

for community assessments and supervision and obviously make judgements as to the service being rendered by the after-care agency worker insofar as this is revealed in these documents. But the parole service staff are not necessarily trained in supervision and in fact many of the after-care agency workers are longer experienced and with better professional training than their parole service counterparts.

A high proportion of the staff of the after-care agencies have had professional pre-employment training. For example, a quick survey of the staff of the John Howard Society of Ontario revealed that of 35 supervisory and casework staff, 24 had Master of Social Work degrees, 1 had a B.S.W., 8 had B.A. degrees in Sociology and were hired on a staff development basis which, following two years of successful practice, would enable them with financial support to proceed to the M.S.W. degree. One of the staff was an ex-parolee with a grade 12 education, but with considerable informal education and life experience.

It does not follow, that persons without pre-employment professional training were unable to make a successful contribution in this field of correctional service. With good supervision, experience and dedication to the task many have made most satisfactory contributions which, however, might have been even greater with pre-employment professional training. The same general mixture of staff qualifications will, I am sure, be found in the staff of the Parole Service.

It is difficult, therefore, to expect the parole service staff to be experts in the judgement of the quality of casework service being provided by the after-care agency workers though they are in a position to assess, from their viewpoint, the functions being performed for the parole service in assessment and supervision. The judgements by either party in problem situations may differ and such matters are worked out on the supervisory level with rare cases becoming matters for administrative discussion between the heads of the services concerned. They have so far been settled in a most amicable manner with the Executive Director of the Parole Service.

The quality of service being provided by the parole service staff should, in equity, also be scrutinized by qualified independent observers and researchers. The after-care agency workers are not in a position to do this as they do not have access to all their reports and have no way of judging concerning their direct involvement with their clients. They know only the content of the referral material concerning inmates and the type of relationship they have with the parole service officer concerning the cases they are supervising.

The product of the service also provides some indication of its quality. A study of High and Low Risk Parolees was made by two students, Vichert and Zahnd, under the supervision of Dr. T. Grygier for their M.S.W. degrees at the School of Social Work at the University of Toronto and reported in the January, 1965, edition of the Canadian Journal of Corrections. This study was made of parolees in the Ontario region under supervision by all agencies including the parole service. The major finding was: "The attribute found to be the most strongly associated with success among the high risk group (three or more convictions) was supervision by the John Howard Society. Of the ninety-one in the high risk group, forty-seven were supervised by the John Howard Society. Of these twenty-one or 44.6 percent succeeded on parole. Of the forty-four

high risk parolees supervised by other than the John Howard Society only six or 13.6 percent succeeded on parole."

Other factors such as staff development programmes, the supervisory and administrative structure of the agency focussed on the delivery of service, the motivations and quality of the laymen who are on the Boards and Committees of the agency representing community values, all play a part in standards of service. The acquisition of sound human beings with good pre-employment education for staff positions is of great value. Professionally trained personnel cannot always be obtained due to general shortages in the social services of the community.

DIFFICULT CASES

There is reason to believe that the after-care agencies are receiving a full share of difficult cases. The standard of supervisory control and the difficulty of cases may be related to the extent of revocation and forfeiture in the respective caseloads. In the Report of the Parole Service for 1969, of 3956 parolees under supervision, 1246 were by the after-care agencies and 1504 by the parole service. There were 89 revocations of after-case cases and 93 of parole service cases and there were 175 forfeitures (for a further indicatable offence) from the after-care caseload and 198 from that of the parole service. This indicates an apparently even balance in the control aspects.

JURISDICTION OF THE PAROLE BOARD

At present the decision making regarding all parole is the responsibility of the Parole Board which makes thousands of individual decisions each year. The staff of the Board in cooperation with the institutional staff make recommendations to the Board which may or may not be accepted. Increasingly, an effort is being made to develop a programme, a prescription in a sense, for each inmate as he enters the institution. Ideally the parole service staff should be involved with the institutional staff and the inmate himself in the developing of this programme prescription. As the inmate proceeds successfully in achieving the desired programme, parole should become the obvious continuation of the institutional experience.

It is obvious that the institutional and parole service staff related to that institution will come to know the inmate and his achievements very well and should be in the best position to judge his suitability for release by parole at the most appropriate time in his institutional programme and with due regard to his community situation.

Hence it is suggested that responsibility for day parole (except in cases involving Cabinet approval) and the parole of inmates sentenced to two years imprisonment be placed jointly on the institutional director and the district officer of the parole service. These officers will receive the case material and recommendations from the institutional classification staff and the parole service representative in the institution. In the event of disagreement between the two the inmate should have the right to a review by the Parole Board to whom the matter should be referred for a decision. This places the Board in no more difficult a position in regard to staff than in its present practice which calls for consideration of staff recommendations.