge that different combinations of program elements are possible. In fact, it has been noted that adjustments are constantly being made as more program experience is accumulated.

Facilitators and key informants also suggested that the creation of a separate substance abuse program might be necessary, or a specific component of the existing program. The issue of gambling was also noted as an area that could be addressed by developing a session on the topic. Further, it was suggested that the Tupiq program be linked with other programs currently in place.

In terms of specific program components, the difficulty of switching from the healing to self-management group was noted. Issues with the self-management group were that it doesn't fit with an Inuit approach and needs to include more sessions on specific risk factors. It was also noted that the content of the skills component could be more holistic and incorporate more healing skills. It was suggested that the individual counselling needs more flexibility because some participants need more time than others. It was noted that there is a need for a more in-depth Inuit culture/tradition portion. It was suggested that the community links component be expanded and the amount of contact be increased. It was noted that it is important to integrate Inuit healing throughout the entire program.

Although it is clear that Inuit culture is an integral part of the program and Inuit facilitators are considered part of the Tupiq team, some facilitators note that the recommendations of the healers and Inuit facilitators are given less weight than the recommendations of the psychologist. This may be because institutional staff are used

to a specific structure to reports and may not understand or know how to integrate the recommendations of Inuit facilitators and healers. It is crucial that Inuit cultural knowledge and expertise is given credibility and respect in program management.

Involvement of Others

Although all respondents felt that the involvement of family members and victims would be beneficial to participants, the involvement of family is limited and the involvement of victims is absent. Strategies for greater involvement of family members should be sought. However, the issue of victim involvement is complex and may further victimize the victim. This issue needs more thoughtful discussion in order to decide whether the benefit of victim involvement outweighs the negatives.

The involvement of community links is clearly an important aspect of the Tupiq program. However, the consensus seems to be that greater involvement of community links would be beneficial for participants. Furthermore, the development of mechanisms to ensure their continued involvement with participants after the program has ended and upon release would help in reintegration.

Reintegration

Local community capacity and resources are an issue in many Inuit communities. This is true in regard to providing support for offenders who are returning to the community, and is also the case with regard to the ability to offer local prevention and support programs for victims and offenders. For these reasons, opportunities to strengthen links with Inuit communities, organizations and governments should be explored, such as those offered through Section 81 and 84 of the *CCRA*.

Following the Tupiq program, there is a need for follow-up of some kind. Most respondents noted the need to develop a maintenance program in the community. They also noted the need to identify an Inuit parole option. It is clear that further

consideration should be given to how best to link the institutional program with the community. At present, there are no supervised community programs for Inuit offenders in the North. If Inuit offenders are released to supervised residential or community programs in the South, there is a high failure rate. For this reason, many Inuit offenders complete their sentences within correctional institutions and then return to their communities without the benefit of a graduated release.

Tupiq staff could try to enhance their communication with halfway houses and treatment personnel in the community. Furthermore, parole officers should have better knowledge of the Tupiq program so they can prepare offenders for release. It could also include more contact with community links after release.

Support from CSC

Facilitators and key informants were asked how CSC could help enhance the Tupiq program. First of all, facilitators said that it was necessary to create a stable structure for the program. This includes stable ongoing funding, deciding how often to run the program, deciding on regular timeframes, developing standard contracts or hiring permanent staff, giving appropriate orientation and training, and addressing administrative and logistical issues associated with finances, housing and travel. It was also suggested that the program should be part of a larger system of programs, in order for Tupiq staff to interact with other program developers and counsellors.

It was also noted that CSC could help to identify the importance of Inuit culture and tradition in programming. It is important to recognize the differences between Inuit and white offenders. Training of federal staff on Inuit culture would be useful.

In terms of reintegration, CSC can help to identify Inuit/community parole options, including the development of a post-Tupiq program. It was also noted that CSC could help provide information on the program to communities.

Cost[5]

The cost of the Tupiq program is higher than other sex offender treatment programs in place within CSC. A moderate-intensity program is about $140,000 per year, which would likely include two sessions of four to five months each[6]. In contrast, the cost for delivery of one 16-week session of the Tupiq program is approximately $190,000. This includes $160,000 for staffing and $30,000 for travel. This is about double that of the moderate-intensity sex offender program used in other institutions. As indicated in the table below, the program utilizes a part-time clinical director, a program director for two months, three Inuit co-facilitators for three months, and two Inuit healers for one month.

Staff		#	Per Diem	# of days	Cost
	Clinical Director	1	726	72	52,000
	Program Director	1	350	40	14,000
	Facilitator	3	300	90	81,000
	Inuit Healers	2	300	20	12,000
					159,000
Travel/Accommodation:					
	Program Director	1	--	--	6,000
	Facilitator	3	--	--	18,000
	Inuit Healers	2	--	--	6,000
					30,000
TOTAL					189,000

In addition, for some sessions there are additional costs for program follow-up and training. For instance in 2002-03, an additional $11,000 was required to train new Inuit co-facilitators and $22,000 was required for the clinical director to run a low-intensity

[5] Parts of this section were based upon information from Hylton (2003).

[6] Pamela Yates, Manager Sex Offender Programs - Moderate Intensity National Sex Offender Treatment Program.

maintenance program. These costs should be considered separately from the overall program cost.

Some of the reasons for the high costs are:

- Since the program is in the developmental stages, there are costs associated with initial set-up and training, information sessions about the program to other institutions and Inuit agencies, and making modifications to the program;
- All staff work on a contract basis - contracts are more costly than hiring indeterminate staff;
- There are extensive travel and accommodation costs because the program director, facilitators and Inuit healers don't live in Gravenhurst. Since they are not permanently relocating, their accommodation costs are covered by CSC;
- The program itself is expensive – involving 16 weeks of intensive treatment with extensive reliance on external resources.

It is also important to note that, in addition to addressing sex offending, the Tupiq program also addresses other issues such as cognitive skills, family violence, anger management and substance abuse. Therefore, although it is more costly to run, it is more intensive and covers more areas of need than other sex offender programs currently in use by CSC. Furthermore, unlike other programs, where the facilitators' sole responsibility is to deliver the program, Tupiq staff have assumed other roles. For instance, the clinical director conducts all assessments of Inuit offenders at Fenbrook institution. The program director provides information sessions and training of other facilitators, and also conduct outreach with other institutions to identify potential candidates for the program. In addition to their role in Tupiq, the Inuit healers are the only Inuit Elders at Fenbrook, so are involved in ceremonies and counselling of other Inuit offenders.

If there was a need to reduce costs, there are a number of areas that could be considered. First of all, the length of the program could be shortened. This option would require removing some components from the program. However, a number of

respondents have suggested increasing the length of the program and including additional components. Therefore, it is not clear that this is a viable option.

Another possibility would be to make changes to the complement of staff in the program. For instance, the clinical director could supervise the program, which could potentially save the cost of salary and accommodation for the program director. It may also be possible to have another psychologist from Fenbrook supervise the program, which could reduce the costs for the program director and clinical director, although not entirely. Another option may be to have the program supervised by the program director. This would not meet CSC's national program standards for sex offenders. However, this is also the case with at least one other sex offender program within CSC (the Clearwater program).

Costs could also be reduced by less reliance on external resources, such as the healers from the North or facilitators on contract. However, it was clear from interviews with participants, facilitators and key informants that the use of the healers is one of the most important aspects of the Tupiq program. Furthermore, it is clear that Inuit facilitators are a crucial component of the success of the program. However, hiring permanent, full-time staff, rather than contract staff could achieve economies of scale. This would also help to: address staff recruitment and retention issues that will be a serious on-going concern; create possibilities for the development of other program options; and, reduce travel, sustenance, recruitment and training costs. However, it is not clear whether it would be possible to recruit and retain qualified staff in the current location. The prospects of doing so would be much higher if the program was offered in an urban area with a large Inuit population (e.g., Ottawa). This option, however, may remove much of the northern influence.

In summary, there are some good reasons why the Tupiq program costs what it does to operate. However, there may also be some options for reducing the costs. These options should be thought through in terms of the impact they would have on the success of the program. For instance, given comments from various respondents, it

would not be a good idea to remove the involvement of Inuit healers. It is also very important to maintain, and in fact increase, the involvement of Inuit facilitators. Some reductions in costs could be achieved by reducing management by the program director or clinical director once the program is more stable. Finally, if the program were structured in such a way that it was run consistently, hiring permanent staff may be a viable option.

Adapting the Tupiq Program

Adapting Program to Other Offenders

It has been asked whether the Tupiq program can be adapted for use with other Inuit offenders. Although the largest proportion of Inuit federal offenders are incarcerated for sex offences, there is a growing number of Inuit offenders who are young violent and incarcerated for offences such as robbery[7]. The question is - can the program be adapted to address the needs of these types of offenders?

As noted earlier, one program cycle involved non-sex offenders. The results of that cycle were not promising and some of the participants did not complete the program. However, five of the six facilitators and 89% of the key informants said that they thought the program could be adapted for other Inuit offenders. It was noted that the Tupiq program could be revised for all Inuit offender groups, with the exception of those with psychological or learning issues that would prevent them from sitting in a group and learning. It was also noted that offenders needed to have common offences - they should not be mixed.

Facilitators noted that the Inuit culture and tradition components are transferable to programs for other Inuit offenders. In addition, it was noted that the Inuit healing, community links, and skills are transferable. It was felt that components that are not transferable to other Inuit offenders are those that specifically focus on sex offenders.

[7] Information from Jim Spicer based on OMS (2002).

This includes parts of the self-management group that focus specifically on sex offenders. This would need to be changed to deal with the specific needs of the offender group.

Adapting Program to Other Settings

Another question is whether the Tupiq program could be adapted for other federal or provincial/territorial institutions, or to community settings. Five of the six facilitators and 94% of key informants said that they thought the program could be adapted for other institutions. Most felt that the program could best be adapted to northern territorial or federal institutions, rather than southern institutions. Some of the benefits of adapting the program identified by facilitators and key informants were that, if it was based in the north, there would be better access to resources such as staff, community support, and Inuit organizations. It would also be closer to home for Inuit offenders

However, the limitations to moving the Tupiq program would be that there might not be a large enough population base to warrant a program such as Tupiq in other institutions. Furthermore, it may be difficult to find appropriately skilled facilitators. It is important to have staff with the ability to communicate, who are knowledgeable of Inuit culture and have expertise in program facilitation and counselling. Furthermore, in provincial or territorial institutions, offenders may not be incarcerated for a long enough period of time to participate in a program such as Tupiq.

All six facilitators and all key informants said that certain aspects of the Tupiq program could be implemented outside of institutions in northern communities. The benefit of implementing a program in northern communities would be the opportunity for stronger Inuit content and resources. It was also felt that the program content could be integrated into community realities and that participants could practice what they learn in a community setting. The limitations would be that it would be difficult to run a closed group, the group size would need to change, it would be difficult to find appropriate staff to run the program and funding would need to be found.

It was felt that any program set in the community would need to be less structured than the current program. Elements could need to be adapted to an open group. There would also need to be more focus on Inuit traditions and survival skills. However, the healing and skill aspects would be crucial elements to any community-based program.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this project was to examine the Tupiq program in place at Fenbrook Institution. Since the program is a pilot program, only preliminary information is available on the effects of the program. Therefore, it is premature to consider a full-scale evaluation at this time. However, consideration should be given to how the program is operating and any issues it faces before the current program model is permanently adopted. Should the program continue, a more comprehensive evaluation should be undertaken once a large enough number of participants have completed the program.

Program Success

Based on the small number of participants who have gone through the program to date, the Tupiq program has showed some success. First of all, 93% of the participants completed the Tupiq program. This is important since typically many Inuit offenders do not complete programs (Hamilton, 2002). Furthermore, positive changes have been seen in the attitudes of participants, including a decrease in need for programming, in particular relating to personal/emotional issues and substance abuse, and less endorsements of distortions relating to their crime. In interviews with participants, facilitators and key informants, all indicated that they were satisfied with the program and felt that it had a positive benefit on participants. Positive changes are also evident in participants' risk - including a lower risk to sexually re-offend and increased reintegration potential. It is too soon to see substantial behavioural changes, since only 11 of the participants have been released. Of those released, no significant differences were found in re-admission to custody between Tupiq participants and a matched comparison group. Three of the eleven participants who were released following the program were re-admitted. Two were re-admitted for technical violations relating to the use of substances and one was re-admitted for the commission of a new offence. The remaining eight offenders released have been safely reintegrated into society for about one year.

These results provide a good indication of the success of the Tupiq program. Once a larger number of participants have gone through the program, a more in-depth examination of outcomes could be undertaken.

The goals of the Tupiq program, as stated in the program manual, are very broad. Therefore, perhaps not surprisingly, the Tupiq program has not had an extensive impact on the goals. Even if the Tupiq program was completely effective, it would be very difficult for it to impact on these areas. Many other things may have an impact on these goals. For instance, although the Tupiq program may end up having an impact on decisions to detain offenders, many other things may influence the decision. Furthermore, the number of offenders involved in the Tupiq program is too small to influence such factors as the number of Inuit offenders detained by NPB, overall recidivism rates and involvement of Inuit communities in relapse prevention. In order to fairly examine the program, the program goals should be modified to adequately reflect what changes the program could realistically produce.

Based on this research project, the following are some suggestions in terms of program success include:

- Revise the goals of program to make them more in line with what the program could realistically be expected to achieve.
- Implement the use of additional pre- and post-assessment measures of attitude that are more sensitive to change.
- Once the program has run for a longer period of time and more participants have been released - examine recidivism and the long-term development of offenders.
- Given the fact that participants have quite substantial needs in the area of substance abuse, and that two participants were re-admitted because of breach of a condition related to substances, thought could be given to developing a module for the program that focused specifically on substance abuse.

Alternatively, the development of a separate program on substance abuse may be useful.

Program Design

The Tupiq program was developed based upon a recognized need to address the issues that Inuit offenders are facing. Furthermore, it appears to represent current "state-of-the-art" content with respect to the provision of culturally-appropriate programming for Inuit sex offenders. Although there is face validity to the program, the aspects of Western and Inuit programming that contribute most and least to the program's effectiveness has not yet been established. Since this evaluation was an outcome evaluation, it did not examine program content in depth.

It appears that the appropriate participants are being chosen for the Tupiq program. With the exception of one session that included non-sex offenders, all other participants are Inuit with at least one federal conviction for a sex offence. As indicated in the program manual, those who have low cognitive functioning or language difficulties, or who are resistant to programming, are excluded from the program. Furthermore, participants of the program have been assessed as requiring moderate- or high-intensity sex offender programming, which make them appropriate candidates for the Tupiq program.

Profile information demonstrates that Inuit offenders have a variety of program needs. Some of these needs specifically relate to their sexual offending, however, there are other needs that relate, for example, to cognitive and skills deficits. Additional needs relate to alcohol and substance abuse. Moreover, there are some violent Inuit offenders who should not be placed in a program that focuses on sexual offending. Within the current Tupiq program, there isn't an opportunity to match levels of program intensity with levels of need for sex offender treatment. Presently, all offenders receive the same program whether their needs relate to sexual offending or other needs.

Since the Tupiq program is currently the only Inuit-specific program available within the federal correctional service, some key informants have suggested that the program run more often. Furthermore, the program would be more cost efficient if each session was run with a larger number of participants (currently 8 participants per session). However, since there are only about 100 Inuit federal offenders incarcerated at any one time, it is difficult to find candidates who fit the criteria of the Tupiq program. One option suggested by some key informants would be to broaden the eligibility criteria to involve Inuit offenders who have not committed sex offences. However, the one attempt at this approach was deemed not to have been successful. While it is understandable why one may want to provide Inuit-specific treatment to as many Inuit offenders as possible, integrating non-sex offenders into a sex offender-specific program goes against the risk/need principle of effective corrections (Andrews, 2001). Perhaps other possibilities for expanding the program could be considered, including developing "spin-off" programs that address the needs of other Inuit offenders who are not sex offenders. As currently designed, it is likely that the Tupiq program will only be offered once a year, since this appears to be adequate given the current focus and program eligibility criteria. This suggests that there may be some mismatch between program resources and offender needs.

Enhancing the outreach to institutions other than Fenbrook could increase the pool of potential candidates for the program. Furthermore, it may be worthwhile to consider exchange of services agreements with other provincial and territorial governments. These steps to increase the pool of offenders eligible to participate in Inuit specific programs may be required to increase effectiveness while achieving overall economies of scale.

One possibility for modifying the program would be to consider “modularizing” the Tupiq program. Program components relating to sexual offending could be separated from those that deal with other needs, such as cognitive or skills deficits. In addition, new program modules could be developed. For example, components could specifically focus on addressing needs relating to violence, alcohol and substance abuse, and

gambling. Some program modules, such as those dealing with culture, history and values, could be open to all Inuit offenders, irrespective of their current or past offences. In this way, the Tupiq program could evolve to provide different levels and types of program options for a broader cross-section of Inuit offenders. Such a modular approach might also allow for better matching of offenders' needs with program intensity - those with more intense needs could participate in additional program modules. This is somewhat the approach being designed at Willow Cree Healing Lodge for Aboriginal offenders.

Further research is required to determine the level of need for various program options. It may be that a modular approach could only be justified if there was a larger pool of Inuit offenders to draw upon. Given the small number of Inuit federal offenders (about 100 incarcerated at any one time), it is somewhat difficult to find appropriate candidates. Enhancing the outreach to institutions other than Fenbrook could increase the pool of potential candidates for the program. Furthermore, new partnerships might help address this issue. For example, it may be worthwhile to consider exchange of services agreements with the Nunavut government, as well as with other provincial and territorial governments. These steps to increase the pool of offenders eligible to participate in Inuit specific programs may be required to increase effectiveness while achieving overall economies of scale.

Based on interviews with participants, facilitators and other key informants, in addition to developing components relating to substance abuse and gambling, it was suggested that the Inuit culture be enhanced throughout the program. In particular, it was suggested that the self management and skills components could incorporate more Inuit healing approaches. Furthermore, it was suggested that the Inuit healers be involved throughout the full 16 weeks of the program. This last suggestion may not be feasible, given the substantial costs it would involve.

It is clear that there are experienced facilitators involved in the program - and the skills of the facilitators complement one another. In particular, the importance of the Inuit

healers was stressed. However, it will be difficult to maintain the success of the Tupiq program without a continuing presence of a core group of facilitators. Furthermore, it is necessary to address the problems that staff are experiencing. An initial orientation session that covers information about the institution, offenders and the program should become mandatory. Further, communication between staff is important - weekly meetings with facilitators should occur. In addition, to make the program most effective, communication between Tupiq staff and other institutional staff should be more widespread. Finally, administrative issues that contract staff face need to be addressed.

Although there may be more effective and cost efficient ways to run the Tupiq program, program delivery is currently based upon a number of practical considerations. For instance, the program may be more effective if spread out over a longer period of time, allowing participants time for reflection. However, the decision to run an intense 16-week program is largely dictated by practical considerations related to the contracting of program staff. A longer and less intense program could be considered if program staff were otherwise occupied in providing different program modules to other Inuit offenders. This possibility is also appealing because it would better address CSC's need to develop and retain the highly specialized staff who need to be involved in providing Inuit-specific programming. Rather than contracting out a more narrowly conceived program, permanent staff could be hired to develop and provide ongoing Inuit-specific programs to a broader range of Inuit offenders.

Although the results of the research indicate that the involvement of family members and victims would be beneficial to participants, their involvement is absent or limited. Strategies for greater involvement of family members should be sought. However, the issue of victim involvement is complex and may re-victimize the victim. This issue needs more thoughtful discussion in order to decide whether the benefit of victim involvement outweighs the negatives. The involvement of community links is clearly an important aspect of the Tupiq program and greater involvement of community links would be beneficial for participants.

Finally, it is clear that the Tupiq program is a costly program to operate. As discussed in this report, there are some good reasons why the program costs what it does to operate. However, there may also be some options for reducing the costs. These options should be thought through in terms of the impact they would have on the success of the program. For instance, it is important to maintain, and in fact increase, the involvement of Inuit facilitators and healers. Some reductions in costs could be achieved by reducing management costs once the program is more stable. Finally, if the program were structured in such a way that it was run consistently, hiring permanent staff may be a viable option.

The following are some suggestions for improving program design:

- Conduct further research on which aspects of Western and Inuit programming contribute the most and least to the program's effectiveness.
- Ensure that the program, as currently designed, focuses on the appropriate offender types. For instance, the program was developed for use with sex offenders and is not appropriate for non-sexual offenders.
- Examine the possibility of modularizing the Tupiq program to provide flexibility in the programming needs of Inuit offenders. Alternatively, develop components or separate programs that focus on substance abuse and gambling.
- Ensure the appropriate number of participants in each session (8-12 participants). In order to do so, procedures for more outreach to other institutions should be implemented.
- Modify components of the program (e.g., self management) to more fully incorporate Inuit culture.
- Discuss options to enhance the role of Inuit healers in the program.
- Conduct orientation sessions for new Tupiq facilitators and ensure weekly meetings.
- Enhance the involvement of Tupiq staff with other program staff and institutional staff generally.

- There is a need to stabilize the program - including confirming program funding and staff.
- Further discuss the benefits of involving family members and victims.
- Develop procedures to ensure appropriate community links are being chosen and to more fully involve community links.
- Consider options for reducing the cost of the program.

Continuum of Care

Another issue raised in this research relates to the provision of a continuum of care for Inuit sex offenders. At present, the Tupiq program is the only option available for Inuit sex offenders. For many, the opportunity to participate in the program may come early in their sentence, and culturally-appropriate options for maintenance, supervision and follow-up in the community are very limited. The absence of follow-up and community components impairs the overall effectiveness of the program. As indicated earlier, even if the program is effective, the lack of community-based options upon release may create a situation that hinder successful reintegration for Inuit offenders.

The creation of community links is a key to community support upon release. However, these community links do not typically continue after the program is finished. The development of mechanisms to ensure the continued involvement of community links with participants after the program has ended and upon release would help in the reintegration process. The development of stronger community links will likely involve the development of partnerships between CSC and local Inuit communities. As such partnerships are being developed, some consideration will need to be given to the focus of such arrangements - will they be limited to the supervision and follow-up of offenders, or will they encompass capacity building, prevention and other components?

There could be advantages to changing the location of the program, although the support of Fenbrook staff and administrators has been an important factor in the success of the program to date. Nonetheless, there would be distinct advantages to

offering the program in a less isolated location, such as Ottawa or Kingston. There would also be disadvantages, such as the lack of northern influence in southern locations. Offering the program in the North is another option that should be considered. Synergies could be achieved with the programs of the Nunavut correctional service, there would be more opportunities to develop a continuum of institutional and community care, costs of involving external resources would be significantly reduced, and there would be a much larger pool of qualified staff to draw upon.

Some suggestions for enhancing the continuum of care include:

- Develop stronger community links that continue upon completion of the program and upon release.
- Examine additional ways to enhance the reintegration and community component of the Tupiq program.
- Develop a maintenance program in the community.
- Further examine the possibility of delivering the Tupiq program in the North.

Assessment

There is a need to examine the screening process currently in place for the Tupiq program. As indicated by facilitators, those who are referring potential candidates do not appear to have a good understanding of the criteria for acceptance into the program. Therefore, some Inuit offenders are being sent to Fenbrook in order to participate in the program - but they do not fit the criteria.

Correctional program standards require that program facilitators assess participants' progress with respect to addressing the program's specified targets of change related to criminal behaviour, including pre- and post-program assessment batteries and possibly interim assessments. Although there are a substantial number of documents completed on participants of the Tupiq program, many of these are not feasible for use as pre/post assessment tools. For instance, participants provide feedback on each pole of the program, but based on the current instrument, no information is available on which

participant completes the form and there is no opportunity to examine changes over time. The current tools need to be refined in order to provide the required information.

Some suggestions relating to assessment include:

- Ensure case managers have a good understanding of the program criteria so that they are referring appropriate candidates to the Tupiq program.
- Further develop the initial assessment process in place for Inuit offenders - to ensure appropriate candidates are being screened in to the Tupiq program.
- Develop appropriate pre/post-test measures for the program.

REFERENCES

Andrews, D.A. (2001). "Principles of effective correctional programs". In L.L. Motiuk & R.C. Serin (eds.) *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming: Volume 1* (pp 9-17). Correctional Service Canada.

Barbaree, H. (1991). "Denial and minimization among sex offenders: Assessment and treatment outcome". *Forum on Corrections Research*, *3(4)*, 30 -33.

Correctional Service Canada (2002). *One-day snapshot of federal offenders*, Unpublished data from Offender Management System, July 2002.

Correctional Service Canada (1995). *Commissioner's Directive 702: Aboriginal Programming*.

Department of Justice Canada (1992). *Corrections and Conditional Release Act*, c.20.

Ellerby, L.A., & MacPherson, P. (2002). *Exploring the profiles of Aboriginal sex offenders: contrasting Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal sexual offenders to determine unique client characteristics and potential implications for sex offender assessment and treatment strategies*. Research Report R-122, Correctional Service of Canada.

Epprecht, N. (2000). "Programs for Aboriginal offenders: A national survey". *Forum on Corrections Research*, 12(1), 45-47.

Evans, J., Hann, R., & Nuffield, J. (1998). *Crime and corrections in the Northwest Territories*. Prepared for the Honourable Goo Arlooktoo, Minister of Justice and the Honourable Kelvin Ng, Minister of Health and Social Services, Government of the Northwest Territories.

Faulkner, C. (1989). *Inuit offender study*. Prepared for Correctional Service of Canada.

Government of Canada (2001). *Speech from the Throne*. 1st Sess., 37th Parl., January 30, 2001.

Hamilton, E. (2003). *A description of Inuit communities*. Unpublished paper prepared for the Research Branch, Correctional Service Canada.

Hamilton, E. (2002). *Corrections for Inuit offenders: The Tupiq program overview*. Prepared for Fenbrook Institution.

Hanson, K. (2001). "A structured approach to evaluating change among sexual offenders". *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *13(2)*, 105-120.

Hanson, R.K., & Harris, A. (1998). *Dynamic predictors of sexual recidivism*. User Report 96-04. Ottawa, ON: Solicitor General of Canada.

Heckbert, D., & Turkington, D. (2001). *Turning points: A study of the factors related to the successful reintegration of Aboriginal offenders*. Research Report R-112, Correctional Service of Canada.

Hylton, J.H. (2003). The treatment of Aboriginal sex offenders in Canada: Towards best practices. Unpublished paper prepared for the Research Branch, Correctional Service Canada.

Johnston, J.C. (1997). *Aboriginal offender survey: Case files and interview sample*. Prepared for Correctional Service Canada, Research Branch, Research Report R-61.

Mals, P., Howell, K., Day, A., & Hall, G. (1999). "Adapting violence rehabilitation programs for the Australian Aboriginal offender". *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *30(1,2)*, 121-135.

Marshall, W. L. (1996). "Assessment, treatment, and theorizing about sex offenders: Developments during the past twenty years and future directions". *Criminal justice and Behaviour*, *23(1)*, 162-199.

Marshall, W.L., & Williams, S. (2001). "The assessment and treatment of sexual offenders". In L.L. Motiuk & R.C. Serin (eds.) *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming: Volume 1* (pp 135-145). Correctional Service Canada.

Moore, J.P. (2002). *A comparative profile of First Nations, Métis and Inuit federal offenders*. Research Report (in publication), Correctional Service Canada.

Motiuk, L., & Nafekh, M. (2000). "Aboriginal offenders in federal corrections: A profile." *Forum on Corrections Research*, *12(1)*, 10-15.

National Parole Board (2003). *Performance monitoring report 2002-2003*. National Parole Board Performance Measurement Division.

Nunavut Corrections Planning Committee (1999). *Planning for Nunavut corrections*. A report for the Honourable Jack Anawak, Minister of Justice, Nunavut.

Nunavut Department of Justice (2001). *Mamisaq Qamutiik*. Nunvaut Department of Justice, Corrections Branch.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996). *Bridging the cultural divide: A report on Aboriginal people and criminal justice and Canada*. Ministry of Supply and Services Canada.

Sioui, R., & Thibault, J. (2001). *The relevance of a cultural adaptation for Aboriginals of the Reintegration Potential Reassessment Scale (RPRS)*. Research Report R-109, Correctional Service of Canada.

Solicitor General of Canada (1988). *Correctional issues affecting native peoples*. Correctional Law Review Working Paper No. 7.

Trevethan, S., Auger, S., Moore, J.P., MacDonald, M., & Sinclair, J. (2001). *The effect of family disruption on Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal inmates*. Research Report R-113, Correctional Service of Canada.

Trevethan, S., Tremblay, S., & Carter, J. (2000). *The over-representation of Aboriginal people in the justice system*. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

Tupiq Program (2002). *National Inuit offender needs assessment*. October 30, 2002.

Weekes, J.R. & Millson, W.A. (1994). *The Native offender substance abuse pre-treatment program: Intermediate measures of program effectiveness*. Correctional Service Canada, R-35, Ottawa.

Williams, S., Vallée, S., & Staubi, B. (1997). *Aboriginal sex offenders: Melding spiritual healing with cognitive-behavioural treatment*. Correctional Service Canada.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Tables

Table 1
Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics

	Tupiq Participants		Other Incarcerated Inuit Offenders		
	#	%	#	%	*p*
Total	**27**		**77**		
Age at Admission	27		77		*ns*
<35	16	59%	51	66%	
35+	11	41%	26	34%	
Mean age		34.6 yrs		32.8 yrs	
Marital Status at Admission	27		77		
Single	13	48%	54	70%	*
Married/common-law	9	33%	18	23%	*ns*
Separated/divorced	5	19%	4	5%	*
Widowed	0	0%	1	1%	*ns*
Education at Admission	26		61		*ns*
No high school diploma	24	92%	57	93%	
High school diploma	2	8%	4	7%	
Employment at Arrest	26		61		*ns*
Employed	8	31%	22	36%	
Unemployed	18	69%	39	64%	

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*
Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 2
Current Most Serious Offence

	Tupiq Participants		Other Incarcerated Inuit Offenders		
	#	%	#	%	*p*
Most Serious Offence	27		77		
Homicide	1	4%	20	26%	**
Attempt murder	1	4%	1	1%	*ns*
Sexual assault	23	85%	38	49%	***
Assault	0	0%	10	13%	*
Robbery	0	0%	3	4%	*ns*
Property	2	7%	2	3%	*ns*
Other *Criminal Code* and Federal Statutes	0	0%	3	4%	*ns*
Mean Aggregate Sentence (1)		5.5 yrs		3.8 yrs	*
Sex Offence Check List	20				
Current/past sex offence history	20	100%			
Current:					
Serving sentence for sex-related offence	18	90%			
Incest	4	20%			
Pedophilia	4	20%			
Sexual assault	18	90%			
Other sex offence	1	5%			
Past Sentence:					
Convicted for 1 or more sex offences	8	40%			
Incest	2	10%			
Pedophilia	2	10%			
Sexual assault	7	35%			
Other sex offence	2	10%			
Victims:					
One	7	35%			
Two	6	30%			
Three or more	6	30%			
Type of Victim:					
Female children	7	35%			
Female adolescents	9	45%			
Female adults	18	90%			
Male children	0	0%			
Male adolescents	0	0%			
Male adults	0	0%			
Resulted in death or serious harm	11	55%			

(1) Mean aggregate sentence is calculated with life sentences removed.
*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*
Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 3
Criminal History

	Tupiq Participants		Other Incarcerated Inuit Offenders		
	#	%	#	%	*p*
Previous Youth Convictions	21		61		*ns*
Yes	10	48%	30	49%	
No	11	52%	31	51%	
Previous Adult Convictions	21		61		*ns*
Yes	18	86%	54	89%	
No	3	14%	7	11%	
Previous Community Supervision	21		61		*ns*
Yes	18	86%	49	80%	
No	3	14%	12	20%	
Previous Provincial Term	21		61		*ns*
Yes	16	76%	48	79%	
No	5	24%	13	21%	
Previous Federal Term	21		61		*ns*
Yes	6	29%	28	46%	
No	15	71%	33	54%	
Failed - Community Sanction	21		61		*ns*
Yes	15	71%	40	66%	
No	6	29%	21	34%	
Failed - Conditional Release	21		61		*ns*
Yes	10	48%	30	49%	
No	11	52%	31	51%	
Segregation for Disciplinary Infraction	21		57		*
Yes	3	14%	22	39%	
No	18	86%	35	61%	
Escape/Attempt/UAL	21		60		*ns*
Yes	2	10%	8	13%	
No	19	90%	52	87%	
Reclassified to Higher Security	21		59		*
Yes	1	5%	15	25%	
No	20	95%	44	75%	
< 6 Months Since Last Incarceration	21		61		*ns*
Yes	7	33%	21	34%	
No	14	67%	40	66%	

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*
Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 4
Static and Dynamic Factors - at Intake

	Tupiq Participants		Other Incarcerated Inuit Offenders		
	#	%	#	%	*p*
Security Level at Admission	27		73		*ns*
Minimum	4	15%	4	5%	
Medium	18	67%	50	68%	
Maximum	5	19%	19	26%	
Risk to Re-offend	26		70		*ns*
Low	0	0%	0	0%	
Medium	3	12%	12	17%	
High	23	88%	58	83%	
Overall Dynamic Need	26		70		*ns*
Low	0	0%	0	0%	
Medium	4	15%	7	10%	
High	22	85%	63	90%	
Dynamic Factors	26		67		
Employment - some/considerable need	15	58%	35	52%	*ns*
Marital/Family - some/considerable need	21	81%	41	61%	*ns*
Associates - some/considerable need	8	31%	30	45%	*ns*
Substance Abuse - some/considerable need	21	81%	65	97%	**
Community - some/considerable need	13	50%	29	43%	*ns*
Personal/Emotional - some/considerable need	26	100%	67	100%	*ns*
Attitude - some/considerable need	12	46%	41	61%	*ns*
Motivation for Intervention	10		18		*
Low	0	0%	8	44%	
Medium	6	60%	7	39%	
High	4	40%	3	17%	
Reintegration Potential	26		68		*ns*
Low	19	73%	54	79%	
Medium	7	27%	11	16%	
High	0	0%	3	4%	

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*
Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 5
Other Information on Participants

	#	%
Understand/Speak Inuktitut?	24	
Yes	24	100%
No	0	0%
Able to Carry on Conversation in English/French?	24	
Yes	23	96%
No	1	4%
Religion (1)	24	
Protestant	15	63%
Roman Catholic	3	13%
Traditional Inuit	0	0%
Traditional First Nations	1	4%
Other	6	25%
None	1	4%
Attached to Inuit Culture - childhood?	24	
Very	18	75%
Somewhat	3	13%
Not at all	3	13%
Attached to Inuit Culture - in institution?	24	
Very	9	38%
Somewhat	7	29%
Not at all	8	33%
Attached to Inuit Culture - outside institution?	21	
Very	10	48%
Somewhat	7	33%
Not at all	4	19%
Attached to Other Aboriginal Culture - childhood?	22	
Very	1	5%
Somewhat	4	18%
Not at all	17	77%
Attached to Other Aboriginal Culture - in institution?	20	
Very	5	25%
Somewhat	5	25%
Not at all	10	50%
Attached to Other Aboriginal Culture - outside institution?	19	
Very	2	11%
Somewhat	4	21%
Not at all	13	68%

	#	%
Participate in Inuit Activities - childhood	24	
Yes	20	83%
No	4	17%
Participate in Inuit Activities - now?	24	
Yes	19	79%
No	5	21%
Type of Community during Childhood	24	
Large/small city	0	0%
Large/small town	18	75%
Large/small village/hamlet	5	21%
Other	1	4%
Type of Community at Recent Arrest	24	
Large/small city	2	8%
Large/small town	16	67%
Large/small village/hamlet	6	25%
Other	0	0%
Where do you Consider Home?	24	
Large/small city	2	8%
Large/small town	17	71%
Large/small village/hamlet	5	21%
Other	0	0%
Best Place to be Released	22	
Large/small city	9	41%
Large/small town	7	32%
Large/small village/hamlet	5	23%
Other	1	5%
Plan to be Released	21	
Large/small city	5	24%
Large/small town	11	52%
Large/small village/hamlet	5	24%
Other	0	0%

(1) More than one response was possible. Therefore, percentages will not equal 100%.
Source: Interviews with program participants.

Table 6
Family - Background and Current

	#	%
Primary Caregiver during Childhood	24	
Parent(s)	17	71%
Grandparent(s)	3	13%
Siblings	3	13%
Other relative	1	4%
Stable Childhood?	23	
Yes	16	70%
No	7	30%
Experienced/Witnessed Violence in Home	24	
Yes	19	79%
No	5	21%
Experienced/Witnessed Violence in Community	24	
Yes	19	79%
No	5	21%
Drug/Alcohol Use in Family	24	
Yes	14	58%
No	10	42%

	#	%
Current Contact with Spouse	8	
Yes	4	50%
No	4	50%
Current Contact with Children	17	
Yes	10	59%
No	7	41%
Current Contact with Other Family	24	
Yes	24	100%
No	0	0%

Source: Interviews with program participants.

Table 7
Program Participation

	Program Participation		Aboriginal Program		Successful Completion	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Current Sentence	**25**					
Sex offender (other than Tupiq)	7	28%	5	71%	5	71%
Substance abuse	6	24%	1	17%	3	50%
Anger management	5	20%	0	0%	3	60%
Violence prevention	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Family violence	8	32%	0	0%	8	100%
Cognitive/living skills	8	32%	0	0%	8	100%
Educational	18	72%	0	0%	5	28%
Vocational skills	13	52%	0	0%	12	92%
Institutional work	21	84%	13	62%	13	62%
Psychological/counselling	1	4%	0	0%	1	100%
Cultural/spiritual	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	3	12%	1	33%	3	100%
Previous Sentence	**5**					
Sex offender	2	40%	0	0%	1	50%
Substance abuse	5	100%	2	40%	4	80%
Anger management	1	20%	0	0%	1	100%
Violence prevention	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Family violence	1	20%	0	0%	1	100%
Cognitive/living skills	3	60%	0	0%	2	67%
Educational	4	80%	0	0%	2	50%
Vocational skills	1	20%	1	100%	0	0%
Institutional work	5	100%	0	0%	3	60%
Psychological/counselling	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cultural/spiritual	2	40%	2	100%	2	100%
Other	3	60%	3	100%	3	100%

Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 8
Detention Decisions: Inuit Offenders

Detention	**1998-99**		**1999-2000**		**2000-01**		**2001-02**		**Total**	
Rates	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Statutory Release	55		50		59		44		208	
Released	47	85%	41	82%	51	86%	37	84%	176	85%
Detained	8	15%	9	18%	8	14%	7	16%	32	15%

Source: National Parole Board Performance Measurement Division, 2004.

Table 9
Release and Re-Admissions: All Inuit Offenders

	1999-2000		2001-2002			Total	
	#	%	#	%	***p***	#	%
Release Type	119		77		*ns*	196	
Day parole	31	26%	15	19%		46	23%
Full parole	5	4%	3	4%		8	4%
Statutory release	51	43%	29	38%		80	41%
Warrant expiry	31	26%	29	38%		60	31%
Other	1	1%	1	1%		2	1%
Re-Admission 1-Year after Release	119		77		*ns*	196	
Yes	46	39%	25	32%		71	36%
No	73	61%	52	68%		125	64%
Sexual Offenders - re-admission 1-year after release	7		5		*ns*	12	
Yes	1	14%	1	20%		2	17%
No	6	86%	4	80%		10	83%
Re-Admission Type	46		25		*ns*	71	
Warrant of committal	4	9%	1	4%		5	7%
New offences	7	15%	5	20%		12	17%
Technical violation	35	76%	18	72%		53	75%
Other	0	0%	1	4%		1	1%
Time to Re-Admission	5.9 mths		4.2 mths		**		

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*

Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 10
Dynamic Factors: Tupiq Participants

	Pre Program M	Post Program M	*p*	Current M	*p*
Dynamic Needs - Overall	2.8	2.6	*	2.3	**
Individual Needs					
Personal/emotional	3.9	3.5	**	3.3	***
Substance abuse	3.6	3.3	*ns*	3.2	**
Marital/family	3.0	3.3	*ns*	3.1	*ns*
Employment	2.7	2.8	*ns*	2.6	*ns*
Attitude	2.6	2.6	*ns*	2.6	*ns*
Community functioning	2.5	2.4	*ns*	2.3	*ns*
Associates/social interaction	2.5	2.3	*ns*	2.4	*ns*
Reintegration Potential	1.3	1.5	*ns*	1.8	*
Motivation for Intervention	2.0	2.2	*ns*	2.4	*ns*
Other Assessments					
Sonar	6.5	5.3	***		
Denial/minimization	6.1	4.5	***		

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*
Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 11
Incidents: Tupiq Participants (one-year)

	Pre Program		Post Program		
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**	***p***
Perpetrated one or more incidents	25		25		*ns*
Yes	5	20%	5	20%	
No	20	80%	20	80%	
Types of incidents (1)	5		5		*ns*
Causing a disturbance (2)	0	0%	0	0%	
Assault (3)	2	40%	1	20%	
Intelligence (4)	0	0%	0	0%	
Contraband (5)	1	20%	3	60%	
Disciplinary infraction (6)	0	0%	0	0%	
Self-injury/suicide (7)	0	0%	0	0%	
Other	2	40%	1	20%	

(1) These percentages are based the number of offenders who have committed an incident and will therefore not add up to 100%.
(2) Includes disciplinary problems, setting fires, major and minor disturbance.
(3) Includes assault on staff, visitors, other inmates and fighting.
(4) Indicates that a CSC staff has either heard from another inmate or witnessed activities to suggest an incident has occurred.
(5) Includes possession, receiving or transporting unauthorized items or contraband.
(6) Includes damage to government property, being under the influence and other incidents.
(7) Includes self-injury and suicide.

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*
Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 12
Dynamic Factors: Tupiq versus Comparison Group

Post Program	Participants	Comparison	
	M	M	*p*
Dynamic Needs - Overall	2.6	2.9	*
Individual Needs			
Personal/emotional	3.5	3.9	**
Substance abuse	3.3	3.8	*
Marital/family	3.3	2.7	*
Employment	2.8	2.4	*ns*
Attitude	2.6	2.9	*ns*
Associates/social interaction	2.3	2.4	*ns*
Community functioning	2.4	2.5	*ns*
Reintegration Potential	1.5	1.3	*ns*
Motivation for Intervention	2.2	1.7	**

Current Assessment	Participants	Comparison	
	M	M	*p*
Dynamic Needs - Overall	2.3	2.9	**
Individual Needs			
Personal/emotional	3.3	3.9	***
Substance abuse	3.2	3.7	*
Marital/family	3.1	2.7	*ns*
Employment	2.6	2.5	*ns*
Attitude	2.6	2.9	*ns*
Community functioning	2.3	2.5	*ns*
Associates/social interaction	2.4	2.5	*ns*
Reintegration Potential	1.8	1.3	*
Motivation for Intervention	2.4	1.7	**

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*
Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 13
Incidents - Post Program: Tupiq versus Comparison Group (one-year)

	Participants		Comparison		
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**	***p***
Perpetrated one or more incidents	25		25		*ns*
Yes	5	20%	7	28%	
No	20	80%	18	72%	
Type of incidents (1)	5		7		*ns*
Causing a disturbance (2)	0	0%	2	29%	
Assault (3)	2	40%	1	14%	
Intelligence (4)	0	0%	1	14%	
Contraband (5)	1	20%	1	14%	
Disciplinary infraction (6)	0	0%	1	14%	
Self-injury/suicide (7)	0	0%	0	0%	
Other	2	40%	4	57%	

(1) These percentages are based the number of offenders who have committed an incident and will therefore not add up to 100%.
(2) Includes disciplinary problems, setting fires, major and minor disturbance.
(3) Includes assault on staff, visitors, other inmates and fighting.
(4) Indicates that a CSC staff has either heard from another inmate or witnessed activities to suggest an incident has occurred.
(5) Includes possession, receiving or transporting unauthorized items or contraband.
(6) Includes damage to government property, being under the influence and other incidents.
(7) Includes self-injury and suicide.

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*
Source: CSC Offender Management System.

Table 14
Release and Re-admission to Federal Custody: Tupiq versus Comparison Group

	Participants		Comparison		
	#	%	#	%	*p*
Released	25		25		*ns*
Yes	11	44%	6	24%	
No	14	56%	19	76%	
Release Type	11		6		*ns*
Statutory release	6	55%	4	67%	
Warrant expiry	2	18%	2	33%	
Day parole	2	18%	0	0%	
Full parole	1	9%	0	0%	
Re-Admitted to Federal Custody	11		6		*ns*
Yes	3	27%	0	0%	
No	8	73%	6	100%	
Reason for Re-Admission	3				
Technical violation	2	67%			
New offence	1	33%			
		Mean		**Mean**	
Time to Release		3.3 yrs		3.8 yrs	*ns*
Time to Re-Admission		5.9 mths			

*ns = Not Significant; * = p<=.05; ** = p<=.01; *** = p<=.001*

Source: CSC Offender Management System.