

POLICE DISCRETION WITH YOUNG OFFENDERS

METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX

Figure A.1 Locations of police services in the sample



I. Interviews

1.0 Sample

1.1 Target sample

A sample of 118 police agencies was selected to be interviewed. This consisted of 76 agencies which we designated as high priority, and 42 additional agencies which were designated as “to be interviewed if time permits”.

The target sample was based on the principles of representativeness of the regions of Canada, of communities of different sizes, and communities inside and outside Census Metropolitan Areas, and the different modes of delivery of police services: independent municipal, provincial, RCMP municipal and provincial contract, OPP municipal contract, and First Nations self-policing.

The 76 first-priority agencies consisted of 47 independent municipal police services, 20 RCMP detachments, 5 provincial police (OPP and RNC) detachments or headquarters, 2 First Nations police services, one police training facility, and the headquarters of the Sûreté du Québec.

The 42 second-priority agencies included 27 independent municipal services, 8 RCMP detachments, and 7 OPP detachments, with a number of detachments of the Sûreté du Québec, to be determined in consultation with the headquarters of the Sûreté.

1.2 Actual sample

The target sample had to be modified in various ways, which are discussed below. The outcome was that members of 98 police agencies were interviewed. These are shown as push-pins in the map in Figure A-1, and listed in Annex A-1, at the end of this Appendix. These police agencies fall into 5 categories:

1. Independent municipal police services (in all provinces except Newfoundland) (n=50);
2. RCMP detachments in 5 provinces and 3 territories (NWT, Nunavut, Yukon, B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and New Brunswick (n = 29);
3. Provincial police detachments (Ontario Provincial Police and Royal Newfoundland Constabulary) (n=14);

4. First Nations police services (n=3);
5. Training facilities (n=2).

Of the original sample of 76 first-priority police agencies, 15 could not be included in the final sample. Six of these 15 agreed to participate, but could not be accommodated in the interviewer's travel schedule. Representatives of one police service (the Sûreté du Québec) expressed initial interest in participating, but eventually declined to participate after consultation with the provincial Ministère de la sécurité publique. The other 8 first-priority police services which could not be included are all located in Province of Québec. Municipal consolidation and the amalgamation of policing services during 2002 in Québec have resulted in the substitution of regional police, or policing by the Sûreté, for smaller independent municipal services. These 8 police services were in the process of being dissolved or merged into larger regional services, and were therefore unsuitable for inclusion in the study.

Thirty-seven police agencies were added to the 61 original first-priority agencies included in the sample. These 37 additional agencies were selected according to two criteria: they had characteristics which improved the representativeness of the resulting sample, and they were relatively convenient to interview, given the travel schedule imposed on our interviewers by the locations of the 61 first-priority agencies.

Initiatives by the RCMP and Ontario Provincial Police were extremely helpful in overcoming the shortcomings of the target sample, particularly its under-representation of rural and small-town policing. This bias in our target sample in favour of larger communities was partly a result of our priority on representativeness by population, and was partly forced on us by the necessity of concentrating our interviewers' visits in cities and surrounding areas in order to use their time and travel budget most efficiently.

On the initiative of Dorothy Franklin, Officer in Charge, National Youth Strategy, Community, Contract and Aboriginal Police Services, contact was made on our behalf with 12 RCMP members who had served recently in 7 detachments in the Yukon, Northwest Territories, or Nunavut, but were now posted to Ottawa, southern Ontario, or Edmonton. Project staff were able to interview these members without travelling to the North. The interviews provided unique information on policing with young offenders, and indeed, policing in general, in the North.

A similar opportunity was provided by the OPP, on the initiative of Supt. Susan Dunn, Commander, Operational Planning and Research Bureau. Her staff arranged for officers currently posted to 10 remote detachments in Northern Ontario to travel to OPP HQ in Orillia to be interviewed by project staff.

Apart from these 17 remote RCMP and OPP detachments, we were able to include from the second-priority list, 6 RCMP detachments in B.C., Alberta, and Saskatchewan, a police training academy in B.C., and one municipal service in each of Ontario and Nova Scotia. However, the main substitutions occurred in the Province of Québec, due to the large number (9 out of 14) which could not be included from the first-priority sample. Nine additional municipal and 2 First Nations police services in the Province of Québec were incorporated in the resulting sample of police services interviewed.

We believe that the resulting sample provides adequate representation of public policing in the regions of Canada, in communities of different sizes, and communities inside and outside Census Metropolitan Areas, and the different modes of delivery of police services: independent municipal, provincial, RCMP municipal and provincial contract, OPP municipal contract, and First Nations self-policing. The only major aspect of policing which is not represented in the sample is provincial policing in the province of Quebec.

The number of members interviewed per police agency varied between one and seven, depending on the size of the agency and the availability of interviewees. Altogether, 199 interviews were conducted with more than 300 members of the 98 police agencies. Their names are listed with their permission in Annex A-2.

Qualitative data from all the interviews has been incorporated into the report. The statistical analyses of the interview data are based on 194 interviews with 95 police agencies since key information was not available from 5 interviews with 3 police agencies.

2.0 Interview Procedure

2.1 Contact

Initial contact with the sampled police agencies was made in three ways:

- Project staff attended and made presentations at the semi-annual meetings of the POLIS (Police Information and Statistics) Committee of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, in October, 2001 and March, 2002. This committee has members representing the largest police services in Canada, including the RCMP, the 3 provincial police forces, and approximately 12 of the largest municipal forces, representing almost every province of Canada. After receiving expressions of support at both POLIS meetings, and invitations from some POLIS members, project staff contacted most members of POLIS as the

first “wave” of interviews, in March, 2002. Eventually, all members (as of October, 2001) of POLIS were contacted to request interviews.

- A letter of introduction requesting cooperation was sent in March, 2002, by the Director General, Youth Justice Policy, Department of Justice, to the Commanding Officer (Chief of Police, Chief Constable, etc.) of every sampled municipal and provincial police service, and to the Commanding Officers of the RCMP Divisions for the 5 provinces in which sampled RCMP detachments were located. This letter enclosed a brief description written by project staff of the objectives of the project, the information which we wanted to elicit in the interviews, and the kinds of officers whom we wanted to interview (see Annex A-3).
- A representative of Youth Justice Policy arranged a meeting in March, 2002, at RCMP National Headquarters between project staff and members of the Community, Contract and Aboriginal Police Services, RCMP. This resulted in a strong expression of support for the project, expressed in a letter of introduction written by Dorothy Franklin, Officer in Charge, National Youth Strategy, requesting cooperation from the Divisional Commanding Officers for the 5 provinces (and for “Depot” Division) where we wished to interview RCMP members; with copies to the Officer in Charge, Criminal Operations, in each provincial Division, and to the Officer in Charge of each sampled detachment.

We believe that each of these approaches probably contributed significantly to the extremely high degree of cooperation which we subsequently received from police services. In our approaches to the many police services which do not belong to POLIS, we cited the support for the project expressed by POLIS, and the fact that almost all members of POLIS had agreed to participate in the study. Presumably the support of POLIS and its individual members, in combination with the letter requesting cooperation sent by Justice Canada, encouraged the commanding officers of other police services to allow us access.

In the case of the OPP, it was in response to our presentation at the March, 2002, meeting of POLIS that the Commander, Operational Planning and Research Bureau, offered the services of her office in coordinating the interviews with OPP officers which we had planned, and also made the very generous offer to bring members of Northern detachments to OPP Headquarters to be interviewed.

In the case of the RCMP, we believe that the letter of introduction from the OIC, National Youth Strategy, was probably crucial to obtaining the cooperation of the provincial Divisional Commanders, who then arranged access for us to the individual detachments.

The second contact with each sampled municipal police service, and the two RNC detachments, took the form of a short letter faxed to the Commanding Officer, written by the Principal Investigator. It referred to the letter of introduction from Justice Canada, briefly repeated the objectives of the project, listed the (growing number of) names of police services which had already agreed to participate, suggested a day for the interviews to take place, and invited the recipient to contact the Principal Investigator to arrange the interviews. A copy of the project summary was included (Annex A-3). In the case of the RCMP, this letter from the Principal Investigator was sent to the provincial Divisional Commanders, and listed the detachments which we wished to interview and the days, or week, during which our interviewer would be available to visit the detachments. A slightly different procedure was followed with the police services in the Province of Québec; this is discussed below.

In some cases, the faxed letter elicited a telephone call from the Chief's office, or someone in the police service assigned by the Chief to liaise with us. If no response was forthcoming, project staff contacted the Chief's office by telephone. In the phone calls, we answered questions about the project, since many of the police services which we contacted had concerns about our objectives, our methods, and the nature of our intended report; and explained what kinds of officers we wished to interview, and arranged a mutually convenient day or days to visit the police service.

In the case of the smaller police services, it was often possible to make the arrangements for the visit in one or two telephone calls, with either the Chief himself, or his secretary or Deputy Chief. In some of the larger police services, the Chief's executive assistant, or a Deputy Chief or other officer in a management position was assigned to assist us, and arrangements were made fairly easily. In other police services, responsibility for assisting us was passed from person to person down the chain of command; in these cases, several phone calls, over a period of weeks, were needed to arrange a visit. In some cases, more than a dozen phone calls were required to make the arrangements.

In the case of the RCMP, our first phone call was to the office of the provincial Divisional CO. In one province, the CO assigned an officer to assist us, who requested information from us concerning our preferred interview times, then personally contacted all the detachments which we had identified, and arranged all the visits for us. In the other provinces, the CO notified the detachments by letter of our wish to visit them, requested their cooperation, and left it for us to arrange the visits. We then contacted the Officer or NCO in Charge of each detachment, as though it were an independent police service – with the important difference that the provincial CO had already requested that the OIC of the detachment cooperate with us. In all but one province, staff of Divisional Headquarters were made available to us to interview, although in two provinces, our interviewer's crowded travel schedule made this impossible.

A few police services required detailed information about the questions which we planned to ask during the interviews, and our provisions for maintaining the confidentiality of oral answers and documentary material. In these cases, we provided the police service with a written Confidentiality Protocol (Annex A-4) and a complete Interview Schedule (Annex A-5).

We used a slightly different procedure to contact police services in the Province of Québec, since the regular project staff are not fluent in French. A bilingual interviewer who is resident in Montreal was engaged in late April, to do interviews with police in the Province of Quebec. During May, she translated our main interview documents into French, including the interview schedule (Annex A-6) and letters of introduction to police (Annex A-7). After the Director General, Youth Justice Policy, had sent the initial letter of introduction (in French) to sampled police services, our bilingual interviewer faxed the follow-up letter on our company letterhead, under her own signature, with an invitation to contact her at her Montreal office. If she did not receive a reply, she then made contact with the police services and arranged the interviews.

2.2 Interview procedures

With very few exceptions, interviews were conducted on-site, either at the premises of the police agency, or in the officer's car. The exceptions are two telephone interviews and one conducted at a conference which the interviewee was attending. All interviews were tape-recorded, with the permission of the interviewees. There were some group interviews with two or more members participating. Almost all interviewees were sworn police officers; a very small number were civilian employees in administrative support divisions, such as Records.

Interviews were conducted between March and August, 2002. For the sake of consistency, we decided to have all the anglophone interviews conducted by the same interviewer, the Assistant Project Manager. (Actually, a few interviews were also conducted by the Principal Investigator when the Assistant Project Manager was unavailable.) This imposed limits on how much time she could spend with each police service, since she had to visit a large number of agencies, scattered all across Canada, in a few months. Generally, we allocated half a day for visits with smaller police services (and detachments), where we anticipated conducting only one or two interviews; and a full day for visits to the larger municipal police services, involving three to seven interviews. For a few very large municipal services, two days were allocated.

In the case of police services with specialized youth detectives, and where the interviewer's schedule permitted, we requested that the interviewer be taken on a ride-along with a youth detective. Eleven ride-alongs were conducted. No tape recorder was

used during the ride-alongs, but the interviewer's observations were recorded afterwards, and incorporated into the analysis.

The interview schedule is reproduced in Annexes A-5 and A-6. Interviews were semi-structured; that is, the interview schedule was used by the interviewers as a guide to topics to be covered, rather than to be slavishly followed. If the interviewee wished to pursue a line of thought which was not, strictly speaking, in the interview schedule, but seemed relevant to the project's objectives, then s/he was not discouraged from doing so.

The last part of the interview schedule, covering recording practices, was devised mainly to shed some light on the genesis of UCR data, for the benefit of project staff doing analysis of statistical data, rather than to provide substantive information for the final report. This section turned out not to be very successful, since many or most of the officers interviewed were not in a position to give informed answers, and there were few opportunities to interview personnel in Records. Furthermore, this section came at the end of the interviews, which tended to be lengthy and tiring for both interviewers and subjects, and which were usually conducted during a fixed period of time; so that there was often no time to cover this section, or it seemed inadvisable on account of the subject's or interviewer's fatigue. In addition, this seemed to be the one topic on which interviewees seemed reluctant to speak frankly. Therefore, interviewers adopted the practice of omitting this section, unless there was some particular opportunity to pursue it (e.g. someone from Records was made available for interviewing).

Although interviewers attempted to ask all the questions in the interview schedule (with the exception noted above) in the course of interviewing each police agency, they did not necessarily ask all the questions of each interviewee. Subsets of questions are designated in the schedule as being particularly appropriate for upper management to answer; subsets for middle management, and subsets for general duty officers (patrol and investigators). However, in the smaller police services, where only one or perhaps two officers could be interviewed, a larger portion or all of the questions were addressed in the one or two interviews. In some large municipal police services, some interviewees had highly specialized functions, and the interviews with them concentrated on these functions.

Further limitations on coverage of the interview schedule for some police services were imposed by the busy schedules of some interviewees, and occasionally by the travel schedule of the interviewer.

Relevant documentary material was requested from all police agencies, and in many cases was provided. Much information about the nature of the community, general police service orientation, and organizational structure was also obtained from the web sites maintained by some police services and municipalities.

Following the visit, a letter was sent to the CO or Chief expressing appreciation for the participation of the police service, and thanking by name the members who had been most instrumental in the success of the visit.

2.3 Transcription and translation

The English interviews were transcribed by a local transcription service. The French interviews were transcribed in French, and then translated into English.

II. Statistical data on young offender cases

Custom tabulations of statistical data from the Incident-Based Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR2) Survey were provided by Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

For the analyses reported in Chapter II, we used a tabulation of all youth-related incidents reported to the UCR2 for 2001, broken down by province and clearance status of the incident; and a tabulation of all youth-related incidents reported for 1995-2001 by a subset of police services which have been reporting continuously to the UCR2 between 1995 and 2001 (the “Trend Database”).

For the analyses reported in Chapter V, we used a tabulation of all young persons apprehended in 2001 who were reported to the UCR2 by a subset of police services. This tabulation was broken down simultaneously by the police disposition (charged vs. processed otherwise) and several independent variables. Because this tabulation incorporated information pertaining to the years 1995-2001 (see below), the sample of police services was restricted to the Trend Database (see above). It was further restricted by omitting one police service (Toronto) which does not report youth who are not charged – since the dependent variable in the analyses was whether or not the youth was charged. The resulting sample included 186 police services in 6 provinces: New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia.

The youth’s record of prior criminal activity has been identified as an important determinant of the police disposition, both by previous research and by interviews in the present research. Special programming work was required in order to create this variable, since it is not routinely captured by the UCR2. The work was done for this project by staff of Statistics Canada and the Principal Investigator. The procedure involved searching through all UCR2 records for 1995-2001 for the selected sample of

police services, and matching records of apprehensions pertaining to youths apprehended in 2001. Each record (except the latest apprehension in 2001, which was the apprehension whose outcome was being analyzed) constituted one prior apprehension. These were counted and classified.

Matching of records for the same person was not straightforward, since there is no unique person identifier in the UCR2. The person's surname is encoded in a 4-character SOUNDEX code, which is not unique; i.e. many surnames are encoded with the same SOUNDEX. Thus, simply matching on the SOUNDEX would result in many false positive matches; i.e. many records for different people would be erroneously treated as prior apprehensions of a single person. The result would be an underestimate of the number of unique persons and an overestimate of the length of their prior records. This is not necessarily as great a problem in the present research as it might be in other types of research, because we are not concerned here with prior record in itself, but in its correlation with the probability of being charged. In general, errors in measurement of variables (such as overestimates of prior records) result in attenuation of correlations, so the result of such error would be a small underestimate of the impact of prior record on police dispositions, and a small overestimate of the impact of other related variables, such as the youth's age. False positives can be greatly reduced by matching simultaneously on SOUNDEX, birth date, and sex (which are all in the UCR2), but are still a potential problem.

Methodologists at Statistics Canada conducted an exhaustive analysis of the probability of false positive matches by comparing the rate of occurrence of each SOUNDEX in the UCR2 with the rates of occurrence of the corresponding surnames in the populations of the provinces of Canada, using electronic telephone directories. This enabled them to establish, for each SOUNDEX, the expected rate of false positives, when it was used for matching in combination with birth date and sex. SOUNDEXES vary greatly in their vulnerability to false positive matches, since some encode very common surnames and others do not. Assessments of SOUNDEX "match quality" (i.e. non-vulnerability to false positives) were made under the assumption that UCR2 records would be matched only within the police services in a Census Metropolitan Area (CMA), or within the jurisdiction of individual police services outside CMA's (since there was no obvious principle with which to group non-CMA police services). Consideration was also given to the possibility of matching within larger areas, such as an entire province, in order to capture a youth's apprehensions in different jurisdictions. The basic principle here is that the probability of false positives is directly related to the size of the population within which one is matching.

On the basis of this quality analysis, four categories of SOUNDEXes were defined:

- **0** – SOUNDEX is rare enough that it can be used in analysis within a given CMA or individual police service (99% or better match efficiency rate)

- **1** – SOUNDEX is rare enough that it can be used in analysis within a given CMA or individual police service (95% – 99% match efficiency rate)
- **2** – SOUNDEX is common enough that it should be used with caution in analysis within a given CMA or individual police service (90% - 95% match efficiency rate)
- **3** – SOUNDEX is too common to be used for analysis – this will result in too many false matches (less than 90% match efficiency rate).

“Match efficiency” refers to the absence of false positives; e.g. 99% match efficiency means that 1% of matches are expected to be false positives, and “99% or better” means that 1% or fewer false positives are expected.

Using 95% match efficiency as a criterion of acceptability, we decided to omit all records with SOUNDEXes with a quality code of 2 or 3, except in Montreal. This omission is quite acceptable elsewhere, since most jurisdictions have small enough populations that there are very few or no SOUNDEXes with quality codes of 2 or 3: the only jurisdictions with more than 0.0% of these SOUNDEXes are Montreal (28.4%), Quebec City (2.2%), Calgary (1.3%), Edmonton (3.5%), and Toronto (15.1%), but Toronto was already omitted from our sample because of its non-reporting of youth who are not charged. Due to the large number of records which would be omitted for Montreal if we adopted this criterion, we included records with a SOUNDEX quality code of 2 in that jurisdiction.

The population of areas of New Brunswick reporting to the UCR2 is small enough that matching could be done with all police services treated as one unit, for all SOUNDEXes. For Saskatchewan and Alberta, matching was done with all police services treated as one unit for SOUNDEXes with a quality code of 0, but within individual police services for SOUNDEXes with a quality code of 1. For Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia, matching was done within CMA or individual non-CMA police service for SOUNDEXes with quality codes of 0 and 1. This resulted in a sample of 38,727 unique young persons apprehended in 2001, with an average of 2.9 apprehensions, including the current one; or 1.9 prior apprehensions. We also examined the results of three other plausible but less conservative sets of matching criteria, which produced very similar results, ranging from 38,369 to 38,411 unique youths, and an average number of apprehensions (in all three cases) of 3.0. Thus, for this study, the results of matching were robust even when less stringent matching criteria were used.

Although the number of prior apprehensions of youths in our sample ranged from 0 to 261, the great majority (96%) had 10 or fewer, and most (90%) had 5 or fewer. In assessing the relationship between the number of prior apprehensions and the police disposition, no information was lost by recoding the number of prior apprehensions as 0, 1, 2, 3-4, and 5 or more.

The police disposition (charged vs. processed otherwise) was cross-tabulated separately with each of the independent variables:

- the type of offence, indicated by the Criminal Code classification;
- the level of injury suffered by a victim;
- the presence of a weapon;
- the number of prior apprehensions of the youth;
- the age of the youth;
- the gender of the youth;
- whether the youth was an aboriginal;
- whether the youth was apprehended alone or with other persons
- the type of relationship, if any, between the youth and a victim;
- whether the youth and a victim were living together;
- whether there was evidence that the youth had recently consumed alcohol or drugs.

The two latter variables were omitted from further analysis, since they were unrelated to the police disposition. The proportions of youth who were charged, broken down by each of the other variables, are presented in individual tables in Chapter V.

In order to assess the relationship of the independent variables while controlling for related factors, all independent variables were entered simultaneously into a multiple regression analysis with the police disposition (charged vs. processed otherwise) as the dependent variable. Two statistics were calculated:

- the adjusted percentage of youth who were charged, for each category of the independent variable: this is the percentage of youth who “would have been charged if everything about the offence and the offender were the same, except for variations in this variable”; and
- partial eta squared: this is an estimate of the amount of variation in the police disposition which is accounted for when all other variables are controlled, i.e. the strength of its unique impact on the police disposition.

Annex A-1. Interview Sample

Subsample 1. Independent municipal police services (n=50)

British Columbia

- 1) Vancouver (POLIS member)
- 2) Victoria (POLIS member)
- 3) Abbotsford
- 4) New Westminster

Alberta

- 5) Edmonton (POLIS member)
- 6) Calgary (POLIS member)

Saskatchewan

- 7) Regina (POLIS member)
- 8) Saskatoon
- 9) Moose Jaw

Manitoba

- 10) Winnipeg (POLIS member)

Ontario

- 11) Toronto (POLIS member)
- 12) Ottawa (POLIS member)
- 13) Sudbury (POLIS member)
- 14) Waterloo Regional (POLIS member)
- 15) Peel
- 16) Windsor
- 17) Guelph
- 18) Barrie
- 19) Cornwall
- 20) Prescott

- 21) Durham
- 22) Hamilton-Wentworth
- 23) Niagara Regional
- 24) Essex
- 25) Orangeville
- 26) New Liskeard
- 27) Lasalle
- 28) South Bruce Grey

Québec

- 29) Montréal (POLIS member)
- 30) Québec City
- 31) Sherbrooke
- 32) St. Jérôme
- 33) Mirabel
- 34) Laval
- 35) Roussillon
- 36) Sainte-Julie
- 37) Vallée-du-Richelieu (Beloeil)
- 38) Mont-Tremblant
- 39) Rivière-du-Loup
- 40) Les Collines-de-l'Outaouais (La Pêche)
- 41) Memphrémagog
- 42) Sorel-Tracy

New Brunswick

- 43) Saint John
- 44) Rothesay Regional
- 45) Bathurst

Nova Scotia

- 46) Halifax (POLIS member)
- 47) Truro
- 48) Stellarton

Prince Edward Island

- 49) Charlottetown
- 50) Summerside

***Subsample 2. RCMP Headquarters, Divisional Headquarters,
and detachments (n=29)***

- 1) RCMP Headquarters (“A” Div., Ottawa)

British Columbia (“E” Div.)

- 2) Kelowna
- 3) Penticton
- 4) Prince Rupert
- 5) Terrace
- 6) Hope
- 7) Surrey

Alberta (“K” Div.)

- 8) “K” Divisional Headquarters
- 9) St. Albert
- 10) Fort Saskatchewan
- 11) Sherwood Park
- 12) Stony Plain
- 13) Barrhead
- 14) Wetaskiwin
- 15) Hobbema

Saskatchewan (“F” Div.)

- 16) “F” Divisional Headquarters
- 17) Battlefords
- 18) Warman

Manitoba (“D” Div.)

- 19) Portage La Prairie
- 20) Neepawa

New Brunswick (“J” Div.)

- 21) Hampton

Yukon Territory (“M” Div.)

- 22) Whitehorse
- 23) Dawson City (interviewed at “K” Div. HQ, Edmonton)
- 24) Old Crow (interviewed at Newmarket, Ontario detachment)

Nunavut Territory (“V” Div.)

- 25) “V” Div. HQ, Iqaluit (interviewed at “K” Div. HQ, Edmonton, and “A” Div. HQ, Ottawa)
- 26) Arctic Bay (interviewed at “A” Div. HQ, Ottawa)
- 27) Resolute Bay (interviewed at “A” Div. HQ, Ottawa)

Northwest Territories (G” Div.)

- 28) Yellowknife (interviewed at “A” Div. HQ, Ottawa)
- 29) Inuvik (interviewed at “A” Div. HQ, Ottawa)

Subsample 3. Provincial police headquarters and detachments (n=14)

Ontario

- 1) Caledon detachment
- 2) Orillia detachment
- 3) West Parry Sound detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 4) North Bay detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 5) Noelville detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 6) Almaguin Highlands detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 7) Kenora detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 8) Nipigon detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 9) Greenstone detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 10) Red Lake detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 11) Fort Frances detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)
- 12) Dryden detachment (interviewed at OPP HQ, Orillia)

Newfoundland

- 13) RNC St. John's
- 14) RNC Corner Brook

Subsample 4. First Nations police services (n=3)

- 1) Stl'atl'imx (B.C.)
- 2) Kanasatake (Quebec)
- 3) Kahanawake (Quebec)

Subsample 5. Training facilities (n=2)

- 1) Justice Institute of B.C.
- 2) RCMP Training Facility, Regina ("Depot" Division)

Annex A-2 List of Interviewees

This list includes all interviewees who gave permission for their names to be used, and other people who provided background information. We are grateful to them for making this research study possible.

Sergent Danielle Abel-Normandin (Police Communauté Urbaine de Montréal)
Corporal Lorne H. Adamitz (R.C.M.P. “K” Division)
Deputy Chief Bernie Allain (Bathurst City Police)
Sergeant C.C. (Chuck) Allingham (R.C.M.P. – Portage la Prairie)
Constable J.P.P. (Peter) Anctil (R.C.M.P. – Stony Plain)
Inspector Dan Anderson (Waterloo Regional Police)
Val Atkinson (Abbotsford Police Department)
Constable Bill Bakkan (Victoria Police Department)
Susan Ballangear (Victoria Police Department)
Staff Sergeant Bob Bangs (R.C.M.P. – Portage la Prairie)
Sergeant Charlie Bates (Victoria Police Department)
Chief Paul Battershill (Victoria Police Department)
Chief Jack Beaton (Calgary Police Service)
Constable H. Beauclair (O.P.P. – Kenora)
Superintendent Gary W. Beaulieu (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Det. Constable Karen Beuparlant (Toronto Police Service)
Investigator Bill Beiersdorfer (R.C.M.P.)
Sergent-superviseur Michel Bélisle (Ville de Mirabel Service de police)
Directeur Pierre Bernaquez (Ville de Mont-Tremblant Sécurité publique)
Chief Vince Bevan (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
DéTECTIVE Dany Blouin (Régie de police de Memphrémagog)
Constable Manon Boisvert (Régie intermunicipale de police Vallée-du-Richelieu)
Constable Serge Boivin (Régie intermunicipale de police Saint-Jérôme métropolitain)
Corporal Stephane Bonin (R.C.M.P. “A” Division)
Constable J.W. (James) Bos (R.C.M.P. – Terrace)
Directeur Pierre Bourgeois (Régie intermunicipale de police Saint-Jérôme métropolitain)
Directeur Bernard Bousseau (Service de police de Mirabel)
Chief Rick Bowie (Prescott Police Service)
Staff Sergeant Jerome Brannagan (Windsor Police Service)
Corporal Robert W. Brossart (R.C.M.P. – Spruce Plains)
Staff Sergeant Scott Brown (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Corporal Gordon Brown (Saint John Police Force)
Special Constable Wayne Brown (City of North Battleford)
Constable Robert Brunette (Greater Grand Sudbury Police Service)
Constable D.R. (Darrel) Bruno R.C.M.P. – Hobbema)
Grant Bunker (British Columbia Ministry for Children and Families)
Corporal Reg Burgess (R.C.M.P. – Kelowna)

Deputy Chief Dale Burn (Calgary Police Service)
Constable Jennifer Caddell (Barrie Police Service)
Staff Sergeant Boyd D. Campbell (Winnipeg Police Service)
Sergent-déetective Donald Campeau (Police Communauté Urbaine de Montréal)
Constable Joe Cantelo (Rothesay Regional Police Force)
Det. Constable Stephen Canton (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Constable Howard G. Carey (Royal Newfoundland Constabulary)
Constable Maizy Carlson (O.P.P. – Almaguin Highlands)
Directeur Sylvain Caron (Ville de Sorel-Tracy Service de police)
Directeur Michel Carpentier (Service de police de Sherbrooke)
Capitaine André Castonguay (Service de police de la région Sherbrookoise)
Det. Constable Cates (Toronto Police Service)
Chief Noel P. Catney (Peel Regional Police)
Constable André Champagne (Ville de Mirabel Service de police)
Déetective Daniel Charest (Service de police de la région Sherbrookoise)
Dan Clattenburg (Ministry of Community and Social Services)
Constable Gary J. Clow (City of Charlottetown Police Department)
Chief C.E. Cogswell (Saint John Police Force)
Garth Coleman (O.P.P. – General Headquarters)
Chief Terry Coleman (Moose Jaw Police Service)
Constable T.J. Cooney (O.P.P. – Nipigon)
Directeur Yves Corbin (Sécurité publique de Rivière-du-Loup)
Inspecteur Michel Cousineau (Service de protection des citoyens de Laval)
Constable Phil Crouch (R.C.M.P. “A” Division)
Deputy Chief Brian Cunningham (Waterloo Regional Police)
Deputy Chief Tracy J. David (South Bruce-Grey Police Service)
Acting Inspector John A. Davidson (Abbotsford Police Department)
Inspector John De Haas (Vancouver Police Department)
Staff Sergeant Casey De Haas (New Westminster Police Service)
Uultsje De Jong (Abbotsford Restorative Justice and Advocacy Association)
Sergeant Doug Deacon (New Westminster Police Service)
Constable Bryan Dean (Guelph Police Service)
Chief Rick Deering (Royal Newfoundland Constabulary)
Inspector M.A. (Marlin) Degrand (R.C.M.P. – Terrace)
Staff Sergeant C.J. (Jim) Delnea (R.C.M.P. – Hope)
Superintendent John Dennis (Toronto Police Service)
Constable F.M. (Ferlin) Desjarlais R.C.M.P. – Hobbema)
Harj Dhami (Victoria Youth Empowerment Society)
Chief Peacekeeper John K. Diabo (Kahnawake Mohawk Peacekeepers)
Det. Constable Allan Dionne (Toronto Police Service)
Constable Yannick Dionne (Sécurité publique ville de Rivière-du-Loup)
Constable Luc Doherty (Régie de police de Memphrémagog)
Detective Barry Dolan (Peel Regional Police)

Det. Sergeant Mike Dougall (Peel Regional Police)
Constable Nathalie Drouin (Ville de Sainte-Julie Sécurité publique – Police)
Chief Ian Drummond (Summerside Police Department)
Lieutenant-détective Marc Dubé (MRC des Collines-de-l’Outaouais Sécurité publique)
Superintendent Keith Duggan (Edmonton Police Service)
Superintendent Susan C. Dunn (O.P.P. – General Headquarters)
Detective Brian Eckensviller (Waterloo Regional Police)
Corporal Brian Edmonds (R.C.M.P. – Carcross)
Sergeant Pat Egan (R.C.M.P. – Whitehorse)
Inspector T.G. (Tonia) Enger (R.C.M.P. – Prince Rupert)
Det. Constable C. Ennis (Vancouver Police Department)
Superintendent Bill Evans (Winnipeg Police Service)
Sergeant E.J. (Ed) Eviston (Vancouver Police Department)
Staff Sergeant Jim Fair (Calgary Police Service)
Sergeant Dan Fantetti (LaSalle Police Service)
Chief Julian Fantino (Toronto Police Service)
Instructor Marianne G. Farmer (Justice Institute of British Columbia)
Staff Sergeant Ray Fast (R.C.M.P. – Whitehorse)
Inspector Len Favreau (Peel Regional Police)
Detective Marvin Fefchak (Abbotsford Police Department)
Sergeant Debbie Ferguson (Regina Police Service)
Capitaine André Fillion (Ville de Québec Service de police)
Constable Jovette Fillion (Service de protection des citoyens de Laval)
Staff Sergeant L.A. (Lee) Findlay (R.C.M.P. – Sherwood Park)
Constable René Fleury (Régie intermunicipale de police Roussillon)
Constable John Forster (Abbotsford Police Department)
Peter Frampton (Learning Enrichment Foundation)
Chief Wayne Frechette (Barrie Police Service)
Chief Rod Freeman (Orangeville Police Service)
Det. Constable R.W. (Bob) Fremlin (O.P.P. – West Parry Sound)
Chef de division Paul Fugère (Sûreté du Québec)
Sergeant R.A. (Bob) Furchner (O.P.P. – Noelville)
Sergeant Bob Gallop (R.C.M.P. – Hampton)
Constable Gary Gamberta (Essex Police Service)
Capitaine Alain Gariépy (Ville de Mirabel Service de police)
Agent de liaison Diane Gilbert (Ville de Mirabel Service de police)
Sergeant S.P. (Steve) Gleboff (R.C.M.P. “K” Division)
Constable M. Golding (O.P.P. – Fort Frances)
Sergeant Nancy Goodes (Hamilton Police Service)
Deputy Chief Cameron Graber (LaSalle Police Service)
Constable Lisa Graham (O.P.P. – Orillia)
Chief Superintendent J.H. (Jamie) Graham (R.C.M.P. – Surrey)
Chief Larry Gravill (Waterloo Regional Police)

Corporal David Gray (R.C.M.P. “A” Division)
Deputy Chief Dave Griffin (Summerside Police Department)
Inspector Gordon Gummer (Victoria Police Department)
Constable J.W.Q. (Jared) Hall (R.C.M.P. – Portage la Prairie)
Constable Grant Hamilton (Victoria Police Department)
Det. Constable Hammond (Toronto Police Service)
Instructor Robert Harding (Winnipeg Police Service)
Constable Shannon Hartenberger (Saskatoon Police Service)
Corporal Nick Hartle (R.C.M.P. – Warman)
Constable Alex Hasham (Edmonton Police Service)
Constable G.D. (Gord) Hay (R.C.M.P. – Neepawa)
Chief Ambrose J. Heighton (Stellarton Police)
Sergeant S. Lee Henderson (Truro Police Service)
Constable Mary Henderson (Rothesay Regional Police Force)
Sergeant Mike Herman (Winnipeg Police Service)
Constable Richard Hickox (Truro Police Service)
Constable Linda Hilborn (Toronto Police Service)
Constable Rob Hlebec (O.P.P. – Caledon)
Detective Lisa J. Hodgins (Toronto Police Service)
Constable Carl Horn (Kahnawake Mohawk Peacekeepers)
Constable Mark Houle (Edmonton Police Service)
Christine Hudy (R.C.M.P. “Depot” Division)
Corporal Jeff Hurry (R.C.M.P. “A” Division)
Sergeant I.S. (Irv) Inglemart (R.C.M.P. – Stony Plain)
Inspector Jeremy Irons (Vancouver Police Department)
Constable Greg Irvine (R.C.M.P. – Sherwood Park)
Det. Sergeant Steve Izzett (Toronto Police Service)
Constable Don James (O.P.P. – Orillia)
Constable Joe James (Orangeville Police Service)
Chief Doug Jelly (New Liskeard Police)
Chief Cal Johnston (Regina Police Service)
Sergent Jean Joly (Service de protection des citoyens de Laval)
Staff Sergeant C.L. (Chris) Kaiser (R.C.M.P. – Battlefords)
Constable Ed Kaminski (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Constable Ellen Kartio-Archibald (R.C.M.P. – Battlefords)
Rick Kayes (Community Justice Forum of New Liskeard)
Constable Linda Kennedy (O.P.P. – Caledon)
Constable Steve Kern (Abbotsford Police Department)
Senior Constable Terry King (O.P.P. – West Parry Sound)
Constable Julian Knight (New Westminster Police Service)
Terry Kopan (R.C.M.P. – Surrey)
Corporal Anthony Kubanowski (Regina Police Service)
Det. Sergeant Dave Kuzina (Victoria Police Department)

Deputy Chief Armand Labarge (York Regional Police)
Superintendent Richard Lafortune (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Constable Lisa Lafreniere (Saskatoon Police Service)
Mark LaLonde (Justice Institute of British Columbia)
Directeur Daniel Langlais (Service de police de Québec)
Sue Larkin (Windsor Police Service)
Inspector Dale M. Larsen (Moose Jaw Police Service)
Constable Terry Lashar (Vancouver Police Department)
Sergent-déetective Enrick Laufer (Service de protection des citoyens de Laval)
Deputy Chief Ron Laverty (Cornwall Police Service)
Program Coordinator Shane Leathem (Justice Institute of British Columbia)
Directeur Benjamin Leclair (Régie intermunicipale de police de Vallée-du-Richelieu)
Enquêteur Germain Leclerc (Régie intermunicipale de police Roussillon)
Constable Shawn Lemay (R.C.M.P. – Whitehorse)
Chief John Leontowicz (LaSalle Police Service)
Enquêteur Benoît Lévesque (Sécurité publique ville de Rivière-du-Loup)
Inspector G.W. (Gerry) Locke (R.C.M.P. District Commander – Hampton)
C. Louise Logue (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Constable Darrel Long (Royal Newfoundland Constabulary)
Sergeant Dan Longpré (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Constable Norbert Losier (Bathurst City Police)
Det. Constable Shannen Lough (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Constable Heather Macdonald (R.C.M.P. – Kelowna)
Chief Mackenzie (Abbotsford Police Department)
Chief Ken C. MacLean (Truro Police Service)
Charles MacPherson (Youth Intervention Outreach Program – Charlottetown)
Constable L. Maksymchuk (O.P.P. – Red Lake)
Kevin Malloy (Cornwall Police Service)
Det. Constable Phil Mann (South Bruce-Grey Police Service)
Det. Constable Roger Marchack (Toronto Police Service)
Julie Marcoux (R.C.M.P. – Surrey)
Sergeant Mitch Martin (Durham Regional Police Service)
Chief Peacekeeper Georges Martin (Kanasatake Mohawk Peacekeepers)
Sergeant Tom Matthews (Waterloo Regional Police)
Sergeant Joseph J. Matthews (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Chief Kevin McAlpine (Durham Regional Police Service)
Chief Alex McCauley (Greater Grand Sudbury Police Service) (Retired)
Instructor Keiron R. McConnell (Justice Institute of British Columbia)
Constable Dave McConnell (Hamilton Police Service)
Constable Richard McDonald (Halifax Regional Police)
Constable Jack McFarland (Hamilton Police Service)
Sergeant David R. McGrath (Stellarton Police)
Staff Sergeant Noel McIntee (R.C.M.P. – Barrhead)

Chief Stephen N. McIntyre (Rothesay Regional Police Force)
Chief David McKinnon (Halifax Regional Police)
Chief Terry McLaren Peterborough Lakefields Community Police Service)
Staff Sergeant Scott J. McLean (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Inspector Brian McLeod (R.C.M.P. – Sherwood Park)
Susan McMullen (Windsor Police Service)
Superintendent Chris McNeil (Halifax Regional Police)
Constable Derek McNeilly (Guelph Police Service)
Constable Helen Meinzinger (R.C.M.P. – Fort Saskatchewan)
Deputy Chief Chuck Mercier (Durham Regional Police Service)
Directeur Adrien Mercier (Régie de police de Memphrémagog)
Inspector Debbie Middleton-Hope (Calgary Police Service)
Heather Miller (Saskatchewan Social Services)
Sergeant Bob Miller (R.C.M.P. “Depot” Division)
Constable John Allen Minke (South Bruce-Grey Police Service)
Sergent Francois Monetta (Ville de Sorel-Tracy Service de police)
Capitaine James Montgomery (Régie intermunicipale de police Vallée-du-Richelieu)
Deputy Chief Donna L. Moody (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Constable Jarrett Morgan (Halifax Regional Police)
Sergent Danny Morillon (Ville de Québec Service de police)
Directeur Pierre Morin (Régie intermunicipale de police Roussillon)
Capitaine Denis Morneau (Ville de Sorel-Tracy Service de police)
Constable Rick Morris (Winnipeg Police Service)
Staff Sergeant Paul Murdock (Greater Grand Sudbury Police Service)
Detective Sherri Murphy (Cornwall Police Service)
Constable Guy Nadeau (Ville de Sorel-Tracy Service de police)
Chief Gary E. Nicholls (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Deputy Chief Sue O’Sullivan (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Sergeant James Oakes (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Corporal Wayne Oakes (R.C.M.P. – Barrhead)
Staff Sergeant R.E. (Ron) Obodzinski (R.C.M.P. – Spruce Plains)
Inspector J.L.C. (Chuck) Orem (R.C.M.P. “F” Division)
Det. Constable Jocelyn Ouellette (Bathurst City Police)
Deputy Chief E. Stephen Palmer (Rothesay Regional Police Force)
Arden Parent (Windsor Police Service)
Constable Samantha Parker (Edmonton Police Service)
Staff Supt. Daniel C. Parkinson (Peel Regional Police)
Constable Lester Parsons (Royal Newfoundland Constabulary)
Sergeant Bob Patterson (O.P.P. – Caledon)
Déetective Martin Pelletier (Régie intermunicipale de police Saint-Jérôme métropolitain)
Chief G.H. (Greg) Pigeon (Essex Police Service)
Inspector Barry Pike (Royal Newfoundland Constabulary)
Capitaine Pierre Pilon (Régie intermunicipale de police Saint-Jérôme métropolitain)

Staff Sergeant Steve Pilote (Winnipeg Police Service)
Chief Dennis W. Player (South Bruce-Grey Police Service)
Sergent Réjean Pleau (Ville de Québec Service de police)
Directeur Jacques Poire (Régie intermunicipale de police de Roussillon)
Constable J.O.R. (Bob) Poitras (R.C.M.P. – Hampton)
Inspector Gerry Pope (Greater Grand Sudbury Police Service)
Acting Staff Sergeant Larry Proctor (O.P.P. – General Headquarters)
Constable Dean Puali (O.P.P. – Warren)
Corporal Frank Pualicelli (R.C.M.P. – Surrey)
Constable Randy M. Quinn (R.C.M.P. – Hampton)
Inspector Brian Refvik (Calgary Police Service)
Constable Christine E. Reid (O.P.P. – Orillia)
Acting Inspector Bill Reid (Saint John Police)
Instructor Colin Renkema (Justice Institute of British Columbia)
Detective Norm Renwick (Moose Jaw Police Service)
Chief A. Repa (Cornwall Police Service)
Constable Murray Rice (Moose Jaw Police Service)
Chef de service Guy Richard (Police Communauté Urbaine de Montréal)
Chief Kenneth Robertson (Hamilton Police Service)
Constable Gary Rogers (Halifax Regional Police)
Constable Lindsay Rogers (Summerside Police Department)
Constable J.J.M. (Michel) Ross (R.C.M.P. – St. Albert)
Sergeant Cathy Ross (New Westminster Police Service)
Patrol Sergeant Doug Roxburgh (Winnipeg Police Service)
Inspector Paul Roy (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Constable Dean Roy (Durham Regional Police Service)
Capitaine Guy Roy (Régie de police de Memphrémagog)
Sergeant Bill Russell (Toronto Police Service)
Chief Russell L. Sabo (Saskatoon Police Service)
Constable J.M. Sabourin (O.P.P. – Greenstone)
Sergeant Atallah Sadaka (Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service)
Constable Charity Sampson (R.C.M.P. – North Battleford)
Directeur Pierre Sangollo (Ville de Sainte-Julie Sécurité publique – Police)
Directeur Michel Sarrazin (Police Communauté Urbaine de Montréal)
Det. Sergeant/Acting Staff Sergeant Gregory P. Sartor (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Det. Sergeant Dave Saunders (Toronto Police Service)
Inspector Steve Schnitzer (Vancouver Police Department)
Sergeant Darrell A. Scribner (Saint John Police Force)
Sergent Normand Séguin (Police Communauté Urbaine de Montréal)
Inspector George Shillaker (R.C.M.P. – St. Albert)
Inspector Ted Shinbein (Vancouver Police Department)
Constable Caroline Simmonds (R.C.M.P. – Sherwood Park)
Inspector Brian Simpson (R.C.M.P. – Wetaskiwin, Hobbema)

Inspector Ab Singleton (Royal Newfoundland Constabulary)
Constable J. Singleton (O.P.P. – Dryden Ignace)
Al Sismey (R.C.M.P. – Penticton)
Detective Pamela Smith (Windsor Police Service)
Chief A. Paul Smith (City of Charlottetown Police Department)
Detective Tom Snelling (Peel Regional Police)
Inspector Darryl Snyder (Windsor Police Service)
Detective Bill Soules (Toronto Police Service)
Chief Glenn Stannard (Windsor Police Service)
Detective Troy Stasiuk (Vancouver Police Department)
Sergeant Cam Stauffer (Waterloo Regional Police)
Constable Allison Stephanson (Winnipeg Police Service)
Det. Constable Linda Stewart (Vancouver Police Department)
Detective Rick Stewart (Edmonton Police Service)
Constable Dean Stienburg (Halifax Regional Police)
Directeur adjoint Denis St-Jean (MRC des Collines-de-l'Outaouais Sécurité publique)
Assistant Commissioner W.M. Sweeney (R.C.M.P. “K” Division)
Constable Kathy Szoboticsanec (Vancouver Police Department)
Michael Taylor (Operation Springboard)
Staff Sergeant Nick Taylor (R.C.M.P. – Fort Saskatchewan)
Sergeant Brian D. Thiessen (Abbotsford Police Department)
Executive Officer Brent Thomlison (Waterloo Regional Police)
Constable Scott Thompson (Regina Police Service)
Constable Jennifer Thorson (Toronto Police Service)
Sergeant Derek G. Tilley (Royal Newfoundland Constabulary)
Commandant Réjean Toutant (Police Communauté Urbaine de Montréal)
Staff Sergeant Bruce Townley (Durham Regional Police Service)
Sergeant Peter R. Tremblay (Bathurst City Police)
Sergent Pierre Tremblay (Ville de Sainte-Julie Sécurité publique – Police)
Détective Patrick Trépanier (Ville de Sainte-Julie Sécurité publique – Police)
Inspector Mike Trump (Justice Institute of British Columbia)
Det. Constable Cathy Uskin (Niagara Regional Police Service)
Capitaine Thierry Vallières (MRC des Collines-de-l'Outaouais Sécurité publique)
Deputy Chief Geoff Varley (Victoria Police Department)
Staff Sergeant Tim Vatamaniuk (R.C.M.P. – Stony Plain)
Inspector Chuck Walker (R.C.M.P.)
Melissa Wall (Saskatchewan Social Services)
Sergeant Cheryl Wallin (Edmonton Police Service)
Constable Angela Walsh (Calgary Police Service)
Chief Bob Wasylyshen (Edmonton Police Service)
Diane Wilkins (Greater Grand Sudbury Police Service)
Dawn Wilkonson (Central Okanagan Boys and Girls Club)
Corporal B.E. (Ben) Wilkowski (R.C.M.P. – Fort Saskatchewan)

Sergeant Jeff Wilks (Edmonton Police Service)
Constable D.A. (Derek) Williams (R.C.M.P. – Prince Rupert)
Susan Wilms (Abbotsford Police Department)
Sergeant Jim Wright (LaSalle Police Service)
Constable Bryan Young (Peel Regional Police)
Chief W.L. Zapotichny (New Westminster Police Service)
Constable Rick Zeibots (O.P.P. – Caledon)
Constable R.M. (Ray) Zillich (R.C.M.P. – Warman)
Constable Dennis Zivolak (Hamilton Police Service)

Annex A-3. Introductory Letter and Project Summary

POLICE DISCRETION WITH YOUNG OFFENDERS

This project was commissioned by the Youth Justice Policy Branch of the Department of Justice Canada as part of the preparation for the implementation of the Youth Criminal Justice Act. It has two objectives:

- To provide a comprehensive description of the ways in which police across Canada deal with youth crime under the Young Offenders Act. This will be used as baseline information, for comparison with the results of a replication of the study, done after the YCJA has been in force for a few years, in order to assess the impact of the YCJA on police work with young offenders.
- To provide information which can inform decision-making by Justice Canada concerning the allocation of resources to support the implementation of new measures in the YCJA.

We believe this study will benefit police in Canada in at least two ways, in addition to the objectives stated above:

- Police services will be able to use the report from this project as a benchmark against which to compare their own approach to youth crime;
- By providing information to the study, police services will be able to influence decision-making concerning aspects of the implementation of the YCJA that relate to their work.

We are particularly interested in assessing the factors which influence two decisions: how young offender cases are cleared (by charge, by referral to alternative measures, or informally); and whether youth who are charged are held in detention. Of course, we are aware that these decisions are not made by police alone, but our mandate is to examine the role of police in these decisions.

Our review of previous research on this subject has led us to define the scope of possible factors very broadly: from the environment in which a police service operates, including federal and provincial legislation and programs, and the nature of the community being policed, through the internal organizational structure, policies and procedures of the police service, to decision-making by the front-line officer. These are the main topics which we plan to cover:

Environment

- The type of community being policed
- The impact of provisions of the YOA and any other relevant legislation
- External resources, such as provincial, municipal, and private agencies and programs

Organizational structure

- Overall goals and mandate, approach to policing
- Specialization re youth crime (Youth Bureau, specialist officers, etc.)
- Who has authority/responsibility to lay charges?
- Training

Organizational processes

- Are there specific policies/protocols for dealing with young persons?
- Investigation – how typical scenarios are handled (victim/witness reports completed incident; victim/witness reports incident in progress, etc.)
- Clearing – by charge/refer to alternative measures/informal means
- Compelling attendance at court: use of detention/release/appearance notice/summons/etc.
- The impact of the circumstances of the incident and offender characteristics on the decisions re clearing and compelling attendance
- Recording practices and how they impact on the accuracy of UCR data

Our main source of information will be interviews with police services. We will also analyze statistical data on communities and crime trends, and on young offender cases provided by Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics from the UCR2 Survey, and, if possible, from a sample of police services which do not contribute to the UCR2. We will try to interview a sample of police forces which is representative of the variety of policing environments and organizations in Canada: the regions, communities of different sizes, and the various policing arrangements: independent municipal, contract municipal, provincial, etc.

For each police service which we interview, we would like, if possible, to talk with someone in senior management, who can answer questions about the environment in which the service operates, and its overall structure, policies, and procedures; and also with one or two front-line officers, preferably who specialize in young offender cases. In

addition, in the case of police services with a Youth Bureau, we would like to interview someone in a management position in the Youth Bureau. Each of these interviews should take no more than an hour. We would also like, if possible, to arrange a ride-along with an officer who deals with young offenders, in order to observe decision-making firsthand. We would also appreciate being provided with copies of documents which concern the handling of young offender cases, such as any procedural guidelines.

Of course, it is entirely up to each participating police service, and each officer being interviewed, to decide what questions they choose to answer, and what documents they provide.

For further information, please contact the undersigned at 519-743-0214 or by email at pjcco@sympatico.ca; or the Project Authority for Justice Canada, Jharna Chatterjee, at 613-954-3591 or by email at JChatter@justice.gc.ca.

Sincerely,
Peter Carrington, PhD
Principal Investigator

Annex A-4. Confidentiality Protocol

POLICE DISCRETION WITH YOUNG OFFENDERS

INTERVIEWS AND DOCUMENTS: CONFIDENTIALITY PROTOCOL

Our arrangements to protect the privacy of participants in this research are based on three premises:

- The research is being done under contract to the Department of Justice Canada, which, under the terms of the contract, will hold copyright on any reports written in connection with the research.
- It is the expressed intention of Justice Canada to release the final report publicly.
- Participation in the research, whether by organizations or individuals, is entirely voluntary.

We have adopted the following measures to protect the privacy of individuals and police services:

- No information on identifiable young persons will be recorded or collected, and no information which might identify a young person will be included in any of our reports.
- We recognize that most internal police documents which are provided to us, although they are not necessarily identified as confidential, are not intended for public release. Therefore, we will not reveal their contents to anyone outside our research staff, or reproduce them or quote from them in our reports, without first obtaining the written permission of the police service which provided them.
- No individual will be referenced in our reports, except that: each individual who provides information to us will be acknowledged in an appendix to the Final Report, provided that s/he has given consent to being so acknowledged. In the case of police services for which only one or two individuals provided information, such acknowledgment could conceivably lead to a reader of the report being able to deduce the identity of the person who provided the information. In such cases, individuals who wish to protect their identities should request that they not be acknowledged.

Interviews will be tape recorded, with the consent of the person(s) being interviewed. Tape recording is very important to the integrity of the research, for two reasons:

- A transcript of a tape recorded interview is infinitely more accurate than the interviewer's recollections.
- The interviewer cannot successfully conduct an interview while simultaneously trying to take notes.

In addition to the protections listed above, the identities of individuals and police services participating in tape recorded interviews will be further protected by the following measures:

- The person being interviewed may, at any time during the interview, require that the tape recorder be turned off temporarily, in order to provide confidential background information.
- The contents of the interviews will not be revealed to anyone outside our research staff, except as part of our reports, and under the conditions listed above to protect the privacy of individuals and police services.
- As far as possible, the person(s) being interviewed, and the police service to which s/he belongs, will not be identified in the tape recording. Taped interviews will be identified only by code numbers, and a key connecting the code numbers to individuals and police services will be kept in secure locked storage separately from the tapes and transcripts. Nevertheless, we recognize that there is some possibility that the name of the police service may come up during the interview.
- Tapes, transcripts, and the key connecting taped interviews and individuals' names, will always be kept in secure, locked storage.

Any member of our research staff who has access to the documentary information, tapes, transcripts, or the interview identity information, will be required to agree in writing to the provisions of this Confidentiality Protocol.

For further information, please contact the undersigned at 519-743-0214 or by email at pjcco@sympatico.ca; or the Project Authority for Justice Canada, Jharna Chatterjee, at 613-954-3591 or by email at JChatter@justice.gc.ca.

Peter Carrington, PhD
Principal Investigator

Annex A-5. Interview schedule (English)

Preamble

- any Q's re project?
 - Permission to include their name in the acknowledgments
 - Tape recording of the interview
 - The respondents may turn the recorder off at any time during the interview if they would prefer to answer the question off the record.
 - Confidentiality is ensured as no statements will be directly quoted (referenced to their names)
 - Exchange business cards or confirm rank and spelling of last name

A. UPPER MANAGEMENT

Introduction – (if appropriate) – length of service, previous police services/postings, current responsibilities

Environment – The Nature of the Community

- 1) How would you describe the socio-demographic characteristics of the community(s) you police?
 - a. Poor/wealthy
 - b. Young/old
 - c. Ethnically diverse/homogenous
 - d. Stable/transient/immigrant
- 2) What is the typical level and type of crime (and youth crime) in these communities?

Structure – Management Style

- 3) What types of crime prevention initiatives get delivered that address youth?
 - a. Primary (general)
 - b. Secondary (targeted at high risk groups)
 - c. Tertiary (targeted at identified offenders)
- 4) Can you describe some examples of 'problem oriented policing' within your department that target youth?

Structure – Training

- 5) What types of training help prepare officers for handling youth crime?
 - a. Academy?
 - b. Internal training opportunities?

6) What types of training do you feel would help officers who are working with youth?

Process – Organization

7) Have there been any major changes in this police service's approach to youth crime in the past 15 years since the YOA came into effect?
a. If so, what were the reasons (YOA, budget cuts, other?)?

Structure – Documentation

- During *upper management interview* ask for relevant documentation (and/or confirmations).
- Confirm
 - o Overall strength of force (# of officers)
 - o Rank structure
 - o Approximately how many officers in each rank

B. GENERAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction – (if appropriate) – length of service, previous police services/postings, current responsibilities

Structure – Training

- 8) What type of training have you had that has prepared you to handle youth crime?
a. Academy?
b. Internal training opportunities?
- 9) Do you feel the amount and type of training you received was adequate to prepare you for working with youth?
- 10) What types of training do you feel would help officers who are working with youth?
- 11) How have your previous experiences shaped the way you handle incidents involving youth?
a. Practical field experience
b. Mentors and advice
- 12) Is there any mechanism in place where officers can share these experiences?
a. Successful diversion programs
b. The programs best suited for certain types of crime
c. Decision making processes

Structure – Management Style

- 13) Can you describe some examples of ‘problem oriented policing’ within your department that targets youth?
- 14) Do you find support exists within your working environment for community policing?
- a. Seeking informal alternatives
 - b. Promotion indicators

Process – Organization

- 15) Are there any internal policies or protocols when dealing with young persons? Do you find them helpful?
- 16) Would you characterize your work with youth as proactive or reactive?
- a. What do you feel is ideal?
 - b. What is actually happening?
 - c. Community policing?

Process – Investigation

Youth Detectives/Youth Bureau officers:

- 17) At what point in the investigation does an incident become a youth detective/bureau matter?
- 18) What criteria do patrol officers use in deciding whether to refer a case to your attention?

All Officers:

- 19) In what ways do you generally become aware of youth related incidents?
- a. Victim/witness reports incident (in progress/completed)
 - b. Police discover completed incident (e.g. evidence of break in during patrol)
 - c. Police discover incident in progress
 - d. Other system agents report incident to police (e.g. probation breach)

- 20) Could you take me through the process involved in a typical youth related incident, from dispatch putting out the call, all the way to the case going to court, or being disposed of in some other way?
- 21) How much information on youth suspects is available to you?
- Prior convictions
 - Prior AMs, diversion
 - Prior contacts
- 22) How are administration of justice cases handled by the system?
- Fail to appear
 - Bail violations
 - Violations of probation or community service order conditions
 - Unlawfully at large
- 23) How do they come to your attention?
- 24) How much discretion do you have in these cases regarding charging?
- 25) Are provincial offences handled any differently?
- 26) How much of your caseload involves provincial offences?

Process – Clearing the Incident

- 27) What options are available to you to clear an incident?
- 28) Who has the authority to lay a charge? Does this differ by type of offence?

WITH MIDDLE LEVEL OFFICERS – JUMP TO #38

(Frontline officers:)

- 29) If you decide to take informal action what options are available to you and how do you choose among them? (*Look out for pre-charge diversion*)
- Informal warning (no record / with record)
 - Formal warning (with record)
 - Parental involvement
 - Taking the youth home or to the police station
 - Questioning the youth at the scene or at the police station
 - Referrals to external agencies (e.g. Social Services, Child Welfare)
 - Referrals to internal (police-operated) programs
 - Other?

30) What programs are available in the community for youth diversion? (*Look out for post-charge diversion.*)

31) Do you find them effective?

32) Do you receive any feedback on the case if the youth went through Alternative Measures (diversion)?

a. Is this information that would help your decision making processes?

Process – Incident and Offender Characteristics

33) In what ways do the characteristics of the offence influence your decision to lay charges, use AM, or informal diversion? (*This may need explaining – for the subject, it may be an overall judgment, not reference to a list of criteria*)

- a. Seriousness (type of offence)
 - i. Presence and type of weapon
 - ii. Harm done (injury, amount of loss/damage to property)
- b. Victim / Complainant preference
 - i. Type of relationship between offender and victim
- c. Group vs. lone offender
 - i. Age of co-offenders
 - ii. Number of co-offenders
- d. Use of alcohol / drugs
- e. Location and time of day

34) Are there any offences which almost always result in (a) handling the case informally (b) charge, or (c) diversion?

35) In what ways do the characteristics of the young person influence your decision to lay charges, use AM (diversion), or informal action?

- a. Prior record
 - i. Conviction
 - ii. AM
 - iii. Contact
- b. Age
- c. Gender
- d. Race???? (play this variable by ear) ~ try ‘native, aboriginal’
- e. Attitude
- f. Home / School / Work situations
- g. Peer group / gang affiliations
 - i. How would you define a gang related incident?

I have a couple of questions about arrest and the methods of compelling attendance at court, when charges are laid:

36) How do you decide whether to arrest a young offender?

37) If you don't arrest, would you use an Appearance Notice or a Summons? (If either, under what circumstances?)

(Resume middle level officer interview here)

38) If the youth is arrested and charged, what methods are used to use to compel attendance at youth court – and how do you choose among these methods?

- i. Detain for bail hearing?
- ii. Release with:
 1. Promise to Appear, no conditions?
 2. OIC Undertaking - any conditions? (curfew?)
 3. both PTA and OIC Undertaking?
 4. Recognizance?

39) Are there any offences which almost always result in:

- a. Arrest and detention
- b. Use of an Appearance Notice

40) Which methods of handling youth crime do you perceive as having 'meaningful consequences' for the young person?

41) Is there anything else (besides what we have already covered) that you take into account in assessing the seriousness of a crime and what actions to take?

Environment – Legislation

I have a few questions specifically about the Young Offenders Act:

42) How does the Young Offenders Act impact on the day-to-day handling of youth crime?

- a. Declaration of Principle
- b. Alternative Measures/Diversion provisions
- c. Legal counsel provisions
- d. Taking statements provisions
- e. Notifying the parents
- f. Other provisions?

- g. Other federal legislation (C.C., Bail Reform Act, etc.)
- h. Provincial legislation/practice (e.g. Youth Protection Act, Crown charging)

43) *For any subsections not covered in the previous section:* What are your perceptions of...?

44) In your opinion, does the YOA help or hinder handling youth crime? If so, in what way?

Process – Recording Practices

45) How do you decide whether to record an incident or not?

(skip #46 and #47 unless Records staff)

46) If you are reporting an incident which involves multiple offenders, how do you decide whether to include each offender?

47) Do all of the incidents that you encounter get reported in the UCR? (all occurrence reports?)

48) Is there a method of formal or informal internal tracking of persistent young offenders? If so, what criteria?

49) Is there a procedure in place to record AM dispositions so that youth who have had AM don't appear to be first time offenders?

50) Is there a procedure in place to record informal dealings with apprehended youth?

51) How effective do you think these recording practices are?

52) Are there any types of information that you feel would be useful to record in helping you handle youth crime?

53) Finally, are there any difficulties that you encounter in the day to day handling of youth crime which we haven't covered?

THANK YOU

Annex A-6. Interview schedule (French)

Préliminaires

- Permission d'inclure leurs noms dans les remerciements
- Enregistrement sur cassette audio de l'entrevue
 - les personnes peuvent fermer l'enregistreuse à tout moment durant l'entrevue s'ils préfèrent répondre à une question en toute confidentialité
- confirmer le grade et l'orthographe du nom de famille (échange de cartes d'affaires)
- confidentialité assurée car aucune mention directe d'une déclaration ne sera faite (aucune référence à leurs noms)

A. HAUTE DIRECTION

Milieu – Le genre de communauté

1. Quels sont les caractéristiques socio-économiques de la communauté que vous desservez?
 - a. Démunie/à l'aise
 - b. Jeune/âgée
 - c. Diversifiée d'un point de vue ethnique/homogène
 - d. Stable/de passage/immigrante
2. Quels sont les taux moyens et le genre de délits commis dans cette communauté?

Structure – Style de gestion

3. Quelles sortes d'initiatives de prévention de la criminalité mises en œuvre s'adressent aux jeunes?
 - a. Primaire (tous les jeunes, pas nécessairement des contrevenants : ex. prévention dans les salles de classe)
 - b. Secondaire (les jeunes agressifs à l'école : référés par l'école, jeunes à haut risque)
 - c. Tertiaire (après déclaration de culpabilité, soit par admission ou après procès)
4. Pouvez-vous donner des exemples à l'intérieur de votre service de méthodes axées sur des problèmes qui ciblent les jeunes?

Structure – Formation

5. Quels genres de formation préparent les policiers à traiter de la criminalité des jeunes?
 - a. école nationale?
 - b. possibilités de formation à l'interne?
6. Quels genres de formation, à votre avis, aideraient les policiers qui travaillent avec les jeunes?

Processus – Organisation

7. Y-a-t-il eu des changements majeurs dans l'approche de ce service face à la criminalité des jeunes ces 15 dernières années depuis que la LJC est entrée en vigueur?
 - a. Si oui, quels en sont les motifs (LJC, coupures budgétaires, autre?)?

Structure – Documentation

- pendant la *rencontre avec la haute direction*, demander la documentation pertinente (et/ou des confirmations).
- Confirmer :
 - . Aptitude générale du service (nombre de policiers)
 - . Structure des grades
 - . Nombre approximatif de policiers de chaque grade

B. APERÇU GÉNÉRAL DU DÉROULEMENT DES ENTREVUES

Structure - Style de gestion

8. Pouvez-vous donner des exemples à l'intérieur du service de méthodes axées sur des problèmes qui ciblent les jeunes?
9. D'après vous, y-a-t-il un soutien dans votre milieu de travail pour une approche communautaire au maintien de l'ordre?
 - a. dans la recherche de mesures informelles
 - b. facteur considéré pour les promotions

Structure – Formation

10. Quel genre de formation vous a préparé pour faire face à la criminalité des jeunes?
 - a. école nationale?

- b. possibilités de formation à l'interne?
- 11. D'après vous, est-ce que le genre et l'importance (fréquence) de formation que vous avez reçue ont été suffisants pour vous préparer à travailler avec les jeunes?
- 12. D'après vous, quels genres de formation aideraient les policiers qui travaillent avec les jeunes?
- 13. Comment vos expériences antérieures ont-elles influencé la façon dont vous répondez aux événements qui concernent les jeunes?
 - a. expérience pratique sur le terrain
 - b. mentors et conseils
- 14. Y-a-t-il un mécanisme en place par lequel les policiers peuvent partager ces expériences?
 - a. programmes efficaces de diversion
 - b. les programmes les mieux adaptés pour certains genres de crimes
 - c. processus de prise de décision

Milieu - Législation

- 15. Comment la Loi sur les jeunes contrevenants influence-t-elle votre façon de faire face à la criminalité des jeunes sur une base quotidienne?
 - a. déclaration de principe
 - b. mesures de rechange/dispositions de diversion
 - c. dispositions concernant la représentation par un avocat
 - d. dispositions concernant la prise de déclaration
 - e. avis aux parents
 - f. autres dispositions?
 - g. autres lois fédérales (code criminel,..)
 - h. lois provinciales/usages (ex. Loi sur la protection de la jeunesse, code de procédure pénale, procureurs de la couronne portant accusation)
- 16. *Pour toute sous-section non traitée par la section précédente* : Que pensez-vous de...?
- 17. D'après vous, est-ce que la LJC aide ou nuit au traitement de la criminalité des jeunes? Si oui, de quelle façon?

Processus – Organisation

- 18. Avez-vous des directives ou protocoles à l'interne pour faire face à la criminalité des jeunes? Les trouvez-vous utiles?

19. Est-ce que vous qualifieriez votre travail avec les jeunes de proactif ou de réactif?
- D'après vous, que serait l'idéal?
 - Que se passe-t-il réellement?
 - Police communautaire?

Processus – Enquête

20. À quel moment d'une enquête un évènement relève-t-il d'un agent de la jeunesse/ de la section de la jeunesse?
21. Quels critères sont utilisés pour décider de référer un dossier à votre attention?

Tous les policiers

22. De quelles façons êtes-vous généralement avisés d'évènements concernant les jeunes?
- rapports d'évènements de victime/témoin (en cours/terminé)
 - la police trouve un évènement terminé (ex. preuve d'effraction durant une patrouille)
 - la police arrive lors d'un évènement en cours
 - d'autres intervenants du système rapportent un évènement à la police (ex. bris de condition)
23. Est-ce que la façon dont vous devenez au courant d'un évènement influence la façon dont vous réagissez?
24. Pouvez-vous me décrire le processus impliqué lors d'un évènement typique concernant les jeunes (arrivée sur les lieux, et puis...)?
25. Quels renseignements sur le suspect vous sont disponibles sur les lieux?
- condamnations antérieures
 - mesures de rechange antérieures, diversions
 - contacts antérieurs (informels)
26. Comment sont traités par le système les dossiers d'administration de la justice?
- défaut de comparaître
 - bris de condition de cautionnement
 - bris de libération conditionnelle ou d'ordonnance de travaux communautaires
 - en liberté illégalement
27. Comment sont-ils portés à votre attention?

28. Dans ces dossiers, quelle discrétion avez-vous pour porter une accusation?
29. Est-ce que les infractions de juridiction provinciale sont traitées différemment?
30. Quelle proportion de vos dossiers concerne des infractions de juridiction provinciale?

Processus – Traitement de l'évènement

31. Quelles possibilités vous sont disponibles pour traiter d'un évènement?
32. Qui a l'autorité pour porter ou recommander de porter une accusation? La nature du délit influence-t-elle ceci?
33. Si vous décidez de prendre des mesures informelles, quelles possibilités vous sont disponibles et comment choisissez-vous parmi elles?
 - a. avertissement informel(sans rapport/avec rapport)
 - b. avertissement formel (avec rapport)
 - c. participation des parents
 - d. ramener le jeune à la maison ou au poste
 - e. interrogatoire du jeune sur les lieux ou au poste
 - f. renvoi à des agences externes (ex. DPJ)
 - g. renvoi à des programmes internes (gérés par la police)
 - h. autre?
34. Quels programmes sont disponibles dans la communauté pour la diversion des jeunes?
35. Les trouvez-vous efficaces?
36. Êtes-vous tenus au courant du dossier si le jeune est soumis à des mesures de rechange?
 - a. ces renseignements influenceraient-ils la façon dont vous prenez une décision?

Processus – Circonstances de l'évènement et caractéristiques du contrevenant

37. De quelle façon les circonstances du délit influencent votre décision de porter ou de recommander de porter une accusation, de recommander le renvoi à des mesures de rechange ou d'une diversion informelle?
 - a. gravité (nature du délit)
 - i. possession d'une arme et genre

- ii. dommages causés (blessures, montant des pertes/dommages à la propriété)
 - b. préférence de la victime/du plaignant
 - i. nature du lien entre le contrevenant et la victime
 - c. contrevenant solitaire ou en groupe
 - i. âge des co-contrevenants
 - ii. nombre de co-contrevenants
 - d. consommation d'alcool/de drogues
 - e. endroit et moment de la journée
38. Y-a-t-il des délits qui donnent lieu presque toujours à une accusation, un renvoi à des mesures de rechange ou un traitement informel?
39. De quelle façon les caractéristiques du jeune influencent votre décision de porter (recommander) une accusation, utiliser des mesures de rechange ou une action informelle?
- a. Dossier antérieur
 - i. condamnation
 - ii. mesures de rechange
 - iii. contact
 - b. âge
 - c. sexe
 - d. origine ethnique
 - e. attitude
 - f. situation à la maison/école/travail
 - g. groupe d'amis/appartenance à un gang
 - i. comment définissez-vous un événement relié à un gang
40. De quelles façons les circonstances du délit et les caractéristiques du contrevenant influencent-elles votre décision sur le moyen d'assurer sa comparution en cour?
41. Si vous décidez de porter (ou recommander) une accusation, comment décidez-vous de la méthode à utiliser pour assurer la comparution
- a. Si arrestation
 - i. détention et enquête sur cautionnement
 - ii. remise en liberté avec :
 - 1) promesse de comparaître, sans conditions
 - 2) cautionnement
 - b. Si le jeune n'est pas arrêté, dans quelles circonstances utilisez-vous un avis de comparaître ou une sommation?
42. Y-a-t-il des délits qui donnent lieu presque toujours à :
- a. arrestation et détention

- b. arrestation et remise en liberté
- c. utilisation d'un avis de comparaître

43. Quelle méthode de traitement de la criminalité des jeunes percevez-vous comme ayant des `conséquences significatives` sur le jeune?
44. Y-a-t-il autre chose (à part ce qui vient d'être couvert) dont vous tenez compte lors de l'évaluation de la gravité d'un délit et de quelle action prendre?

Processus – Méthodes de rapport (d'enregistrement)

45. Comment décidez-vous de rapporter un évènement ou non?
46. Lorsque vous rapportez un évènement avec plusieurs contrevenants, comment décidez-vous si vous devez inclure chaque contrevenant?
47. Est-ce que tous les évènements que vous rencontrez sont rapportés au DUC2? (tous les rapports d'évènement?)
48. À l'interne, y-a-t-il une pratique formelle ou informelle de repérage au-delà de ce qui est rapporté au DUC ou DUC2? Si oui, quels critères?
49. Y-a-t-il une procédure en place pour enregistrer les dispositions de mesures de rechange pour qu'un jeune qui en a bénéficié ne soit pas considéré comme un contrevenant sans antécédent?
50. Y-a-t-il une procédure mise en place pour enregistrer les moyens informels utilisés avec un jeune appréhendé?
51. D'après vous, quelle est l'efficacité de ces pratiques d'enregistrement?
52. D'après vous, y-a-t-il des genres de renseignements qu'il serait utile d'enregistrer pour vous aider dans le traitement de la criminalité des jeunes?
53. Finalement, y-a-t-il des difficultés que vous rencontrez quotidiennement dans le traitement de la criminalité des jeunes que nous n'avons pas abordé?

MERCI

Annex A-7. Introductory Letter and Project Summary (French)

LA DISCRÉTION POLICIÈRE ET LES JEUNES CONTREVENANTS

Ce projet a été demandé par le secteur de politique sur la justice applicable aux jeunes du ministère de la justice, pour faire partie de la préparation de la mise en application de la Loi sur le système de justice pénale pour les adolescents. Il a deux objectifs :

- Fournir une description détaillée des façons dont la police à travers le Canada s'occupe de la criminalité des jeunes en vertu de la Loi sur les jeunes contrevenants. Celle-ci servira de données de base pour comparer les résultats d'une reprise de l'étude, qui sera effectuée après quelques années de la mise en vigueur de la LSJPA, afin d'évaluer l'impact de la LSJPA sur le travail des policiers avec les jeunes contrevenants.
- Fournir des renseignements qui peuvent guider la prise de décision de Justice Canada lors de l'allocation de ressources pour apporter un soutien à la mise en application de nouvelles mesures de la LSJPA.

Nous croyons que cette étude sera utile à la police au Canada de deux façons au moins, en plus des objectifs plus haut décrits:

- Les services de police pourront utiliser le rapport de ce projet comme référence pour comparer leur propre démarche face à la criminalité des jeunes;
- En fournissant de l'information à l'étude, les services de police pourront influencer la prise de décision concernant certains aspects de la mise en application de la LSJPA qui ont trait à leur travail.

Nous sommes particulièrement intéressés à étudier les facteurs qui influencent deux décisions : comment les dossiers de jeunes contrevenants sont traités (par accusation, par un renvoi à des mesures de rechange ou de façon informelle); et si les jeunes qui sont accusés sont détenus. Évidemment, nous savons que ces décisions ne sont pas prises uniquement par la police, mais notre mandat consiste à examiner le rôle de la police dans ces décisions.

Notre examen de recherches antérieures sur ce sujet nous a amenés à déterminer de façon très générale les facteurs possibles: du milieu dans lequel un service de police évolue, incluant la législation et les programmes fédéraux et provinciaux, et le genre de communauté desservie, à la structure de l'organisation interne, aux politiques et procédures du service de police, à la prise de décision par le policier de première ligne. Voici les principaux sujets que nous entendons couvrir :

Milieu

- Le genre de communauté desservie
- L'impact des dispositions de la LJC et autre législation pertinente
- Les ressources externes, telles que les organisations et programmes provinciaux, municipaux et privés

Structure organisationnelle

- Mandat et objectifs généraux, façon de maintenir l'ordre
- Spécialisation face à la criminalité des jeunes (section de la jeunesse, policiers spécialisés, etc.)
- Qui a l'autorité/la responsabilité de porter une accusation (ou d'en faire la recommandation, dans les juridictions où le service de police procède ainsi)?
- Formation

Processus organisationnel

- Y-a-t-il des politiques/protocoles précis pour s'occuper des jeunes?
- Enquêtes – comment des scénarios typiques sont traités (victime/témoin rapporte un événement terminé; victime/témoin rapporte un événement en cours, etc.)
- Traitement – par accusation (ou recommandation de porter une accusation)/renvoi à des mesures de rechange/moyens informels
- Assurer la présence à la cour : utilisation de la détention/libération/avis de comparution/sommation/etc.
- L'impact des circonstances de l'évènement et des caractéristiques du contrevenant sur les décisions concernant le traitement et pour assurer la présence à la cour
- Méthodes d'enregistrement et leur impact sur la précision des données DUC

Notre source principale de renseignements sera les entrevues avec les services de police. Nous analyserons aussi les données statistiques sur les communautés et les tendances de la criminalité, et sur les dossiers de jeunes contrevenants de l'étude DUC2 fournis par le centre canadien de la statistique juridique et, si possible, d'un nombre représentatif de services de police qui ne contribuent pas au DUC2. Nous tenterons de rencontrer un nombre de services de police qui sont représentatifs de divers milieux et de diverses organisations de maintien de l'ordre au Canada : des régions, des communautés de différentes grandeurs, et des diverses ententes pour assurer le maintien de l'ordre: municipal indépendant, municipal contractuel, provincial, autochtone volontaire, etc.

Lors des rencontres avec chaque service de police, nous aimerions, si possible, parler avec quelqu'un de la haute direction qui peut répondre aux questions concernant le milieu dans lequel le service opère et les structures générales, les politiques et procédures; et aussi avec un ou deux policiers de première ligne, de préférence spécialisés dans les dossiers de jeunes contrevenants. De plus, dans le cas de services de police ayant une section de la jeunesse, nous aimerions rencontrer quelqu'un de la direction de cette section. Chacune de ces entrevues ne prendra pas plus d'une heure. Nous aimerions également, si possible, accompagner un policier en devoir qui s'occupe de jeunes contrevenants pour observer nous-mêmes la prise de décisions. Nous apprécierions recevoir des copies de documents qui concernent le traitement des dossiers de jeunes contrevenants, tels que des directives procédurales.

Bien sûr, il appartient à chaque service de police participant et à chaque policier rencontré de décider des questions auxquelles il répondra et des documents qu'il fournira.

Pour plus d'informations, veuillez communiquer avec l'une des personnes suivantes :

Barbara Muszynski, intervieweuse senior (514) 333-7756
barbara.muszynski@sympatico.ca

Peter Carrington, enquêteur principal (519) 743-0214
pjcco@sympatico.ca

Jharna Chatterjee, responsable de projet (613) 954-3591
JChatter@justice.gc.ca