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The Risk Management System (RMS) is a risk analysis system designed for corrections professionals by corrections professionals. It takes information about an offender typically collected by a correctional system and applies an advanced mathematical approach called example-based modeling (EBM). RMS uses Example-based Modeling (EBM) to generate a risk estimate for a given offender based upon the pattern of risk factors the offender possesses. RMS’s ability to use patterns to derive risk estimates for an offender give it a significant advantage over traditionally constructed risk tools. You will begin to appreciate the advantage as you read this manual and use the RMS tool.

This manual is meant to guide the user in using the RMS interface, to help users develop an appreciation of how to use the information that RMS provides, and to better understand general risk assessment issues. To that end, we appreciate your interest in RMS and welcome you to the RMS user community.

An adage from psychology

If you want to anticipate someone’s response to a situation, examine what that person did, under similar circumstances, in the past. This sounds good in theory, but unfortunately, this only works if you can observe that person several times in similar circumstances to get a baseline of what they might do. In the world of corrections we must attempt to create a baseline of what an offender might do, without the luxury of being able to let them out unhindered to establish a good baseline from which to make future decisions. What to do?

Classical risk assessment

Presently, most risk assessment tools have altered the adage to read: If you want to anticipate what an offender will do in a future situation, compare what a bunch of other offenders with a similar risk score have done in the past. This approach has served to enhance decision-making over the years by better standardizing and objectifying the risk assessment process but it has the
basic statistical limitation of treating everyone with similar scores in a similar fashion without consideration of the underlying risk factors generating a score for a given offender.

The result of using scores in this fashion is to over-classify the risk for some offenders, while simultaneously under-classifying the risk for other offenders. This happens because not all pathways to a particular score will carry the same level of predictive accuracy. Andrews (1989), in the context of juvenile assessment stated, “The classic research is also near unanimous in suggesting that there are several routes through which young people become at risk for delinquency. Thus, producing a list of risk factors does not suggest that any particular risk factor is always present, or that some factors not included in the lists may be very important to some people under some circumstances.” Andrew’s insight provides an important key to the development of advanced risk assessment tools in general—paying attention to the pattern of risk factors can enhance future tools.

Risk tools using scores as described above, essentially distill an “on-the-average” estimation as to the likelihood of correctly classifying an offender as a recidivist or a non-recidivist for a given score. But suppose you could remove pathways to a particular score that are less associated with recidivism so that they wouldn’t water down the real estimation for a given offender? To better understand this concept, we need to revise our adage one more time.

RMS assessment

To begin to understand RMS we must revise the adage to read: If you want to anticipate what someone will do in a future situation, examine what ten other people with similar risk factor patterns have done in the past under similar circumstances. Zamble and Quinsey (1998) examined many of the static and dynamic risk factors associated with recidivism. While recognizing the difficulty in doing so, their work urges professionals to view recidivism as a “process” that should examine the risk factors in the context of each other. We understand that a risk factor pattern is but a limited picture for any given offender, but it is a picture none-the-less, and it is substantially more than a simple additive risk score.

RMS uses an advanced set of statistical techniques that were historically unavailable. RMS builds a risk simulation based upon the patterns of similar offenders to represent the offender being assessed. In order to build these models, we have collected exemplars (really good examples of what we are looking to model) of offenders exhibiting the range of behaviors we are trying to an-
ticipate (recidivism, capacity for violence, and intervention effects). These exemplars form the basis for the library of patterns RMS uses to create risk/needs models for new offenders. We mathematically select our comparable offenders based upon the similarity of risk factor patterns to the risk factor pattern of our target offender. The EBM technology allows us to use time tested variables that have been utilized in a variety of settings and jurisdictions to generate a much more accurate classification model for a given offender.

**How does RMS provide greater accuracy?**

Many readers have been to a risk assessment seminar or training class. Invariably, someone in the session will ask, “What does the risk score mean if an offender’s score falls in the middle?” This is very good question because it drives to the heart of an important issue. What is explained by the trainer is often misunderstood by the listener. The listener typically interprets what is said as meaning that an offender with a score falling in the middle range presents a “medium risk.” This conclusion is based upon the mathematical fact that the offender’s score happens to lie between the lowest possible score and the highest possible score on the risk tool. But let’s think this through...

Most risk assessment tools are comprised of a list of risk factors that are related to a behavior of interest (e.g. recidivism). Put another way, these risk factors are related to one of two categories: offenders who do recidivate and offenders who do not recidivate—there is no category of “sort-of recidivate.” The range of scores from the lowest to highest possible score help us to select a point on the continuum of scores that will chop that continuum into two pieces. The piece with the lowest scores typically represents the non-recidivists, whereas the other piece with the highest scores represents the recidivists. Although we could cut the continuum at any score, the best cut score attempts to classify the most offenders correctly as recidivists or non-recidivists. Clear (1988) provides an excellent primer on this issue. Unfortunately, people who use risk tools have inadvertently inserted a subtle but important misunderstanding.

We often hear people talk about the norm table of a risk tool. The meaning of a norm table is straightforward, it tells you how an offender’s score falls on a continuum from the lowest possible score to the highest possible score in relation to any other offender’s score. Although norm tables come in different flavors, most people are familiar with the term “cumulative percentage.” This is the statistic that provides information about the running total of how many people have at least some level of score. The obvious assumption is that as scores increase so does the likeli-
hood of recidivism. Unfortunately a norm table reporting cumulative percentage information is not reporting actual outcome information. It simply tells you how one offender’s score falls in comparison to some other offender’s score. To make norm tables more useful, a second piece of information called “baserate” is often overlaid on top of a norm table that purports to give an estimate as to an offender’s “likelihood of recidivism.” The base rate is simply the proportion of recidivists to nonrecidivists for a given score or band.

“Likelihood of recidivism” information is sometimes created by grouping scores into several bands: the lowest band of scores is described as low-risk; the middle band of scores are described as medium-risk; and the highest band of scores are described as high-risk. In reality, the “likelihood-of-recidivism” statistic associated with these bands is simply the number of recidivists v.s. the number of non-recidivists falling into the band, it does not represent the risk propensity of a given offender.

Suppose a risk band reportedly has a “50% chance of recidivism.” As stated above, this tells you nothing about any particular offender. For illustration, suppose instead of a band, we have a bag that reports a “50%” chance or recidivism. The contents of the bag are comprised of 50 recidivists and 50 non-recidivists. Imagine being blindfolded and then asked to reach into the bag and pull out your offender. Obviously this isn’t going to happen, because your offender was never part of the group that generated the risk estimate. As a result, it’s statistically clear as a bell that the 50% is not directly tied to your offender and does not reflect a behavioral recidivism propensity. So what is the risk score tied to a risk band actually doing? It’s telling you the likelihood of correctly classifying an offender as either a recidivist or a non-recidivist based upon their score or band. Hopefully, as scores increase, the proportion of recidivists increases which in turn increases your chance of pulling a recidivist out of the bag. In this illustration the bag had a 50% chance of giving you a correct classification of a recidivist and a 50% chance of correctly classifying a nonrecidivist. Notice, there is no medium risk—only recidivist and non-recidivist.

When risk scores are put in this light you can probably see that many of the risk tools you are familiar with are actually attempting to tackle classification problems. Unfortunately, users often misunderstand the information the designers of the tools had intended to provide. Anytime the outcome of interest is an either/or scenario (e.g. recidivist or non-recidivist; violent or not violent), the risk tool is telling you the likelihood of correctly classifying someone as belonging to one group or the other group. In essence, the risk tool is telling you the likelihood of making a
correct decision. Any tool constructed in this fashion with bands purporting to provide a “chance of recidivism” in the neighborhood of “X”% must be interpreted in the following way: you have an “X”% chance of correctly identifying your offender as belonging to one of two groups: a group comprised of 100% recidivists or a group 100% comprised of nonrecidivists. The most obvious implication for supervision is half of the people in a “middle risk” band will recidivate. Unfortunately, we have no way of knowing which offenders are the recidivists. What we do know is that offenders falling into this band will consume the greatest amount of your supervision resources. This is understood when you realize that half of the offenders in this band are estimated to be 100% genuine nonrecidivists and will be assigned exactly the same resources as the future recidivists. There is no middle risk offender.

In summary, a risk score from a tool like the ones described above help us take a slice of offenders whom we have outcome information to determine the proportion of recidivists vs non-recidivists at a score level similar to our target offender. This information provides us with an estimate as to our chance of correctly classifying an offender as a recidivist or non-recidivist. Notice the word estimate. Researchers use the word estimate to emphasize that although they have a degree of confidence in the data associated with their norm tables and the outcome data associated with the norm table, researchers know that data samples can vary to some degree.

The missing piece to local norms

Local norms are considered to be very valuable in most correctional systems. But, local norms are valuable only to the extent that you can make a compelling case that the population you intend on using a risk tool on is fundamentally different from the tool’s development sample. Local norms are often premised upon the notion that OUR offenders get their scores differently than YOUR offenders AND/OR the proportion of recidivists vs. non-recidivists will be different for a given score or range of scores. Thus, local norms are actually an attempt to compensate for a regional bias in the way offenders get their scores. As we have seen above, simply knowing an offender’s score doesn’t mean that you know the likelihood of correctly classifying the offender as a potential recidivist or non-recidivist.

Some researchers might argue that you can simply “transport” the outcome data from a development sample to your new local norms with statistics. But this misses a significant point: the decision to pursue local norms argues that your population’s scores are fundamentally different than the development sample’s scores. Given this fundamental difference what degree of confi-
dence can you have in outcome data developed on a fundamentally different sample of offenders? The answer is simple, you don’t know, at least not until you have outcome data from which to validate your local norms. Validation is the missing piece to most local norms and validation takes time.

Local norms and RMS

Local norms are essentially an “on-the-average” model that has been tweaked for a particular region. The distribution of possible scores is calibrated to the region AND new baserate data is paired with the scores. Local norms can help to increase classification accuracy because they are more likely to capture regional idiosyncratic pathways leading to recidivism. Regardless, even with local norms you are still just comparing scores.

A brief digression is in order. Before it is assumed that your region requires local norms some time should be spent assessing if offender behavior is different in your region or whether it is your region’s ability to detect criminal behavior. If it is the former, local norms may be warranted, but if it is the latter, adjusting your norms to reflect your official detection rate as opposed to detecting actual criminal behavior will only serve to decrease your ability to protect the community. Simply because a tool is consistent with your incarceration rate doesn’t mean it is consistent with your crime rate.

A second issue with local norms is that not all offender patterns are equally useful when trying to classify any particular target offender. It is very likely that some offender’s data patterns are very different from your target offender’s patterns, yet these offenders are still incorporated into the traditional norm table and these offenders will influence the base rate of your outcome variable. This will affect your ability to correctly classify your target offender.

RMS directly addresses what local norms are attempting to accomplish: increase the likelihood that offenders who have similar risk factors are used to model what that offender might do upon release to the community. This is accomplished because RMS was constructed with a pattern matching paradigm at its core.

Summary

RMS was developed from the ground up to tackle classification problems. To do this, RMS incorporates example-based modeling algorithms. EBM identifies historical offenders most similar
to an offender’s risk factor pattern for whom we have behavioral outcomes and builds a modeled simulation of what might be expected for a given risk factor pattern (i.e. whether the pattern is most associated with a recidivist or a nonrecidivist). By incorporating EBM, RMS automatically creates a local model based on the actual risk factors instead of geographic location, or simple summed scores.
Overview

The purpose of rating the form is to capture a data pattern for a given offender that can be used to find other similar offenders from which to construct a statistical model. There will be times when scoring an item may be difficult. In such cases use these guide lines:

1. Time frames are meant to narrow down how an offender has functioned most recently in a relatively unrestricted environment. Over the course of 12 months, generally how has the offender behaved.

2. Violence items may included patterns of violence even though they have not been convicted. For example, confirmed and repeated domestic violence that has not been prosecuted, may be included in rating violence items.

Although the wording of specific items varies from risk tool to risk tool, the general constructs being measured can often be placed in one or more of the following areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic/Vocation</th>
<th>Companions</th>
<th>Mental Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>Medical Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Sexual Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital/Family</td>
<td>Drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RMS has grouped the constructs above into four categories: Needs; Risk; Mental Health; and Other-External.

Needs Section

This section focuses on the intervention needs an offender presents. The dynamic nature of these variables combined with similarity-based modeling allow the rater to examine the potential effects of a target intervention on the offender’s recidivism and violence risk estimates. The steps require to conduct these simulations are contained in the RMS user’s manual.
Risk Section

This section attempts to assess the willingness of an offender to violate community standards. The information in this section is relatively static, as defined by specific time frames for some variables. However, some variables are permanent once an offender has been found to have that quality.

Mental Health Section

This section examines aspects of mental health that affect the stability of the offender. Rating these risk factors can sometimes lead to referring an offender for clinical evaluation.

Other-External Section

This section is intended to capture a sketch of the external resources and stressors that may affect an offender’s ability to be successful while on community supervision. Financial resources, supervision structure, and previous behavior on supervision comprise the bulk of these items.
Scoring: Needs Section

Item 1: Offender ID (DOC number or PACTS number)

Item 2: Offender Name (this field is optional)

Item 3: Offender’s Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy)

Item 4: Sex

1. Male
2. Female

Item 5: Type of Admission (incarceration)

1. Pending Mandatory Release Revocation Hearing
2. Pending Parole Revocation Hearing
3. Pending Probation Hearing
4. Alternative to Mandatory Revocation
5. Alternative to Parole Revocation
6. Alternative to Probation Revocation
7. New Sentence, Mandatory Release Violator
8. New Sentence Not a Violator - New offender on TSR
9. New Sentence Parole Violator - TSR revoked; commits new crime
10. New Sentence Probation Violator - Offender on probation and commits new crime
11. No New Sentence, Early Release Violator
12. No New Sentence, Mandatory Release Violator
13. No New Sentence, Parole Violator - TSR revoked for technical violations
14. No New Sentence, Probation Violator - Probation revoked for technical violations
15. Returned without a new violation

16. Probation or Parole Placement: Pre-trial offenders, Probation, Supervised Release or Parole Placement (note: All non-incarcerated offenders/offenders should be placed in this category).

17. Erroneous admission (offender should not have been incarcerated)

- Community supervision or community treatment providers must score the type of admission to incarceration; if not incarcerated select Temporary Probation Or Parole Placement (selection 16).

**Item 6: Admission Date for current incarceration or Date Supervision Began**

Enter actual date of incarceration or date supervision begins (mm/dd/yyyy).

- If the offender has not been incarcerated, enter the date the offender is expected to be placed on (or actually began) community supervision. If the offender was previously revoked, enter incarceration date for original offense.

**Item 7: Institutional or Supervision Security Level at time of release**

1. Maximum Custody. Requires very close monitoring of offender conduct, behavior, and activities (USP).

2. Medium Custody. Requires moderate monitoring of offender conduct, behavior, and activities (within a custodial setting - FCI).

3. Medium-out. Custody requires moderate monitoring of offender conduct, behavior and activities inside the institution and permits placement outside the confines of an institution under supervision.

4. Minimum-CRC. Offenders are allowed temporary unsupervised release to the community (e.g. work release or community based treatment - RRC and FPC).

5. Minimum. Supervision requires general monitoring of offender conduct, behavior and activities and permits placement of the offender in the community (FDC).


**Item 8: Governing offense #1 (longest governing sentence structure)**
This area should reflect the offense that is currently governing/ or may govern a offender or offender’s supervision or incarceration. The purpose of this item is to capture the actual nature of the behavior committed or alleged to have been committed.

Note: Actual behavior might be obscured by charging practices or plea bargaining. Capture the actual nature of the behavior (e.g. behavior was sexual assault, but convicted of battery should be rated as sexual assault).

**Item 9: Governing offense #2 (second longest governing sentence structure)**

This area should reflect the second offense that is governing/ or may govern a offender or offender’s supervision or incarceration. The purpose of this item is to capture the actual nature of the behavior committed or alleged to have been committed.

Note: Actual behavior might be obscured by charging practices or plea bargaining. Capture the actual nature of the behavior (e.g. behavior was sexual assault, but convicted of battery should be rated as sexual assault).

**Item 10: Mandatory Release Date**

Some correctional systems must deal with sentencing paradigms that restrict when an offender can be released to the community. The Mandatory Release Date should be understood to mean the longest an offender can be held in an incarcerated status. If this date is not applicable to your scoring situation, put the same date you intend to use in Item 11.

**Item 11: Actual or Expected Release Date to Community**

Enter the actual or expected date an offender will be placed into community supervision.

- If the offender has been incarcerated, enter the date the offender is expected to be placed on (or actually began) community supervision.

**Item 12: Assessment Notes**

Enter a brief description as to why you are conducting the evaluation. For example, a “quarterly update”.

If you are completing a “What-if,” enter the item(s) you are planning to change.
**Item 13: Academic/Vocational Need**

1. Has a GED, high school diploma, or some college and has the ability to function independently. Vocational training and academic needs are not problems.

2. Adequate vocational or pre-vocational skills with occasional problems- but satisfactory functioning. Pattern or history of sporadic/frequent job changes, under-employment, or short periods of unemployment.

3. Low educational or vocational skill level; may have high school diploma or GED but has difficulty reading or writing. Employment history of low paying or short term employment or long periods between jobs, not eligible for unemployment. Has trouble filling out a job application. Has the ability to do better.

4. Minimal or no skills. May be developmentally delayed or have required special education classes. Has learning disability, or is unable to read, write, or do simple math. Has few or no vocational skills and/or employment history. Language barrier may exist.

**Item 14: Employment**

1. Satisfactory. Offender likes the job. Earns more than $1.00 above minimum wage. Probation Officer and offender assessment that pay is satisfactory. Offender has been in job more than one year. Has appropriate educational or vocational skills for the job. (if satisfactory, risk employment question (item 14) must be 60% or Not Applicable).

2. Secure. Offender has opportunity in current job for upward advancement to at least $1.00 above minimum wage. Or, offender is supported by others (e.g., offender is a student, homemaker), or offender is retired, or offender is permanently disabled [if this category is selected, risk employment question (item 14) must be 60% or Not Applicable].

3. Unemployed Or Underemployed. Offender is not working but desires to work and has abilities to find stable employment. Or, offender wants to advance in current job, but job has no advancement potential.

4. Unemployable (for any reason). Large gap(s) in periods of employment. Language ability interferes with work. Unstable self employment.

- County/state/federal assistance recipients must be placed in either #3 or #4.
**Item 15: Financial Management**

1. Long-standing pattern of self-sufficiency. Adequate resources plus sound financial management for an extended period of time. Must not ever have filed for bankruptcy. Strong financial stability.


3. Situational or minor difficulties. Positive or solid history, but has situational difficulties such as temporary lay off, high medical bills, current or recent financial stress. Tenuous financial stability.


**Item 16: Marital/ Family Relations**

1. Relationships and support exceptionally strong. Current marriage or relationship intact. No history of separation. Positive family history. No prior family criminal history. Good attitude toward spouse / significant other/ parent(s).

2. No adverse relationships with spouse, significant other, or parents. Getting along. No existing problems.

3. Some problems in interpersonal relationships (with spouse, significant other, or parents) with occasional negative results. Offender recognizes a problem and is taking steps to correct it.

4. Associations and relationships almost completely negative. Major disruption. e.g. children removed, separated or divorced in past 2 years, history of bad marriages, sexual or domestic abuse, Social Service intervention and involvement).

- Note: Item applies to immediate family as well as family of origin.
**Item 17: Companions**

1. Companions provide exceptional support and are a positive influence.
2. Offender does not have adverse relationships with companions, but lacks positive ones.
3. Offender’s association with companions results in occasional negative activities (e.g., co-defendant for current offense). Offender has some friends with prior records. Offender has trouble establishing meaningful relationships.

- May include family members.

**Item 18: Emotional Stability**

1. Exceptionally well adjusted; accepts responsibility for actions. If this category is used, there must be no attitude, alcohol, or drug problems in either the risk section or needs section.
2. Adequate emotional stability with no symptoms of problems (if this category is used, there must be no attitude, alcohol, or drug problems in either the risk section or needs section).
3. Marginal emotional stability. Symptoms limit, but do not prohibit adequate functioning. Mild symptoms of depression, anxiety, or acting out (suicidal, homicidal, psychotic); occasional alcohol or drug abuse. Neurotic, character disorder, prior inpatient or residential treatment.
4. Emotionally unstable. Symptoms prohibit adequate functioning. Severe depression, anxiety, or acting out (suicidal, homicidal, psychotic) Normally requires clinical substantiation. Current inpatient or residential program. Frequent abuse of alcohol or drugs.

- Attitude /Chemical Abuse problems identified in the risk section may be reflected in this item.
**Item 19: Alcohol Usage**

1. No alcohol abuse, no interference with functioning. This category is not to be used if alcohol was involved in the current offense, or if the offender admits or is diagnosed as alcoholic.

2. Occasional abuse; some disruption of functioning. Gets “drunk” by own definition two or more times a month. Some dysfunction when drinking with family, work, social, etc. History of alcohol abuse or treatment, but no current abuse. Offenders with one Driving while Under the Influence convictions.

3. Frequent abuse; serious disruption; needs treatment. One or more of the following: physical or psychological withdrawal symptoms if drinking stops; symptoms of alcoholism—black outs, passing out, memory lapses; serious work or family related problems stemming from alcohol use. Has two or more Driving while Under the Influence convictions.

**Item 20: Other Drug Usage**

1. No interference with functioning. Offenders who have experimented once or twice but have not moved onto abuse may be scored in this category. Appropriate use of prescription medication. If marijuana was previously used, but has not been used within the past year, no interference with functioning may be checked.

2. Occasional abuse; some disruption of functioning as a result of drug use. Offenders who use marijuana or have been convicted of its possession OR placed under probation under a non-conviction statute. Offenders who have not abused drugs on a regular basis. History of abuse or treatment, but none currently.

3. Frequent substance abuse; serious disruption; needs treatment. Offenders who are now using any drug, exclude marijuana unless causing daily dysfunction, or have used drugs in the past on a regular basis. Abuse of prescription drugs; Any conviction for delivery or possession with intent to deliver. Presently in inpatient or outpatient drug program.
**Item 21: Mental Ability**

1. Able to function independently. Appears to be of average intelligence. Can comprehend what is being said in normal conversation. Can read and comprehend monthly reporting forms; rules of probation/parole. Offender may have a learning disability but it doesn’t interfere with functioning. Fully functional mental ability.

2. Some need for assistance; potential for adequate adjustment; mild retardation. Has difficulty in understanding written or verbal communication. Has difficulty completing monthly reporting forms without assistance. Moderate mental ability.

3. Severe need for assistance. Deficiencies severely limit independent functioning; moderate retardation. Low mental ability.

**Item 22: Physical Health**

1. Sound physical health; seldom ill (do not use this score if there is a history of alcohol or drug use). No physical health problems.

2. Physical condition or disability interferes with functioning on a recurring basis. Pregnant; ongoing medical problem, e.g. diabetes, high blood pressure, arthritis, heart disease. Occasional alcohol or other drug abuse. Moderate physical health problems.

3. Serious disability or chronic illness. Frequent alcohol or other drug abuse. Physical disability that is both chronic AND incapacitating. Serious or severe physical health problems.

- Chemical abuse problems on the risk scale items may affect how this item is scored.
**Item 23: Sexual Behavior**

1. No apparent dysfunction. No current or historical sexual problems. Functional homosexual or heterosexual behavior. Do not use this rating if convicted of any sex related offense. No sexual behavioral problems.

2. Real or perceived or situational or minor problems. History of, or current involvement in, non-assaultive sexual behavior which is prohibited by law. Dysfunctional sexual behavior (e.g. transvestite). Moderate sexual behavioral problems.

3. Real or perceived chronic or severe problems. History of, or current sexually assaultive behavior (either convicted OR admitted). Offender was victim of sexual assault AND currently involved in treatment. Serious or severe sexual behavioral problems.

• Raters sometimes find this item to be difficult to score, but it has been found to be useful in modeling risk.

**Item 24: Officer’s impression of Offender needs**

1. Minimum - no needs

2. Low - minor needs

3. Medium - moderate needs

4. Maximum - major needs

• Officers should consider the severity, the number, the anticipated time required for direct officer involvement, and the offender’s motivation to change when scoring this item.
Scoring: Risk Section

Item 25: Number of Address Changes

1. None - none of the criteria listed below.

2. One - any one of the criteria listed below.

3. Two or more of the criteria listed below.

- An address change is defined as one of the following in the past 12 months: Moving belongings from one residence to another; a period of incarceration for any reason; spending 25% or more nights away from permanent residence; half-way house or residential placement. Do not include: over-the-road trucking; active military; college students; or moves associated with natural disasters.

Item 26: Percent time Employed in last 12 months

1. 60+%

2. 40%-59%

3. under 40% (This category includes all offenders receiving AFDC or other Public Assistance, e.g. welfare.)

4. Not Applicable: includes totally and permanently disabled (receiving SSI/SSDI), retired, homemaker, student, or offenders supported by others.

- Federal, State, or County financial recipients (i.e. welfare) must be placed in category 3. For offenders being released to the community, use the 12 months prior to incarceration. This item captures information about an offender’s willingness and capacity to work. If the person has been incarcerated for more than 1 year - use the 12 month period prior to the incarceration. If the offender has not been incarcerated, use the past 12 months.
Item 27: Attitude

1. Motivated to change; receptive to assistance. Past behavior supports positive attitude (e.g. goes to job interviews, registers for school, parolees completed programs in the institution). Accepts responsibility for offense; accepts reasonableness of supervision rules. Remorse for victim. Willing to change. Willingly complies with supervision requirements.

2. Dependent or unwilling to accept responsibility. Does not accept reasonableness of supervision rules; denies need for help; fails to acknowledge obvious problems; appears sophisticated but presents self as helpless (i.e. everyone is picking on me). Reluctantly complies with supervision requirements.

3. Rationalizes behavior; negative; not motivated to change. Refuses to follow intent of officer’s instructions (e.g. sporadically reports for urine specimen to minimize possible detection, when told to report regularly). Does not comply with supervision requirements.

Item 28: Age at First Adult Conviction or Juvenile adjudication

1. 24+ years old

2. 20-23 years of age

3. 19 or younger

- Juvenile adjudication is a formal finding of delinquency by a judge. Informal dispositions are not adjudications.

- Adult convictions also include: diversionary dispositions; expunged cases; municipal ordinance violations that could be criminal offenses. Do not include routine traffic infractions.

Item 29: Number of Prior periods of Adult or Juvenile Supervision (Probation, Supervision Release/Parole)

1. None

2. One or more

- Include any period of supervision as a result of an adjudication or the definition of conviction included in Item 18. Exclude: successful deferred prosecution arrangements; juvenile “status offenses” and informal juvenile dispositions.
Item 30: Number of Prior Probation/Supervised Release/Parole Revocations (Adult or Juvenile)

1. None
2. One or more
   - Count only revocations of formal supervision as defined in Item 19.

Item 31: Number of Prior Felony Convictions (Adult conviction or Juvenile adjudication for a felony level offense)

1. None
2. One or more
   - Current offense of conviction is not counted, only felonies committed prior to the instant offense. All counts and read-ins (counts not prosecuted, but acknowledged by the court as having occurred) which are part of the current conviction, but occurred earlier in time are to be considered as priors.

Item 32: Adult Convictions or Juvenile Adjudications

1. Offender’s record does not include any convictions for the following offenses: Burglary; Theft; Auto Theft; Robbery; Worthless Checks; or Forgery.
2. Offender record includes convictions for: Burglary; Theft; Auto Theft; or Robbery.
3. Offender record includes convictions for: Worthless Checks or Forgery
4. Offender’s record includes one or more convictions from Category 2 AND Category 3
   - Convictions for being a “party to a crime” (accomplices and/or co-conspirators) related to above crimes are to be counted.
Item 33: Assaultive Behavior within the last 5 years (Adult or Juvenile)

Actual, intended, or likely harm to a person. Count an offense as an assaultive offense if the aforementioned elements were present - regardless of whether they resulted in conviction(s) reduced to lesser offenses by plea bargain or charging practices. Parolees are to be scored based on behavior 5 years prior to the offense of conviction or that which led to their incarceration. Include the offense of conviction if violent.
Scoring: Mental Health

Item 34: Self Concept Problems

- Low Self-esteem: lack of confidence in most areas; offenders avoid and/or are fearful of attempting new challenges (e.g. applying for jobs, quits at first sign of pressure or criticism); negative self-talk; pessimistic about future and/or exhibits low energy level; derogatory toward others; codependent on others.

- Grandiosity: grossly exaggerates personal skills, contacts, financial resources etc. that are not based in fact. May present with high energy and self absorption in their own activities; arrogance; unrealistic expectations or dismisses potential obstacles to goals. Over-confident, inappropriate, unrealistic.

- Check one, none, or both if applicable.

Item 35: Interpersonal Problems

- Peers. The offender has few if any close friends; may be a loner; feels people are untrustworthy; manipulates friends for their own gain; may engage in inappropriate behavior due to peer pressure. May frequently argue with friends.

- Authority. The offender characteristically responds negatively to orders from authority figures or may become slavish, fearful, obedient person to the authority figure. Many times this person is rejecting common social values and behaviorally may demonstrate negative or non-conforming behavior.

- Family. The offender rejects family values related to education, social behavior, responsibility for family. Conversely, the offender may resist familial separation to the detriment of other relationships. Exhibits defiant or disruptive behavior in response to most family requests or interactions.

- Check all that are applicable or none.
Item 36: Emotional Problems

- Depression. The offender presents little interest or pleasure in any activity, exhibit tearfulness, sleep problems, decreased appetite; is withdrawn; has decreased sexual interest; guilt or feeling inadequate. Low energy that impairs daily functioning.

- History of Psychotic Episodes. Offenders who have a history of auditory hallucinations; persecutory delusions, or feeling that their thoughts and behavior have magical powers are probably describing past psychotic episodes. Things to watch for might include references to: severe depression; periods of mania with grandiosity; rapid shifts in mood; flight of ideas; or other unusual thought content; a history of psychotropic medication or hospitalization may be present; history of intermittent employment; withdrawal from others and society; difficulty following the offender’s logic; or odd social behavior.

- Anxiety. Physical symptoms may include: shakiness; fatigue; an inability to relax; heart pounding; sweating; dry mouth; dizziness; etc. The offender may feel edgy, worried, obsessed with problems. Difficulty in concentrating or easily distracted.

- Check all, if applicable or none.

Item 37: Mental Health Treatment History

- Inpatient. Any formal hospitalization for mental health treatment.

- Outpatient. Any formal mental health treatment in a non-restrictive setting.

- Check both if applicable or none.

Item 38: Destructive Behavior

- Self. A history of suicidal ideation, threats or attempts; irrational drug use that threatens health; obviously dangerous or destructive behavior with little thought.

- Property. Currently directs anger at objects (e.g. doors, possessions, etc.)

- Person. Currently directs anger or assaultive behavior at other people. Personal failure is blamed on others.

- Check all if applicable or none.
If not otherwise stated: use a 1-year window; if incarcerated use the 12 months prior to the incarceration. We are simply trying to capture how the offender has functioned/operated in an unrestricted environment.

**Item 39: Unusual Behavior or Thought Disorder**

Behavior that strikes you as odd or highly atypical. This offender in a passive state may avoid eye contact. Individuals who talk of plots against themselves or being influenced in bizarre ways or describe hallucinatory experiences; speech patterns that jump from topic to topic with no apparent connecting logic; odd manner of dress; hatred or anger focused on an illogical source of their problems; signs of general panic; grimacing; or tics. A clinical diagnosis may be present.

- A selection is required (Yes or No).

**Item 40: Learning Disability or Mental Retardation**

Much of this information should come from prior educational history or psychological testing. Indications may also be reflected in immature attitudes or emotional expression; simplicity of thought and speech.

- A selection is required (Yes or No).

**Item 41: Criminal or Antisocial Value System**

Offender exhibited at an early age lying, interest in sex, rebelliousness, or resistance to authority; may also do dangerous things for the “fun of it;” lack of remorse for antisocial behavior; use people for their own gain with little empathy for others; may live day to day without sacrifice for long-term gain; hedonistic.

- A selection is required (Yes or No).

**Item 42: Other mental health issues not listed**

On occasion, the offender exhibits attitudes; emotions; or behavior that were not readily captured under a previous item which are likely to impede treatment or supervision. This category is used when a offender possesses such a quality and will be recommended for treatment to address this quality (e.g. eating disorders, oppositional defiant disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder).

- A selection is required (Yes or No).
Item 43: Will Offender be referred to Clinical Services or Community Mental Health Agency for support or medication review?

Previously scored items indicative of emotional or mental health needs may warrant a referral to clinical services for either support or medication review. A selection is required (Yes or No).
Scoring: Other-External

**Item 44: Primary Offender Management Classification**

1. **Selective Intervention:** Offenders in this group enjoy relatively stable and pro-social lives. Effective intervention targets the development of appropriate responses to temporary crises and problems and the reestablishment of pro-social patterns.

2. **Casework Control:** Offenders in this group manifest instabilities in their lives as evidenced by failures in employment and domestic problems. They lack goal directedness which is often exacerbated by alcohol or drugs. Other characteristics may include: numerous arrests; unstable childhoods; family pressure; and/or financial difficulties. Effective interventions include the promotion of stability in their personal and professional lives; maximizing their potential; overcoming self-defeating behavior and emotional/psychological impairments.

3. **Environmental Structure:** Offenders in this group are predominantly characterized by deficiencies in social, vocational, and intellectual skills. Most of their problems stem from an inability to succeed in their employment or to be comfortable in most social settings and from an overall lack of social skills and/or intellectual ability. Effective interventions include: development of basic employment and social skills; pro-social peer selection; improve social skills and impulse control.

4. **Limit Setting:** Offenders in this group typically have extensive criminal histories. These offenders show little remorse; enjoy gaming the system; they easily adapt to prison; and typically resume criminal activity. Intervention usually includes close monitoring and attempts to change the offender’s core attitude and belief system.

5. **Not Classified:** Use this category when the supervision strategy or supervision resources are unknown.

- This item captures the intervention strategy the offender will experience while on community supervision.
Item 45: Living Arrangement (while on community supervision)

1. Alone. No one else living at primary residence.
2. With Spouse or Significant Other.
3. With Parents.
4. With children.
5. With sibling.
7. Other (e.g. half-way house, inpatient treatment, etc.).
8. Not Reported (i.e. living arrangements unknown).

• Select only one item.

Item 46: Number of Dependents

1. A offender supporting him/herself is one dependent. If the offender has children or family who are dependent on him/her for more than half of their support each person should be counted as a dependent (e.g. single offender = 1; single offender and 1 child = 2).
2. Not Reported. No information available.

• General purpose is to examine the financial stressors the offender must address.

Item 47: Currently Making Support Payments

1. Yes. Payments are court-ordered with some payment being made.
2. No. Payments are court-ordered, but are not being made.
3. Not Applicable or unknown OR Payments are made, but are not court-ordered.

Item 48: Need Child Care

1. Yes. There is a perceived need by either the probation officer or offender that day care is needed (the officer’s opinion overrides offender’s opinion).
2. No. Child care is already being provided OR no child care is needed.
**Item 49: Veteran**

1. Not a veteran.
2. Yes, honorable discharge or general discharge.
3. Yes, other than honorable discharge.

- A veteran is a person who has completed military service.

**Item 50: Amount of time Employed**

1. Unemployed, not looking. Not motivated to look.
2. Unemployed, actively looking. Job market may impede.
3. Full time (35-40hrs/wk).
4. Full time (Seasonal).
5. Part-time (20-34hrs/wk).
6. Part-time (less than 20hrs/wk).
7. Student (full time student or half-time student with other half employed).
9. Not Applicable (e.g. retired; disabled; not able to work, possibly medical reasons).

**Item 51: Months at Current Job**

This should reflect the number of months the offender has worked during their current period of employment. This employment includes temporary work for which any wages have been received. Enter “0” if unemployed at the time received on supervision. Enter “1” for one month or less.

- Not reported. No information available.
Item 52: Job Classification (Current employment at time of supervision)

1. Professional, Technical, or Managerial
2. Clerical, Sales, or Services
3. Farming
4. Skilled Trade
5. Semi-skilled Trade
6. Unskilled Labor
7. Other

- Unemployed offenders should be assessed on the general skill set they worked when employed.

Item 53: Current Gross Monthly Income (Wages only)

1. None
2. $1 - $575
3. $576 - $1150
4. $1151 - $1750
5. $1751 - $2300
6. $2301 - $2900
7. $2901 or more

Item 54: Job Training wanted by Offender

1. Yes
2. No
Item 55: Last Grade Completed

- None. No formal education.
- Grades 1-12 (specify actual grade completed) ______
- High School graduate
- Some College
- College graduate
- Some Graduate work
- Graduate degree
- Ungraded other education (e.g. Montessori, Waldorf, etc.)
- Received or receiving Special Education services
- GED
- Technical, Trade, or Vocational School
- Not Reported. No information available.

- This item is to capture the actual level of academic achievement.

Item 56: Number of prior Misdemeanor Convictions (Adult convictions only)

Expunged cases should be included. Also include municipal ordinance violations that would be criminal offenses.

- If there is insufficient information in this area to be considered “not reported.”
- Do not include routine traffic convictions such as speeding, faulty equipment, registration, etc.
Item 57: Number of previous Misdemeanor Probations (Adult convictions only)

A probation period interrupted by revocation should only be considered one probation (i.e. reinstatement into community supervision as a continuation of the original probation period should not be counted again).

- If there is insufficient information in this area to be considered “Not reported.”

Item 58: Number of Previous Felony Probations (Adult convictions only)

A probation period interrupted by revocation should only be considered one probation (i.e. reinstatement into community supervision as a continuation of the original probation period should not be counted again).

- If there is insufficient information in this area to be considered “not reported.”

Item 59: Number of Prior Releases on Supervised Release or Parole (Adult convictions only)

This area should reflect the actual number of releases to parole supervision, including mandatory releases required by statute.

- If there is insufficient information in this area to be considered “not reported.”

Item 60: Number of Prior Incarcerations for one year or longer (Adult convictions only)

This item should reflect the actual number of prior incarcerations for one year or longer as determined by the length of the sentence, not actual time served. This category should also include county facilities (e.g. County Jails, House of Corrections). This item does not include the instant offense.

- If there is insufficient information in this area to be considered “not reported.”

Item 61: Currently Receiving Payments for: Social Security Disability/Worker Compensation

1. Yes

2. No


- This area reflects only those monies received by the offender from public agencies.
Item 62: Currently Receiving payments for regular Social Security.

1. Yes
2. No

• This area reflects only those monies received by the offender from public agencies.

Item 63: Currently receiving payments for: VA Benefits

1. Yes
2. No

• This area reflects only those monies received by the offender from public agencies.

Item 64: Currently Receiving payments for: Unemployment Compensation

1. Yes
2. No

• This area reflects only those monies received by the offender from public agencies.

Item 65: Currently Receiving payments for: Public Assistance for Dependent Children

1. Yes
2. No

• This area reflects only those monies received by the offender from public agencies.
Item 66: Currently Receiving payments for: Welfare or General Relief

1. Yes
2. No

• This area reflects only those monies received by the offender from public agencies

Item 67: Currently Receiving payments for: Other

1. Yes
2. No

• This area reflects only those monies received by the offender from public agencies not reflected above.