

Crime Scene

Psychology Behind Bars and In Front of the Bench

The Official Organ of the Criminal Justice Section of the Canadian Psychological Association

Section Executive:

David Nussbaum, Ph.D.,
President
David_Nussbaum@camh.net

Karl Hanson, Ph.D.,
Secretary/Treasurer
HansonK@sgc.gc.ca

J. Stephen Wormith, Ph.D.,
Past President
wormith@duke.usask.ca

Jeremy Mills, Ph.D.
Co-Editor Crime Scene
MillsJF@csc-scc.gc.ca

Daryl Kroner, Ph.D.
Co-Editor Crime Scene
KronerDG@csc-scc.gc.ca

Jennifer van de Ven
Student Representative
brian.horton@sympatico.ca

Tanya Rugge
Student Representative
rugget@sgc.gc.ca

What's Inside

The Editors View

View from the Top ~ President's Comments
Psychology and Psychotropic Medication

The Personals Column

A Career in a Maximum Security Psychiatric Hospital
by Marnie Rice, Ph.D.

Invited Submissions

A Classic Case of Test Envy in Sex Offender Risk Assessment
by Douglas P. Boer, Ph.D.

Comments on Criminal Justice and Behavior
by Curt Bartol, Ph.D. Editor

Recently Defended Ph.D. Theses

The Use of Detention Legislation: Factors affecting detention decisions and recidivism among high-risk federal offenders in Ontario
by Patricia Nugent, Ph.D.

Understanding Employment: A prospective exploration of factors linked to community-based employment among federal offenders.
by Christa Gillis, Ph.D.

Recent Publications

Criminal Justice Section Student Awards

Overview of the Criminal Justice Presentations at CPA

Executive Elections Information

The Editors View

This edition is our ‘pre-convention’ edition and contains some of the highlights that you can expect at CPA this year in Vancouver. Without a doubt it is a full schedule. There are 10 symposia and 38 posters along with conversation sessions and a theory review. Of course the banquet and awards night will also be a BIG event for our section. We encourage you to register for the banquet today.

We have undertaken to add a “personal” touch to Crime Scene. Many of us know the work of the people who have been instrumental in advancing our field over the years but sometimes we know little about them. So in the interest of peering into the lives of our colleagues we are introducing “The Personals Column” where we invite some of our longer serving members to give us some insight into their lives, their career and their thoughts on the future. In this edition Marnie Rice has graciously offered us some insight into her life and career. We almost tipped over when we learned that Marnie was “retirement age”. How was it possible? On behalf of the Executive and membership we wish to extend to Marnie our sincerest best wishes in her endeavors “post Oakridge”.

Some of our readership remarked that they enjoyed the “Crime Scene Challenge” offered in the January edition of Crime Scene. We are open to pursuing a similar challenge during the fall months, so if you have a burning question send it along with some suggested experts that we can contact and we will see what we can do. Also, if you have someone in mind for our future “The Personals Column” then send their name along as well.

JM & DK

View from the Top

David Nussbaum, *President*

Psychology and Psychotropic Medication

It seems that getting away from wearing two hats is a difficult process. I was recently approached to sit on the ASPPB Practice Analysis Task Force in conjunction with the Professional Examination Service to review curricula and exams in forensic psychology and psychopharmacology. This request mirrors my involvement with CPA and I accepted. As most of you know, I favour a reductionistic approach to understanding *any* behaviour to avoid the circularity that otherwise comes into the language and renders explanation impossible, control unlikely and prediction sub-optimal (Nussbaum, 2002, see below) Consequently, I do not see any conflict between believing that behaviour is generated at levels that are amenable to pharmacological treatment and believing that criminal behaviour, as a subset of general behaviour, will ultimately prove amenable to pharmacological and other emerging bio-behavioural modalities. I have proposed one possibility for conceptualizing and defining behaviour that makes the transition between levels of organization seamless. Never-the-less, innovative suggestions often engender fierce opposition.

A novel situation that has arisen for psychology and psychologists in that the Governor of New Mexico last week signed into law a bill granting appropriately trained psychologists the right to prescribe psychotropic medication. There is a 17 course program with an exam after each course, followed by a year of prescribing under a licensed practitioner (currently a physician) with the necessity of prescribing for at least 100 individuals successfully during the 12 months. Assuming the supervised period meets an acceptable standard, the individual is to be given his/her unrestricted license.

A truly successful treatment of violence and other antisocial behaviour must involve a change in brain activity within both short and long-term social interaction representations. Behavioural treatments have shown themselves to be effective with many, but not all, types of offenders. Like any form of learning, these

modalities involve a change in micro-structures of the brain to facilitate these alterations in memories and ultimately behaviour. The issue that remains concerns those for whom no behavioural treatment has been shown effective. This may very well be because they have a "learning disability" at the cellular level with respect to codes for such constructs as empathy, attachment, perspective taking etc. Forensic and correctional psychologists may well be called upon in future to pioneer new and effective drug treatments to deal with specific types of violence. We have the research expertise to spearhead this effort and can gain the neurobiological background necessary to contribute to this endeavor. It is a challenge we should not ignore.

AACP News

You may recall that January's edition of Crime Scene contained a letter from John Gannon, Ph.D., President of the American Association for Correctional Psychology.

The AACP has just "gone live" with their own website. If you want to visit the site, then type in www.eaacp.org. To use the site you first register using your e-mail address and then logon using the same e-mail address. Take a Look!

The Personals Column

A Career in a Maximum Security Psychiatric Hospital

Marnie Rice, Ph.D.

As March 31, 2002 marks the official date of my "retirement" as a civil servant after 27 years (having reached the magic factor-80; do the math if you must), it seems fitting that Jeremy and Daryl should invite me to write about my career.

In the late 1960's as a psychology undergraduate at McMaster University, I found the experimental, basic science approach to be fascinating, but I couldn't see myself becoming a psychology professor. I decided I'd like to try something more applied, so went to U of T to do a Masters in Child Psychology. I did a thesis on social learning theory, then followed with a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology at York University. Throughout my doctoral years, I worked in treatment programs using social learning approaches for delinquents and their families, and behavior modification for autistic children. I decided I wanted a career doing applied research with clinical populations of children.

When the time came to look for a job, my husband (who was just completing law school) and I decided that we wanted to live somewhere north of Toronto. We considered Peterborough because it had a university, but then I saw an ad for a psychologist position on a behavior modification unit in a maximum security psychiatric hospital for men (called Oak Ridge) in Penetanguishene. At the time, I'd never heard of it, and was disinclined to follow up because it was not the client group I had ever planned for. There was, however, also a job for a lawyer in the nearby town of Midland and I promised my husband I'd find out more. I discovered that Dr. Vern Quinsey had been working there for four years, first as the psychologist on the behavioral unit, and he had also begun a program of research with child molesters. A girlfriend had been a graduate student at Dalhousie while Vern had been at that university.

She recommended that, if I had a chance to work with him, I should take it. So I went up for an interview and quickly became hooked.

In addition to Vern, I also met Grant Harris that day in 1975 when I was interviewed. He was working with Vern for a year before heading off to graduate school. That same day, I was also treated to a tour of the ward that held the most regressed, chronic, and assaultive patients. Many were severely mentally retarded; many others were textbook cases of various types of schizophrenia; and several had had lobotomies. As the burly attendants escorted me down the ward, they had each patient "perform" for me by singing a song, standing on his hands, doing a dance, or reciting poetry. I felt as if I were visiting a menagerie and thought to myself that it couldn't be too hard to make life better for these poor patients. When I was offered the job (at \$27,000/year) I felt very fortunate. Little did I know they were desperate -- my male predecessor had lasted only two weeks before the place got to him. I didn't know I was the first female psychologist to work in Oak Ridge. I certainly never suffered from lack of attention. Many of the attendants tried hard to get rid of me; meanwhile, I found to my surprise that I really enjoyed working with the patients. And Vern got me involved in a research study the first week I was there. This began the first of our many collaborative research studies.

In 1980, Dr. Grant Harris returned from graduate school and stepped into my job as the psychologist on the behavioral unit. I moved into the Research Department that Vern had inaugurated 1975. Grant transferred to the Research Department in 1987. Throughout our time there together until Vern left temporarily for L'Institut Phillippe Pinel in 1986 and then permanently for Queens in 1988, the three of us worked on several projects on institutional violence, violence prediction, mentally disordered fire setters, sex offenders, and psychopaths. I hope this collaboration with Vern and Grant, and our younger collaborators, will continue for many more years, as I have enjoyed every minute of it.

Over the years, our studies have involved larger and larger numbers of subjects. In the 1970's, we had no computer and would have to ship all of our data to Toronto to be keypunched and analyzed. In 1981, we got an Apple II, the hospital's first computer with all of 64 Kb of RAM! As computers got faster and bigger, so did our studies. Oak Ridge is a unique psychiatric hospital and has always had extremely good clinical records on all patients, and it is the high quality of these records that has allowed us to do many of our studies. Over the years, the number of variables we have gathered from the file about each patient has also grown -- in one recent study, we tried to gather over 300 variables on each subject. Many of our more recent projects have involved subjects and investigators from several different sites, as the scope of the projects keeps growing.

As the numbers and locations of subjects grew, and we began to see similar patterns emerging, we began to have confidence that our findings had relevance to public policy and became interested in making public policy recommendations when we could. However, from the day the Research Department was born, (in fact, from the day Vern first arrived in 1971), it has always been a major part of our mission to do research that could make a difference to the lives of the patients and the clinical practice of the staff. We think that working right inside the institution, as compared to working in a university and occasionally visiting to do research, has helped us to better understand the important issues for staff and patients.

What do I think are the important questions to be addressed by future research? It is humbling to say that my opinions about the central issues haven't changed all that much throughout my career. I believe that the concept of psychopathy (or, as we like to call it, lifelong persistent antisociality), will continue to make a contribution to our understanding of those offenders who commit crime and violent crime at rates far out of proportion to their numbers. I believe that understanding the etiology of deviant sexual

preferences is key to the development of prevention and treatment strategies for sex offenders. And I believe that the only way to make progress in the assessment and treatment of violent offenders is to rigorously evaluate everything we do, and not let our judgement be clouded by what we would like to believe.

Alas, as I write this, I find myself locked inside the hospital working in the kitchen to feed the patients during a strike. It's certainly not how I wanted to end my career as a civil servant. But living for a short time under the conditions that many of our patients have to endure for decades makes me see how far we still have to go in providing a decent quality of life inside our institutions, and in developing effective interventions that offer greater hope for release for our long-term clientele. It also brings home the fact that among the greatest challenges facing us all is to find ways to ensure that advances in scientific knowledge get incorporated into clinical practice.

A Classic Case of Test Envy in Sex Offender Risk Assessment

Douglas P. Boer, Ph.D.

The SORAG, SVR-20, VRS-S0, STATIC99, SONAR, STABLE (see below for references), and other relatively similar risk prediction tools (RSVPTs) are just a few of the currently available risk assessment measures designed for use with sexual offenders. These instruments all purport to do a similar job – providing estimates of likelihood to recidivate – and most of the associated authors claim that their test, or their type of test, does a better job at risk assessment than the competition. This same debate exists among the experts of risk assessment for non-sexual violent offenders and the discussion from this paper can be extended to risk assessment in general.

In the above group of instruments there are surprising similarities. Whether the instrument is a straightforward actuarial tool (using only empirically derived variables related to recidivism), or a structured clinical guideline tool (using empirical and clinical variables to arrive at a structured clinical estimate of risk), there is a core group of variables that are generally employed to predict risk which are common to some or all of these tests (e.g., sex of the victim, age of offender at time of offence, presence of personality disorder, prior convictions, attitudes supportive of offending, among others). This appears to be the case regardless of whether a tool is from the actuarial or structured clinical guideline family. Given these similarities, how is a clinician supposed to choose which of these RSVPTs to use?

The first question ought to be: who is the client being assessed? All of these tools are designed specifically for use with sexual abusers. However, it is not unusual to see psychological reports citing the VRAG (an instrument which assesses the general likelihood of violent recidivism designed by the authors of the SORAG) or the GSIR (a CSC test for assessing the general likelihood of any reoffending) with sexual offenders rather than measures of the likelihood of sexual recidivism specifically, such as the SORAG or the STATIC99. Test selection ought to keep in mind the offender's type of crime and use instruments designed for use with that client group.

The second question ought to be: is the instrument being considered for use supported by good data that is relevant to the client being assessed? There are some RSVPT's out there that do not have much in the

way of supporting data and it is part of the assessor's task to determine the adequacy of a measure's supporting data and the relevance of that data to the client being assessed.

The third question ought to be: what is purpose of the assessment? If it is a "treatment needs assessment", perhaps there is no pressing need for an actuarial estimate of risk. An instrument designed to assess dynamic risk variables or treatment needs may be indicated, such as the SONAR, STABLE, or VRS-SO. On the other hand, if the assessment is a "pre-release assessment", then an assessment of change in dynamic risk factors over time (i.e., an estimate of the client's level of manageability) and likelihood to reoffend is needed. Such an assessment would warrant the use of tools designed to provide a probabilistic estimate of the offender's likelihood to reoffend and an overall structured clinical estimate of risk and change in relevant dynamic factors. In such a case, both actuarial tools and structured guideline tools are indicated. The STATIC-99 or SORAG and the SVR-20 respectively are possible selections for the latter referral question (for nonsexual violent offenders, by extrapolation, the VRAG and HCR-20 would parallel the above instrument types).

The above combinations of measures are examples of a convergent approach to risk assessment. Such a convergent approach is not a new idea. In 1994, Chris Webster and his colleagues suggested a similar approach in their "Violence Prediction Scheme" booklet. In this booklet, which also contains the VRAG, Webster et al suggested the use of the ASSESS-LIST, a mnemonic for ten clinical variables, to "help clinicians structure their judgment". These ten variables were to be assessed and used to modify the actuarial score, but "caution (was) recommended in varying far from the actuarial estimate". This approach was an initial attempt to allow modification of an actuarial estimate by structured clinical information.

A convergent approach was subsequently rejected by Webster's former co-authors in their 1998 book entitled "Violent Offenders: appraising and managing risk". In this book, Quinsey et al proclaimed "actuarial methods are too good and clinical judgment too poor to risk contaminating the former with the latter" (p. 171). However, at a recent conference, sex offender treatment expert Richard Laws countered that actuarial methods were based on "junk science"! Given all these friendly experts, what are we clinicians – who do the actual work – supposed to do while the academics debate whose method is better?

There is an excellent paper written by Kevin Douglas and colleagues that gives some insight into the "actuarial-clinical debate". All users of risk assessment tools ought to peruse this paper. While the authors stop short of saying it, it seems that there is no convincing evidence in the literature to stop using either actuarial or structured guidelines in favor of the other at this time. One study suggested that structured clinical judgment outperformed actuarial methods in the prediction of sexual recidivism (Dempster, 1998) but this study remains unpublished. It is also possible that this study and others that promote the use of one measure (or type of measure) over another may be rendered moot depending on the issue being addressed by the assessment at hand. Perhaps one test has better predictive power than another does, but in the end, the test selection may be based on other issues related to risk than simply likelihood of reoffending. For example, victim selection, degree of harm, changes in dynamic risk factors – or other issues related to risk and manageability – may be the determining factors in test selection.

The current state of the actuarial-clinical debate is one of a need for ongoing research. There is no clear answer to aid clinicians in the selection of which of the RSVPTs to use with which client. Since this question is not currently answerable, it would seem that a convergent approach seems most appropriate until the "debate" is resolved. Simply put, a convergent approach would employ actuarial tools to

provide a probabilistic estimate of recidivism as well as structured guidelines to provide an overall estimate of risk. Together these instruments provide a platform from which to discuss changes in dynamic risk factors in order to provide an estimate of the client's current level of manageability. From this perspective, neither type seems as useful to decision-makers as both do when used in combination.

An excellent example of a convergent approach may be seen in the current National Sex Offender Program Standards of the Correctional Service of Canada. These standards incorporate both actuarial tools and a modified structured guideline for risk estimation. Although the rationale is not explicit, the philosophy is implicitly convergent in nature.

It seems that Webster et al (1994) were on the right path in the Violence Prediction Scheme. Clinical variables may be used to modify the actuarial estimates of risk, but their 1994 suggestion of no more than 10% was simply a best guess. Sometimes a single variable (e.g., stated intent to injure) is all that is needed to indicate high risk. However, an actuarial anchor to risk assessment will dissuade clinicians from straying too far from the data due to issues like therapist bias or the offender's ability to manage one's impression. A structured clinical guideline will help frame risk/need issues and help provide an overall risk judgment predicated on well-known clinical and empirical risk variables. The use of newer tools that are essentially actuarial, but focused on dynamic variables, will also be helpful in an overall convergent portrayal of an offender's risk.

Summary

Risk and manageability are related concepts. It is the often-stated purpose of risk assessment to provide suggestions to aid in the management of an offender, as well provide estimates of risk in terms of nature, frequency and severity of future violence. However, estimating an offender's manageability has not been a focus of assessment to date and this is problematic given the need to address this issue in "risk assessments". Although crude, an index of an offender's "manageability" may be construed to be the degree to which an offender's dynamic risk factors have been ameliorated in combination with an estimate of his current ability to react in a pro-social manner to those circumstances that have exacerbated his risk in the past. Clearly, an assessment that neglects dynamic risk variables such as an offender's ability to cope with his unique risk factors cannot provide an estimate of an offender's manageability. Thus, for example, the use of one of the majority of actuarial tools alone would almost always result in an inadequate pre-release assessment in the individual case. Perhaps a good estimate of risk would be provided, but a decision regarding whether to release the offender is as much dependent on manageability as it is on a risk estimate.

In conclusion, a convergent approach is indicated both by the state of the literature, and the fact that most referral requests are related to both risk and manageability. At this time, no one of the RSVPTs provides both in such a convincing fashion that would support its use in isolation. Rather a convergent approach, using tests in a complementary manner is suggested in order to provide a broad basis for decisions regarding risk, changes in risk, and risk management.

References

Boer, D.P., Hart, S.D., Kropp, P.R., & Webster, C.D. (1998). Manual for the Sexual Violence Risk – 20: Professional guidelines for assessing risk of sexual violence. Vancouver: British Columbia Institute Against Family Violence.

Dempster, R.J. (1998). Prediction of sexually violent recidivism: A comparison of risk assessment instruments. Unpublished master's thesis. Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

Douglas, K.S., Cox, D.N., & Webster, C.D. (1999). Violence risk assessment: science and practice. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 4, 149-184.

Hanson, R.K., & Harris, A.J.R. (2000). The Sex Offender Need Assessment Rating (SONAR): A method for measuring change in risk levels. Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Hanson, R.K., & Thornton, D. (1999). Static 99: Improving Actuarial Risk Assessment for Sex Offenders. Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Laws, D.R., Hart, S.D., & Logan, C. (2001, April). Risk for Sexual Violence Protocol: A new instrument for assessment and management of sexual offenders. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Association for Forensic Mental Health Services, Vancouver, Canada.

Quinsey, V.L., Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., & Cormier, C.A. (1998). Violent offenders: Appraising and managing risk. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Webster, C.D., Douglas, K.S., Eaves, D., & Hart, S.D., (1997). HCR-20: Assessing Risk for Violence (Version 2). Vancouver: Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute, Simon Fraser University.

Webster, C.D., Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., Cormier, C., & Quinsey, V.L. (1994). The violence prediction scheme: Assessing dangerousness in high risk men. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto, Centre of Criminology.

Criminal Justice and Behavior: Comments from the Editor

Curt Bartol, Ph.D.

Criminal Justice and Behavior: An International Journal is a publication sponsored by the American Association for Correctional Psychology (AACP). The journal, published bimonthly, seeks any well-executed research, thoughtful literature reviews, provocative theoretical development, scholarly commentary, or books reviews on forensic psychology, broadly defined. We will, of course, continue to have a discernible preference for high quality manuscripts in correctional psychology, but projects that focus on police psychology, psychology and law, victimology, and criminal or delinquent behavior in general are highly welcomed. We continue to be especially interested in innovative, cutting-edge approaches focusing on the prevention, intervention, treatment, risk assessment, and or classification of adult and juvenile offenders in a variety of settings. For research papers, we prefer manuscripts that are methodologically solid but use the most straightforward, easy-to-understand statistical analyses possible. For literature reviews, we look for well-written, thoughtfully organized papers that focus on topics relevant to the psychology of crime or corrections.

I strongly encourage Canadian authors to submit their manuscripts to the journal. Some readers have joked that the journal should be called the "Canadian Journal of Criminal Justice and Behavior" because of the inordinate number of Canadian authors and papers that appear in the journal (approximately 30 percent the past three years). (And eight members on the journal's Editorial Board are Canadians!) However, I continually find that the Canadian contributions are outstanding and represent the cutting edge on innovative approaches to treatment, risk assessment, offender classification, research on the causes of crime, and more generally the psychology of criminal justice. I sincerely wish we had more of them. And I know that John Gannon, the AACP President, joins me in welcoming more Canadians to

join the American Association for Correctional Psychology and receive the journal as part of their membership (See *Crime Scene*, January 2002). I echo John's message for readers interested in AACCP membership to contact Dr. Richard Urbanik at rurbanik@bop.gov, or Dr. John Gannon, Central Coast Consultancy, 897 Oak Park Blvd., #124, Pismo Beach, CA 93449, or check the web site www.eaacp.org.

Unfortunately, the current rejection rate of the journal is over 90 percent of the hundreds of manuscripts we receive each year. However, we hope to increase the number of published papers by increasing the number of journal pages or issues (possibly 12 annually) in the very near future. Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate to me, Editor, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, PO Box 1332, Castleton, VT 05735, USA, typewritten double spaced with tables, charts, and references on separate pages. The format described in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th edition, 2001) must be followed. The ideal length is approximately 25 pages or less. Questions concerning manuscript submissions may be directed to me at curt.bartol@castleton.edu. In addition, if any of you have ideas about topics for special issues or would like to edit a special issue, please let me know. Two of the last three special issues were edited by Canadians, and there are several more "Canadian" special issues in the pipeline.

We are also planning to allocate considerably more space for book reviews in the upcoming issues. Book reviews or book review essays should be sent to David J. Simourd, Ph.D., Book Review Editor, Providence Continuing Care Center, Forensic Unit, 752 King St W., Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7L 4X3. Potential contributors of books should correspond with Dave prior to submission of manuscripts, either through electronic mail: simourdd@PCCC.KARI>NET or (613) 546-1101, extension 5453.

Curt R. Bartol, Editor
Criminal Justice and Behavior

Recently Defended Ph.D. Theses

The Use of Detention Legislation: Factors Affecting Detention Decisions and Recidivism Among High-Risk Federal Offenders in Ontario

Patricia M. Nugent

Department of Psychology
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario

Abstract

Detention Legislation in Canada allows the denial of conditional release for violent federal offenders who are judged to be at imminent risk of causing serious physical or psychological harm to others. Previous studies have found that detained offenders had lower rates of recidivism than offenders released on parole; but these studies did not accurately assess risk or utilized limited static information.

The present study compared the recidivism rates, over an average follow-up time of 2.4 years, of 78 detained offenders and 64 high-risk non-detained offenders. Detailed pre-release information was collected from interviews, file information, psychometric tests, and several structured risk assessment instruments. The results indicate that detained offenders did not have higher risk scores than non-detained offenders and confirmed that they had a lower rate of general recidivism. The overall rate of violent recidivism was low and there was no difference between detained and non-detained offenders. Detention decisions were not based on the risk assessment instruments that accurately predicted recidivism, but were largely influenced by the nature of the offence, noncompliance with treatment, and personality characteristics. Psychologically relevant, dynamic, and proximal variables such as criminal associates, employability, criminal attitude, institutional charges, personality traits such as impulsivity, anxiety, interpersonal problems, and alienation predicted recidivism as accurately as static and historic variables (age, risk level, family background, offence severity, sexual offending, and criminal history). The most accurate prediction was obtained using a combination of static and relatively dynamic factors. Implications for improving release decisions and correctional policy are discussed.

Understanding Employment: A Prospective Exploration Of Factors Linked To Community-Based
Employment Among Federal Offenders

Christa A. Gillis

Department of Psychology
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
January, 2002

Abstract

Offender employment has played a pivotal role in corrections since the introduction of institutions (Funke, Wayson, & Miller, 1982; Gaes, Flanagan, Motiuk, & Stewart, 1999; Guynes & Greiser, 1986; Miller & Greiser, 1986; Townsend, 1996), and has long been a topic of interest within criminological and correctional theory and practice (Andrews, Pirs, Walker, & Hurge, 1980). However, little is known about the factors and processes that contribute to employment outcomes among offenders (Gillis, 2000, 2001; Ryan, 1998), as few systematic empirical studies have been conducted in this area (Gaes et al., 1999; Pearson & Lipton, 1999; Ryan, 1998). Furthermore, the employment construct has not been operationalized to adequately reflect its multidimensional nature (Andrews et al., 1980). A prospective approach was adopted in the present study to explore the contributions of static and dynamic factors to offender employment outcomes in the community. These factors were integrated within the personal-interpersonal-community-reinforcement perspective (PIC-R; Andrews, 1982a; Andrews & Bonta, 1998) on criminal conduct. Additionally, the PIC-R perspective was operationalized in this research according to the framework of the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1985, 1988). This model, which predicts criminal behaviour from beliefs, attitudes, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control and intention, was extended within the present study to account for additional factors (e.g., work attitudes) hypothesized to contribute to an offender's employability. Correlational and regression analyses were conducted to explore factors linked to employment status and quality of employment during the first and

sixth month of male federal offenders' conditional release. The total number of weeks employed was also examined. Results support the influence of personal (e.g., intention to find / keep a job), interpersonal (e.g., social support for employment) and broad social factors (e.g., unemployment rate) in contributing to community employment outcomes for offenders. Moreover, social support for employment was associated with offenders' community reintegration, with higher levels of support linked to a longer period of time in the community. Practical implications for employment-related assessment and intervention for federal offenders are discussed.

Recent Publications

Latessa, E.J., Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (in press). Beyond correctional quackery: Professionalism and the possibility of effective treatment. Federal Probation.

Smith, P., Goggin, C., & Gendreau, P. (2002). The effects of prison sentences and intermediate sanctions on recidivism: General effects and individual differences. A Report to the Corrections Research Branch, Solicitor General of Canada.

Mills, J.F., Kroner, D. G., & Forth A. E. (in press). Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA): Development, Factor Structure, Reliability, and Validity. Assessment.

Recent meta-analysis has demonstrated that attitudes and associates are among the best predictors of antisocial behavior. Despite this finding there are few psychometrically developed and validated measures of criminal and antisocial attitudes and associates. This study reviews the theoretical and empirical development of the Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates (MCAA) which is comprised of two parts. Part A is a quantified self-report measure of criminal friends. Part B contains four attitude scales: Violence, Entitlement, Antisocial Intent and Associates.

The MCAA showed reasonable reliability (internal consistency and temporal stability), and appropriate convergent and discriminant validity. Criterion validity was evidenced in the scales relationship with criminal history variables, and a factor analysis confirmed the four distinct scale domains.

Quinsey, V.L. (2002). Evolutionary theory and criminal behavior. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 7, 1-13.

Purpose: To provide an introduction to evolutionary psychology by describing some of its applications in the literature on the psychology of criminal and antisocial behavior.

Argument: Selectionist thinking is applied to five areas: The relationship of age and sex to crime, the inverse correlation between degree of kinship and homicide, pedophilia, persistent antisociality, and sexual coercion. In each of these areas, ultimate causes of behavior are distinguished from proximal causes. Ultimate causes are produced by selective forces in ancestral environments and are responsible for species typical characteristics. Proximal causes, on the other hand, are contemporaneous developmental, genetic, and environmental determinants of behavior. Conclusions: The interplay between ultimate and proximal causation provides new ways of understanding old problems and is a fruitful source of research hypotheses. Evolutionary psychology can provide a powerful integrative perspective on criminal and antisocial behavior.

Rice, M.E. & Harris, G.T. (in press). What we know and don't know about treating sex offenders. In B. Winick and J. LaFond (Eds.) *Sexually violent offenders: Law and policy in the USA*. American Psychological Association.

The preferred or recommended treatment for sex offenders continues to evolve but the evolution is not based on an empirical foundation of effective treatment and has little chance to be so grounded. If any specific treatment effects have so far been achieved, all scientists would agree that the magnitudes have been small at best, and limited to child molesters. If therapy is to play a large role in protecting society from new offenses committed by identified sex offenders in general or sexual predators in particular, moderate to large treatment effects are required. Although the long term effects of cognitive behavior treatment are still being evaluated, there are sensible grounds to consider other modalities. For example, few drug treatments or treatments that combine behavioral methods to alter sexual preferences with drugs or with other cognitive-behavioral treatments have received methodologically sound outcome evaluations.

Rice, M.E. & Harris, G.T. (in press). Men who molest their sexually immature daughters: Is a special explanation required? Journal of Abnormal Psychology.

Child molesters who target their own children have been considered a special group of child molesters who are usually not pedophiles and are at a low risk to reoffend. We review some constructs possibly relevant to an explanation of this behavior: pedophilia, incest avoidance, deprivation, and psychopathy. In the present study, 82 men who had molested a daughter or step daughter were compared to 102 men whose only female victim(s) were extrafamilial. The results confirmed that child molesters who had only offended against their daughters had less

deviant sexual age preferences than other child molesters. The father-daughter child molesters were also less likely to commit new violent (including sexual) offenses than other child molesters. However, actuarial risk prediction instruments (the Sex Offender Risk Appraisal Guide and the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide) worked just as well for intra-familial offenders as they did for other sex offenders. Implications for theories of incest and for the assessment and treatment of incestuous child molesters are discussed.

Skilling, T.A., Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., & Quinsey, V.L. (in press). Identifying persistently antisocial offenders using the Hare Psychopathy Checklist and DSM antisocial personality disorder criteria. Psychological Assessment.

A large proportion of violent crime is committed by those few offenders who exhibit persistent antisociality beginning from a very young age. This lifetime criminal persistence has been conceived of as sociopathy, antisocial personality disorder, or psychopathy. There is, however, disagreement about the core features of the phenomenon and about which measure is most appropriate for identifying these individuals. In the first of two studies conducted with male offenders ($n = 74$), we found the association between Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R) scores and DSM-IV Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD) criteria scored as a scale was very high. The second study ($n = 684$) replicated this finding and found evidence that, as previously shown for PCL-R scores, a discrete natural class (or taxon) underlay scores on scales reflecting antisocial personality and scales reflecting aggressive and antisocial juvenile behavior. The high association among these sets of items, their similarity in predicting violent recidivism, and the results from taxometric analyses, suggested that the same taxon underlies both. Results indicated the phenomenon of life course persistent antisociality can be assessed well by measures of psychopathy (as defined by the

PCL-R) and Antisocial Personality Disorder (as indexed by the DSM). Subsidiary analyses suggested that optimal classification might be accomplished by a combination of PCL-R items and other indicators of aggressive and antisocial behavior evident in childhood.

Rice, M.E., & Harris, G.T. (2002). Sexual aggressors: Scientific status. In D.L. Faigman, D.H. Kaye, M.J. Saks, & J. Sanders (Eds.), *Modern scientific evidence: The law and science of expert testimony*. Vol. 1. (2nd ed., pp. 471-504). St. Paul, MN: West.

This is a review of what is known about sex offender assessment and treatment and its application to the law, especially to the "Sexual predator" laws in the U.S.

Harris, G.T., Skilling, T.A., & Rice, M.E. (2001). The construct of psychopathy. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: An annual review of research* (pp. 197-264). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The authors review current research and theory on psychopathy. As a psychological construct, psychopathy has undergone recent change and there is still some disagreement among experts as to its fundamental character. Nevertheless, it can be reliably and validly measured with reference to such key psychopathic behaviors as callousness, impulsivity, sensation seeking, dishonesty, emotional detachment, extreme selfishness, antisociality, belligerence, juvenile delinquency, and sexual promiscuity. Hare's Psychopathy Checklist-Revised is the best available assessment. Although more research is required, psychopathy appears to exist in women, children and in all ethnic groups examined so far. No one knows whether any psychopaths live successfully in the community without committing serious criminal offenses. Among institutionalized offender samples where the construct has been most studied,

psychopathy is the strongest predictor of violent recidivism and differential response to treatment yet discovered. Although psychopaths might exhibit very subtle neurological, physiological, and cognitive differences compared to other people, it is unclear whether these differences constitute defective brain function or the execution of a viable life strategy. Research on psychopathy is one of the most exciting areas of applied psychology and psychopathy is the most important psychological construct for policy and practice in the criminal justice field.

Nussbaum, D., Collins, M., Cutler, J., Zimmerman, W. & Jacques, I. (2002.). Crime type and specific personality indicia: Cloninger's TCI Impulsivity, Empathy and Attachment subscales in non-violent, violent and sexual offenders. American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 20, 1, 23-56.

The present study investigated personality differences in violent, non-violent and sexual offenders incarcerated at a medium security federal penitentiary. The Temperament and Character Inventory was administered to 185 male inmates specifically to obtain, among other data, personality measures of impulsiveness, attachment and empathy. Criminal records were reviewed and crime type was assigned according to offense history. Age at first offense was also examined. Violent offenders were found to be more impulsive and less empathic than non-violent offenders. Sexual offenders were found to be less impulsive, more empathic, more attached, and have a later age of onset than all other offenders. Identifying variables associated with different types of criminal behavior may have important implications for treatment.

Nussbaum, D. (2002.). Psychologists should be free to pursue prescription privileges: A reply to Walters. Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne. 42, 2, 126-130.

Unity among psychologists and a cure for the “identity crisis” will not come to fruition by denying those who wish to expand their horizons and pursue prescription privileges. More basically, psychologists should by now realize that neurobiological processes are intrinsic to behaviour and behaviour change. Psychologists have contributed to the accumulation of this knowledge. Better conceptualizations of behaviour than are possible from a dichotomous medical model are available to psychologists. These can and should result in better ways to formulate treatment needs of clients/patients, where the interaction between drug and information/therapy will optimize outcome for some patients. This will enhance psychology’s uniqueness as a discipline.

Want an International Audience?

Last year, Steve Wormith, began a column called 'Canadian Corner,' which appears regularly in *The Correctional Psychologist (CP)*. CP is the newsletter of the American Association of Correctional Psychologists (AACP) and is published quarterly. As you may know, the Criminal Justice Psychology Section of CPA has made contact with AACP and we have begun to forge a stronger relationship between the two organizations. This is evidenced in the letter from Dr. John Gannon, president of AACP, in the last issue of *Crime Scene*.

Our American colleagues have expressed considerable interest in hearing more about what may be going on north of the border. So anyone who has any newsworthy items, legal or correctional policy information, research or conference announcements, job postings or editorial-type pieces that they would like to write, please consider this opportunity for an international audience of correctional psychologists. This may also include material

that is scheduled for *Crime Scene* or has already appeared therein.

Section members who have information they would like to contribute are encourage to contact Dr. Wormith by mid-March, June, September and December, for inclusion in the following month's issue. He is at the Department of Psychology, 9 Campus Drive, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon SK, S7K 5A5 or wormith@duke.usask.ca

Criminal Justice Section Student Prize \$\$\$\$\$

At the upcoming Vancouver conference, the Criminal Justice Section will award a prize of **\$100** for the best poster by a student.

Excellent posters address significant questions, use convincing methods, and clearly present the results. Originality is also commendable. The posters are judged at the conference by a panel of the section's executive committee.

Previous award winners include many current leaders in the field:

- ψ 1990 Elsie De Vita
 - ψ 1991 Larry Motiuk
 - ψ 1992 Paul Hebert
 - ψ 1993 Gurmeet Dhaliwal
 - ψ 1994 Kevin Douglas
 - ψ 1995 Kelley Blanchette
 - ψ 1996 Franca Cortoni
 - ψ 1997 Audrey Gordon/Mimi Mamak (tie)
 - ψ 1998 Craig Dowden
 - ψ 1999 Jeremy Mills
 - ψ 2000 no award
 - ψ 2001 Jennifer van de Ven
-

**The Criminal Justice Section
will be hosting a**

Celebration of Excellence Banquet

The banquet will take place at the Botanical Gardens of UBC the evening of Thursday May 30, 2002. This event will give everyone from across Canada an opportunity to gather, mingle, and celebrate our successes. The Banquet is open to all CPA members, students, and non-CPA members who are interested in this field. The celebration begins at 6:30 with dinner at 7:30. Tickets cost \$55 (students \$45) Please make cheques payable to: CPA - Criminal Justice Psychology. Send payment along with your name, mailing address and student/non-student status to: Tanya Rugge, Corrections Research, Solicitor General Canada, 340 Laurier Avenue West, 10E, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0P8. Tickets will be mailed to the address provided. If you have any questions, please contact Tanya at rugget@sgc.gc.ca. Come join us for a night of fantastic food, great company and a night of celebrating excellence!

Conferences & Conventions

**The Canadian Conference on
Specialized Services for Children and
Adolescents who are Sexually Abusive**

The Government Conference Centre
2 Rideau Street
Ottawa, Ontario
June 12-14, 2002

Sponsored by the Network for Research on
Crime and Justice of Queen's University

Proposals for presentations are being accepted
until April 15, 2002-03-15

For more information on the conference or on
making a presentation contact Guy Bourgon,
Ph.D., Project Manager at guybourgon@igs.net

Members on the Move

Congratulations to Dr. Shelley Brown who successfully defended her Ph.D. thesis in November 2002 at Queen's University.

Congratulations to Dr. Christa Gillis who successfully defended her Ph.D. thesis in November 2002 at Carleton University.

CPA 2002 Criminal Justice Section Activities

POSTERS - 38 - FRIDAY - Party Room - 3:00-4:50pm

CONVERSATION SESSIONS - 2

Diagnosis, Current Psychiatric Symptoms, and Legal Abilities (Jodi Viljoen, Patricia Zapf, Ronald Roesch #459) - **THURSDAY - Room 209 - 11:00-11:55am**

Biopsychological Bases of Antisocial Development and Maintenance (David Nussbaum #659) - **FRIDAY - Room 214 - 2:30-2:25pm**

SYMPOSIA - 9

1. Memories of Violent Crimes in Victims and Offenders (John Yuille - Moderator #186) - **SATURDAY - Room 212A - 9:00-10:55am**
 - a) A Biopsychosocial theory of Eyewitness Memory (Hugues Herve, Barry Cooper, John Yuille, Judith Daylen, #187)
 - b) Memory for Mayhem (Barry Cooper, Hughes Herve, John Yuille #188)
 - c) Investigation of Murderers' Memory for Their Homicide Relative to Their Memory for Other Emotional Experiences (Stephen Porter, Mary Ann Campbell, Naomi Doucette, #189)

Memory for Decades-Old Sexual Abuse: Theoretical and Legal Implications (J. Don Read, Deborah Connolly #190)

2. Investigations of Impulsive and Instrumental/Proactive Aggression as a Function of Psychopathic Traits in Children and Adults (Stephen Porter - Moderator #195) - **SATURDAY - Room 212A - 1:00-2:55pm**
 - a) An Investigation of Callous/Unemotional Traits in Elementary Age Children With and Without Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD) and Conduct Disorder (CD). (Daniel Waschbusch, Stephen Porter #196)
 - b) A Cognitive Model of the Alcohol-Aggression Relationship (Peter Hoaken #197)
 - c) Criminal Psychopathy and Its Subtypes: Implications for the Assessment of Risk as a Function of Psychopathy (Hughes Herve #198)
 - 4) Investigation of Impulsivity and Sadistic Violence by Canadian Homicide Offenders as a Function of Psychopathy (Steve Porter, Michael Woodworth #199)

3. Criminal Attitudes Among Diverse Offender Populations (David Simourd - Moderator #223) - **THURSDAY - Room 216 - 11:00am-12:55pm**
 1. Criminal Attitudes and Research Among Adult Male Offenders (David Simourd #224)
 2. Assessing Antisocial Attitudes in the Juvenile Offender (Robert Hoge, Robert Rowe #225)
 3. Gender Issues in Criminal Attitudes Treatment (Linda Simourd, Tricia O'Connor #226)
 4. Criminal Attitudes of Aboriginal Federal Offenders (Stephen Wormith #227)

4. The Community Management and Treatment of Sex Offenders (Heather Scott - Moderator #465) - **FRIDAY - Room 209 - 12:30-2:25pm**
 1. The Community management and Treatment of Sex offenders on Conditional Sentence Orders (Bill C-41). (Heather Scott, Carmen Gress #467)
 2. Assessing Pre and Post Treatment Change in a Community Based Sexual Offender Program: Implications for Treatment (Carmen Gress, Heather Scott #468)
 3. Community Supervision of High Risk Sex Offenders (Carson Smiley, Lori McHattie #469)
 4. Community Treatment and Supervision of Sex Offenders Serving a Federal Sentence j- The Importance of Integrating Treatment and Supervision (Anton Schweighofer #470)

5. Issues in Civil Forensic Psychology (Joti Samra - Moderator #612) - **SATURDAY - Room 212A - 11:00am-12:55pm**
 1. Model of Litigation Behaviour (Tristin Wayte, William Koch #613)
 2. Legal Compensability of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD): Issues for Forensic Psychologists (Joti Samra, Deborah Connolly #615)
 3. Assessing Disability, Pain, and Suffering in PTSD Claimants (William Koch #616)
 4. Ethical Issues in Conducting Personal Injury Evaluations (Joti Samra #617)
 5. Child or Parental Evaluation of Families Involved in Custody Litigation (Andrew Benjamin #618)

6. Focusing Addiction Research and Program Development: The Addictions Research Centre (Brian Grant - Moderator #669) - **THURSDAY - Room 207 - 11:00am-12:55pm**
 1. Methadone Maintenance Treatment While Incarcerated (Sara Johnson #670)
 2. Results from the CSC Random Urinalysis Program (Patricia MacPherson #672)
 3. High Intensity Substance Abuse Program (Edward Hansen #673)
 4. Intensive Support Units for Federal Inmates: A Descriptive Review (David Varis #674)
 5. Substance Abuse Treatment for Women Offenders (Lucy Hume #675)

7. Current Issues in the prediction of Criminal Behaviour (Stephen Wormith - Moderator #707) - **FRIDAY - Room 205 - 10:30am-12:25pm**
 1. Using a Coffee Can and a Filter to Improve Criminal Risk Prediction (Daryl Kroner, Jeremy Mills #708)
 2. Exploring Optimal Binning Procedures and the use of Multiple Instruments in Risk Prediction (Jeremy Mills, Daryl Kroner #709)
 3. Constructing Empirically Based Risk Scales: Balancing Breadth and Efficiency (R Karl Hanson #710)
 4. Remarkably Similar Violence Prediction Scales: What's a Clinician to Do? (Douglas Boer, Faye Paris, Arthur Gordon #711)

8. Restorative Justice in Action: The Multi-Faceted Role of the Psychologist (Robert Cormier - Moderator #738) - **FRIDAY - Room 209 - 10:30-12:25pm**
1. Restorative Justice: Overview and Context (Robert Cormier #739)
 2. Collaborative Justice Project: Evaluation Results (Tanya Ruge #740)
 3. Community-Based Restorative Justice Practice in Federal Corrections: The Restorative Justice Options to Parole Suspension Project (Andrew McWhinnie #741)
 4. Fostering Community-Based Partnerships in Restorative Practice Within Federal Corrections: The Victoria Parole Experience (Robert Brown #742)
9. Mental Health Screening in BC Jails Symposium (Carson Smiley - Moderator #747) - **FRIDAY - Room 214 - 11:30am-1:25pm**
1. Cross-Validation of Pretrial Intake Interviewers' Mental Health Evaluations with the SCID (Tonia Nicholls, Zina Lee, James Ogloff, Raymond Corrado #748)
 2. The Surrey Mental Health program: An Analysis of Admission and Screening Data (Andrew Welsh, James Ogloff #749)
 3. The Development of a Mental Health Screening Tool for New Admission in BC Jails (Maureen Olley, Tonia Nicholls #750)

THEORY REVIEWS - 1

Prevalence of Mental Disorder in Federal Offenders on Supervised Community Release: A Survey (W Carson Smiley, Lori McHattie, #751) - **SATURDAY - Room 212 - 9:30-9:55am**

Criminal Justice Section Special Events Program

SYMPOSIUM - THURSDAY - Room 216 - 1:00-5:00pm

Crystal Balls of Many Colours: Current Risk Assessment Measures (Moderator; Robert Cormier: Participants: James Bonta, Adelle Forth, Karl Hanson, Grant Harris, Randall Kropp, Larry Motiuk, David Nussbaum, David Simourd, Christopher Webster, #799)

CELEBRATION OF EXCELLENCE BANQUET - THURSDAY -Botanical Gardens - UBC Campus - 6:30-9:00pm

*****Section Business Meeting - 1 hour - SATURDAY - Room 213 - 3:00-3:55pm*****

For more information on the Convention see “www.cpa.ca/vancouver/programs.html”

Pre-convention Criminal Justice Workshop at CPA

Conducting Criminal Risk Assessments

Instructors: Jeremy F. Mills, Ph.D. and Daryl G. Kroner, Ph.D.

The educational goal of this workshop is to provide Psychologists with a review the theoretical underpinnings related to criminal risk assessment in combination with applied issues in order to facilitate them conducting criminal risk assessments. Theories of criminal behaviour will be reviewed both from a social learning perspective and a personality perspective. Current risk prediction instruments will be reviewed paying particular attention to the strengths and weaknesses of each [Includes: Psychopathy Checklist - Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 1991); Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R; Andrews & Bonta, 1995); HCR-20 (Webster, Eaves, Douglas, & Wintrup, 1995); Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG; Harris, Rice, & Quinsey, 1993); Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form (LCSF; Walters, White, & Denney, 1991)]. Evaluation of the instruments will be accomplished through examining dynamic and static contributors to risk, in addition to assessing high risk situations. Based on research involving meta-analysis and direct comparisons, guidelines for choosing and integrating various risk prediction instruments will be covered. The contribution of these risk instruments to issues such as family violence and special populations such as mentally disordered offenders and sex offenders will be discussed. In addition, how treatment responsivity relates to risk will be covered. A number of previously published self-report psychological tests used in the assessment of offenders will be reviewed giving particular attention as to how the interpretation may be applied to the overall assessment and management of offenders, particularly violent offenders. The assessment procedure and recommended report content areas will be reviewed in detail with attention given to the various ways of presenting risk conclusions.

- 1) to identify the scientific approaches that underpin criminal and violent risk assessment.
- 2) to construct the risk assessment report according to the various approaches, accounting for the etiology of criminal behavior, modifying and managing risk.
- 3) to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of the most recent published risk assessment instruments (basic training in risk instruments is assumed).
- 4) to provide guidelines for choosing the most appropriate risk assessment instruments.
- 5) to integrate various risk prediction instruments into making risk prediction statements.
- 6) to determine the role of self-report instruments in risk management and assessment.
- 7) to derive individual judgements from the research and to communicate (group vs. individual) representations of risk in the report.

Note: For those members who cannot make the workshop at CPA and for our US readership a similar workshop is being offered during APA in Chicago, August 2002. The APA workshop will offer 7 Continuing Education Credits to participants.

Section Elections

As always the section will elect the new executive at this year's annual Section Business Meeting (SBM) in Vancouver.

The current executive is listed on the front page of this newsletter.

One proposed change to the executive is the introduction of the position of Director-at-Large (x2). This change will be voted on at the SBM.

Also, our esteemed President, David Nussbaum is stepping down and while he cannot be replaced the position he held needs to be filled.

In the recent 'Call for Contributions', section members were given the opportunity to signal their intention with respect to seeking a position on the section executive. Below you will find the list of interested parties received at press time.

<u>Position</u>	<u>Declared Interest</u>
President	Daryl Kroner, Ph.D.
Secretary/Treasurer	Karl Hanson, Ph.D.
Editor of Crime Scene	Jeremy Mills, Ph.D.
Director at Large (2 positions)	Stephen Wormith, Ph.D. Doug Boer, Ph.D. Carson Smiley, Ph.D.
Student Rep	?

WOW! We may have a race for the positions of Director at Large. This is a first in recent (and not so recent) memory for our section. A note to the candidates - there is no preset spending limits for campaigns and no regulations about "soft" campaign financing monies.

So far there is no declared interest for the Student Rep. If you know of a student who would be an asset please encourage them to submitted their name. The position of Past President is an un-elected position that goes to our past president David Nussbaum.

Also note that nominations are taken from the floor of the SBM as usual so there is still lots of time if you choose to get involved.

See You In Vancouver!