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Risk Assessment (RA)

- **Risk** = for serious delinquent offending or violence

- **Brief Risk Assessment**: Instrument developed to help answer the question: “Is this youth at relatively low or relatively high risk for reoffending or engaging in violent behavior?”

- **Comprehensive Risk Assessment**: also identify what is most likely to be driving the youth’s risk for reoffending
  - “criminogenic needs”
Meaning of ‘Risk’

- **Low risk:**
  - Have few relevant risk factors present, or
  - Require minimal or no intervention in order to decrease likelihood of reoffending

- **High risk:**
  - Higher likelihood than their peers of engaging in continued offending or violence
  - Has many risk factors associated with their delinquency
  - Require more intensive intervention in order to decrease likelihood of reoffending

- **Moderate risk:**
  - Who are neither high nor low risk as described above
Risk Assessment Comes in Different Forms

- Different purposes and different decision-points where it is used.....
  - Diversion eligibility
  - Appropriateness for Pre-trial detention
  - Dispositional and case planning/treatment needs
  - Release/re-entry

- Actuarial (formuliac) vs. Structured Professional Judgment
- “Off-the-shelf” vs. “home-grown”
Risk Factors

- A **risk factor** is anything that increases the probability that a person will cause harm to others or will re-offend.
  - **Static risk factors** – do not change
  - **Dynamic risk factors** (similar to criminogenic *needs*) – changeable, targets for services & intervention. Enable reassessment

- A **protective factor** - something that decreases the potential harmful effect of a risk factor - *buffer*
SAVRY: Evidence-Based Risk Assessment
Structured Professional Judgment

24 Risk Items
- 10 Static
- 14 Dynamic

+ 6 Protective Items

Items rated a on 3-pt scale using interview + all available info
YLS/CMI: Evidence-Based Risk/Needs Assessment

42 Risk Items
8 Domains
- Family
- Attitude/orientation

+ Strengths

Items rated present/absent using interview
+ all available info
PART I:
WHY USE RISK ASSESSMENT IN JUVENILE JUSTICE?
Confinement is Expensive

Justice Policy Institute (2014)

- Direct costs of confinement in the US per youth per year = up to $148,767
- Total costs of youth confinement in US per year = $8 to $21bil
- Confinement has diminishing returns after 6 months
  (MacArthur, Pathways to Desistance Study)
Cost of Evidence-Based Services Is Less: Benefits Per Dollar Invested

- For every $1.00 spent on the following services, you save (Aos, 2001):
  - Functional Family Therapy: $28.34
  - Multisystemic Family Therapy: $28.81
  - Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care: $43.70
  - Adolescent Diversion Project: $24.92
  - Juvenile Boot Camps: $0.81
  - Scared Straight: -$477.75 (NET LOSS)
Research Evidence

There is emerging consensus on characteristics of effective programming for young offenders:

- Punitive sanctions do not have a significant effect on re-offending (Gatti et al., 2009) when we implement treatment as usual.

- Severity of a youth’s offense is not a strong indicator of the future pattern of offending (Mulvey et al., 2010). But tested static and dynamic risk factors for offending are (Lipsey & Derzon, 1998 ---and many others)
Most low-risk youth are unlikely to re-offend even if there is no intervention (Lipsey, 2009). But mixing them with high risk youth can make them worse.

When services are matched to youth’s level of risk and what might be driving their delinquency (criminogenic needs), the lower the chance of offending.

GOAL: Individualized case planning
Recommendations For Reform & Preventing Youth Reoffending

National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences (2013). 
*Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach*

- Use structured risk and need assessment instruments to identify low-risk youths who can be handled less formally in community-based settings, to match youths with specialized treatment, and to target more intensive and expensive interventions toward high-risk youths.
Recommendations For Reducing Youth Reoffending

**Council of State Government** (Seigle et al., 2014). Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System

- Principle 1: Base supervision, service, and resource-allocation decisions on validated risk and needs assessments
PART II: WHAT IS RISK-NEED-RESPONSIVITY?
Effective and individualized case management requires valid assessment & RNR principles

- **Risk** – Match the intensity of the intervention with one’s level of risk for re-offending

- **Need** – Target dynamic or changeable risk factors (aka criminogenic needs)

- **Responsivity** – Match the mode & strategies of services with the individual
Starts With Valid Identification: Risk Assessment As Early As Possible

Pre-Disposition

Pre-Adjudication
Risk Assessment

Minor Sanction

Probation

Correctional Placement

Post-Disposition

Case planning
Family Services
Substance Abuse Treatment
Cognitive-Behavioral therapy
Life Skills
Nothing Changes Without Effective Implementation of RA

- Stakeholder Buy-In
- Policy & Case Plan Changes
- Staff Training in Assessment & RNR
- On-going reassessment & monitoring
Risk Assessment in Juvenile Justice: Guidebook to Implementation

8 Steps to Implementation

Vincent, Guy, & Grisso (2012)
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Risk Principle In Disposition Decisions: Implementation Post-Adjudication/Pre-Disposition (Vincent, Guy, et al., 2012)

Pre-SAVRY (n=205)

Post-SAVRY (n=205)

OR = 2.69

OR = .39

OR = .39
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A few slides containing unpublished data were removed prior to dissemination
Risk Principle in Placement Decisions (ave 10 mths probation) (Vincent, Guy, et al., 2012)

- **High risk** – 60% placed
- **Low risk** - 22% placed

**Any placement during study**
- Pre-SAVRY (n=205) OR = 0.56
- Post-SAVRY (n=205) OR = 0.37

**Placed immediately after disposition**
- Moderate risk – 36% placed
Risk Principle in Probation Supervision
(Vincent, Guy et al., 2012)
Risk Principle in Service Allocation
(Vincent, Guy, et al., 2012)

$p < .01$
Impact of RNA will depend on the quality and nature of implementation and on some characteristics of the site.

Disposition
- Significant shift to less severe dispositions in 4 sites
- More severe in 1 site but not a result of RA tool
- The shift will depend on the decision-point where the RA is implemented
Summary Across 6 Sites

- **Placements**
  - The change depends on the jurisdictions current rate of placement
    - High placement rates ($\geq 40\%$) decreases
    - Low placement rates ($\leq 15\%$) increase
    - Moderate placement rates (20%) no change

- **Probation supervision**
  - Significant shifts to lower levels of supervision in all sites that implemented the policy and completed RA before disposition
Summary Across 6 Sites

- **Service Referrals**
  - Significant shift in service allocation by risk in most sites
  - Again, will depend on quality of implementation and staff training

- **Recidivism (new petitions & adjudications)**
  - Will likely depend on current recidivism rates
  - One site cut new petitions and adjudications in half
  - No change in all other sites
NEED PRINCIPLE IN ACTION
Primary Criminogenic Need Areas (aka Criminogenic Risk)

- The “Big 8”
  - Criminal history
  - Family/Poor Parental Monitoring
  - Pro-criminal attitudes
  - Behavioral problems/personality traits
  - Negative or Deviant Peers
  - Substance Abuse
  - Education/Employment
  - Leisure/structured activities
Using Risk Assessment to Match Services With Needs: Risk Reduction

(Vieira et al., 2009)

Match based on # of services given in response to a youth’s criminogenic needs
Service-to-Need Match & Reoffending

Peterson-Badali, Skilling, Haqanee (2014)
Service-to-Need Match (YLS/CMI)

% of Youth With Need That Actually Received a Service (n = 148)

Peterson-Badali, Skilling, Haqanee (2014)
## Implementing Need Principle

### Service Matrix (partial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminogenic Need Areas</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Substance Abuse</th>
<th>Family/Parenting</th>
<th>Disruptive Beh/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Support family to monitor youth</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Outpatient Individual counseling</td>
<td>Strengthening families Active parenting</td>
<td>Courage2Change Thinking for a Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Intensive outpatient Inpatient if needed</td>
<td>FFT MST (if other risk factors too) Therapeutic foster care if serious</td>
<td>CBT ART, MRT MST Possible residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protective Factors – Buffer Risk

- Increasing protective factors can also be an effective means of decreasing risk – particularly when services for crim needs are limited

- Focus on the positives/strengths in addition to treating the risks
  - Pro-social activities
  - Attachment to school
  - Attachment to pro-social adults
  - Positive social support
Recidivator’s vs. Non-recidivator’s Mean SAVRY Protective Factor Scores

(Vincent, Guy et al., 2012)

![Bar graph showing the comparison of SAVRY Protective Factor Scores for recidivator's and non-recidivator's in terms of violent and non-violent offenses. The p-values are p = .005, p = .02, and p = .03 for Violent, Non-Violent, and Violation, respectively.](image-url)
RESPONSIVITY PRINCIPLE: WHAT ABOUT BEHAVIORAL HEALTH?
What About Mental Health?

- Among adults - criminogenic risk factors account for more of the variability in reoffending than mental health factors (Silver et al., 2008), and

- Treatment of criminogenic risk factors has a larger impact on reoffending than mental health-related treatments (Skeem et al., 2011).
Among youth - presence of a behavioral health problem appears to be related to higher levels of criminogenic risk (Schubert et al., 2011; Guebert & Olver, 2014).

BUT – it depends on the ‘behavioral health’ problem. These increase the likelihood of other criminogenic needs being present:

- Conduct Disorder
- ADHD
- Disruptive behavior disorders in general
- Comorbidity – definitely
- Substance abuse problems - definitely
CONCLUSIONS
Take Home Messages

- Risk assessment + RNR can be used to conserve resources and improve outcomes for youth while still protecting public safety
  - Impact will vary based on the quality of implementation & site characteristics

- Implement the risk principle in all areas of case management

- Implement the need principle while also considering protective factors and strengths (may help buffer lack of RNR-related services)
Take Home Messages

- Presence of some mental health problems and serious substance abuse problems greatly elevate the likelihood of having other criminogenic needs.

- Try not to treat mental/behavioral health in isolation w/o treating the risks.

- **Caveat:** Quality implementation, quality assurance and buy-in from stakeholders is crucial for success.
  - **Track your data**