

**To:** Illinois Risk, Assets and Needs Assessment Task Force

**From:** Vera Institute of Justice, Center on Sentencing and Corrections

**Re:** National Information on Offender Assessments, Part II

**Date:** May 27, 2010

---

This memorandum provides an overview of current assessment instruments used in the adult criminal justice system.<sup>1</sup> It also presents the results of a national survey conducted by the Vera Institute of Justice of the use of assessment instruments by community supervision agencies and releasing authorities. The goal of the survey was to identify the most commonly used assessment tools and to identify trends in how agencies are using the information collected by the tools.

## **I. National Survey Results: Key Findings**

Overall, over 60 community supervision agencies in 41 states reported using an actuarial assessment tool, suggesting that an overwhelming majority of corrections agencies nationwide routinely utilize assessment tools to some degree.<sup>2</sup> The key findings from the survey include:

- *Assessment is new.* Many jurisdictions are relatively new to assessment: seventy percent of respondents implemented their assessment tools since 2000, with one third of those having implemented since 2005. Less than 20 percent reported the use of assessment tools in the 1990s or earlier.
- *State-specific or state-modified tools are most common.* Of the 41 states that responded to this survey, twenty reported using a state-specific tool.<sup>3</sup>
- *LSI-R is the most commonly used generic tool.* Of the remaining 20 states, 16 of them reported using the LSI-R. Other commonly used tools are the COMPAS (three states) and the LS/CMI (three states).
- *Risk and need are routinely assessed.* A significant majority (82 percent) of respondents reported assessing *both* risk and need, while just 18 percent reported that they assess only risk. Releasing authorities reported assessing only risk at a greater rate than supervision agencies. All respondents who use COMPAS report assessing both risk and need. Most – but not all – of those using LSI-R also assess both factors.
- *Paroling authorities generally assess risk only.* Despite being responsible for setting parole/post-release supervision conditions, nearly 40 percent of the releasing authorities assess only risk and not needs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Vera's first memo explained the core principles underlying offender assessments and described the various points in the criminal justice system at which assessments are commonly used. For a copy of the memo, contact Maggie Peck at Vera Institute: 212-376-3094 or [mpeck@vera.org](mailto:mpeck@vera.org).

<sup>2</sup> Responses were received from 72 agencies (probation, parole, and releasing authorities) across 41 different states.

<sup>3</sup> Some of these state-specific tools were modified versions of the LSI-R, LS/CMI or Wisconsin Model.

- *Assessment at pre-sentence stage.* Nearly all probation agencies report that they conduct their assessments in the pre-sentence phase.
- *Assessment used to guide supervision levels.* The most common use of the assessment is to guide supervision levels. Assessment results are also used to develop case plans, set case loads and guide revocation decisions.
- *Sharing results is common.* Nearly all probation agencies share the results with the sentencing judge, and one jurisdiction even shares the results with the judge, district attorney and defense attorney. Many respondents reported sharing the results with treatment providers.
- *Storage of results is nearly all electronic.* While most reported storing the results of the assessments in an electronic database, only some are web-based (nearly all COMPAS users and some LSI-R users).

## **II. Commonly Used Assessment Instruments**

Drawing upon findings from the national survey as well as literature on offender assessments, this section presents a more detailed description of the tools most commonly used by states: the LSI-R, COMPAS and LS/CMI.<sup>4</sup> A chart comparing these tools is included in Appendix A. Included in Appendix B is a review of assessment tools compiled by the Illinois Collaborative on Reentry’s Alternatives to Incarceration Workgroup, which includes a description of the LSI-R, COMPAS and several specialized tools.

### **Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R)**

*General Information.* As indicated in our survey, the LSI-R is the most commonly used and researched generic assessment tool throughout the country. The LSI-R was developed by Canadian researchers Don Andrews and James Bonta, both of whom are widely recognized for their research on the risk, need and responsivity principles.<sup>5</sup> The tool is a robust predictor of recidivism across a range of correctional settings – corrections, probation and parole – and claims validity across age, gender, race and economic backgrounds. It assists correctional professionals in making decisions concerning the necessary levels of supervision and can also aid in decisions concerning sentencing, program or institutional classification, release from institutional custody, bail and security level classifications, and assesses treatment progress.

*Domains.* The LSI-R assesses a range of risk and criminogenic needs factors through semi-structured interviews with offenders and other sources of data collection, including a self-report survey. The tool consists of a 54-item scale comprised of the following ten subscales: prior criminal history, education/employment, financial situation, family/marital relationships, accommodation, use of leisure time, companions, alcohol/drug use, emotional/mental health, and attitudes/orientation (see Appendix A for more details).

---

<sup>4</sup> The COMPAS and LS/CMI instruments are considered “fourth-generation instruments,” while the LSI-R is considered a “third-generation instrument.” A description of the generational differences among assessment instruments is included in the previous Vera Institute memo (*National Overview of Offender Assessments, Part I*).

<sup>5</sup> Multi-Health Systems (MHS), Inc. is the proprietor of the LSI-R.

The LSI-R also has a screening instrument called the LSI-R:SV (Screening Version), which is used when resource and time constraints prohibit the full assessment from being administered. The LSI-R:SV consists of eight of the 54 items contained in the complete instrument and covers four risk factors: criminal history, criminal attitudes, criminal associates and antisocial personality patterns. The screening tool is a brief and inexpensive way to establish whether the full LSI-R should be administered, and it is not intended as a stand-alone assessment instrument.

*Criticism.* Although the LSI-R is a strong general predictor of recidivism across different backgrounds and settings, it has been criticized as not being a valid predictor for women. Critics assert that the tool was validated on an all-male sample and does *not* include certain items that may be significant to female risk; for example, whether the offender has children or has a criminal spouse.<sup>6</sup> However, more recent research suggests that the tool is a valid predictor of risk for both males and females.

### **Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS)**

*General Information.* The COMPAS assessment instrument was developed by Northpointe Institute for Public Management, Inc., a research and consulting firm based out of Michigan. COMPAS is a statistically based risk and needs assessment designed to assess risk and criminogenic needs factors in adult and youth correctional populations. While other risk assessment instruments provide a single risk score, the COMPAS provides separate risk estimates for violence, recidivism, failure to appear, and community failure. The COMPAS also provides a “criminogenic and needs profile” for the offender, which provides information about the offender with respect to criminal history, needs assessment, criminal attitudes, social environment, and social support.

*Domains.* The COMPAS assessment includes a number of strength and protective factors, including job and educational skills, history of successful employment, adequate finances, safe housing, family bonds, social and emotional support, and noncriminal parents and friends. In some states where COMPAS is used (e.g., Michigan), the assessment summary form includes a section for the practitioner to list an individual’s strengths.

*Criticism.* Although research suggests that the instrument is gender-responsive for both men and women, the tool has demonstrated mixed results regarding ethnicity. A 2008 research study found weak results for predicting arrest outcomes for African-American men.<sup>7</sup> The results indicated a tendency to either over- or under-classify study participants depending on race and ethnicity. However, the study has several limitations, including a short outcome period (12 months post-release) and a relatively small sample size. More recently, a study found that the COMPAS recidivism models performed equally well for African-American and White men at predicting arrest outcomes.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Holtfreter, K. & Cupp, R. (2007). Gender and Risk Assessment. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Vol. 23, No. 4, 363-382.

<sup>7</sup> Fass, T., Heilbrun, K., DeMatteo, D., & Fretz, F. (2008). The LSI-R and the COMPAS: Validation Data on Two Risk-Needs Tools. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 1095-1108.

<sup>8</sup> Brennen, T., Dieterich, W. & Ehret. (2009). Evaluating the Predictive Validity of the COMPAS Risk and Needs Assessment System. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 36, No. 1, 21-40

## Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI)

*General information.* The LS/CMI system is a comprehensive assessment instrument that assesses risk and criminogenic needs. Similar to COMPAS, it serves as a fully functional case management tool. The LS/CMI was developed by the same researchers who developed the LSI-R and it is owned by the same company (Multi-Health Systems). It was created to reflect the expanding knowledge base about offender risk assessment that has emerged since the development of the LSI-R.

*Domains.* The instrument was updated to assist correctional professionals with the expanded duties required of them, namely the focus on behavior change through programmatic interventions and referrals. The revision includes refining and combining the 54 LSI-R items into 43 items. In addition, assessors can indicate areas of offender strength, serving as protective factors.

As indicated in Table 1, the LS/CMI is comprised of eleven sections. Section 1 produces the total risk/need score based on the 43-item assessment. Sections 2, 3 and 4 assess mitigating or aggravating factors that can affect risk and need levels indicated in the first section. Section 6 documents a professional or administrative override. The remaining sections deal exclusively with case management considerations, including assessing responsivity concerns.

**Table 1: LSC/MI Section Functions**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>1. General Risk/Need Factor</b>	Total Risk/Need Score
<b>2. Specific Risk/Need Factors</b>	Personal problems with criminogenic potential (e.g., racist behavior), history perpetration
<b>3. Prison Experience/Institutional Factors</b>	Crucial institutional considerations including history of incarceration and barriers to release
<b>4. Other Client Issues</b>	Supplementary psychological and physical health, financial, accommodation, and victimization items
<b>5. Special Responsivity Considerations</b>	Dominant responsivity considerations from clinical research and correctional opinion
<b>6. Risk/Need Summary and Override</b>	Summarizes risk/need scores and allows for overriding score-based risk/need level
<b>7. Risk/Need Profile</b>	Graphically summarizes the Section 1 subcomponent and risk/need level scores
<b>8. Program/Placement Decision</b>	Record of major classification decisions (e.g., program placement
<b>9. Case Management Plan</b>	Lists criminogenic needs, non –criminogenic needs, and special responsivity considerations
<b>10. Progress Record</b>	Log of activities designed to measure change resulting from case management strategies
<b>11. Discharge Summary</b>	Summarizes information useful if the offender returns to custody or community supervision

*Research and validation.* Extensive scientific validation has been conducted on the LS/CMI's predictive validity. A review of the literature suggests the LS/CMI as a valid and reliable assessment tool across a range of offenders. Furthermore, a 2004 meta-analysis of the LS/CMI concluded that the instrument is as predictive and reliable with females as it is with males.<sup>9</sup> The researchers also determined the instrument to be effective across a range of settings including, probation, probation, and prison/jail.<sup>10</sup>

### **III. Other Assessment Tools**

#### **Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)**

*General information.* In collaboration with the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections, researchers at the University of Cincinnati (led by Dr. Ed Latessa) developed the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS), which assesses individuals at several points in the criminal justice system. Ohio developed ORAS with two specific goals in mind: first, to promote consistent and objective assessment of risk throughout the criminal justice system; and second, to improve communication and avoid duplication of information from one system point to the next.

*Tools and domains.* Five assessment instruments were created: Pretrial Assessment Tool, Community Supervision Screening Tool, Community Supervision Tool, Prison Intake Tool, and Reentry Tool.

- The *Pretrial Assessment Tool* is designed to predict risk of failure to appear at a future court date and risk of arrest. It consists of seven items from four domains: criminal history, employment, substance abuse, and residential stability.
- The *Community Supervision Screening Tool* identifies moderate- to high-risk offenders in need of the complete assessment instrument. It is a four item instrument designed to quickly identify low risk cases that do not need the full assessment.
- The *Community Supervision Tool* assists in the designation of supervision levels and guides case management for offenders in the community. It consists of 35 items from seven domains: criminal history, education, employment and finances, family and social support, neighborhood problems, substance abuse, antisocial associations, and antisocial attitudes and behavioral problems.
- The *Prison Intake Tool* prioritizes prison treatment based on the likelihood of reoffending. It consists of 31 items from five domains: criminal history, education, employment, and finances, family and social support, substance abuse, and criminal lifestyle.
- The *Reentry Tool* predicts the likelihood of recidivism and was designed to be administered within six months of release. It consists of 20 items from three domains: criminal history, social bonds, and antisocial attitudes.

---

<sup>9</sup> Williams, K. , Andrews, D. , Bonta, J. , Wormith, J. , Guzzo, L. and Brews, A. , 2009-03-04 "The Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI): Reliability and Validity in Female Offenders" *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychology - Law Society, TBA, San Antonio, TX* <Not Available>. 2010-03-11 from [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p295679\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p295679_index.html)

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

*Research and validation.* The five tools were validated on the Ohio population. The results of the validation study indicate that the ORAS instruments performed as well, if not better, than both the LSI-R and the Wisconsin Risk/Need instrument. The tools are in the public domain and are available in non-automated paper-only format from the University of Cincinnati.

### **Arizona Suite of Tools: OST, MOST and FROST**

*General information.* In 2004, the Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts sought to standardize assessment procedures across its 15 state probation offices and implement a uniform screening instrument. The tools used by Arizona include the Modified Offender Screening Tool (MOST), the Offender Screening Tool (OST), and the Field Reassessment Offender Screening Tool (FROST). The MOST is a pre-screening tool to filter out low risk offenders. The OST is a comprehensive assessment and case planning tool, which is conducted on all medium or high risk placements as identified by the MOST screening tool. The FROST is used for reassessment.

*Domains.* These tools were developed by the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department, which decided to create its own tool after reviewing the performance of existing offender risk and needs assessment tools. The OST collects information in 10 categories that are supported by the research as predictors of an offender's criminal behavior: physical health/medical, vocation/financial, education, family and social relationships, residence and neighborhood, alcohol, drug abuse, mental health, attitude, and criminal behavior. The items on the OST include both static and dynamic criminogenic risk factors.

Assessments are used by the probation departments to determine appropriate supervision levels, guide development of case management strategies, and provide a mechanism to measure offender progress. The MOST and OST are used by all probation departments in Arizona and by local probation offices (handling misdemeanors) in Virginia.

### **Conclusion**

Almost every state uses an assessment tool at one or more points in the criminal justice system to assist in the better management of offenders in institutions and in the community. This memo describes the tools most commonly used across the country and broadly outlines their general use and function in the criminal justice system. It also provides an overview of the risk, need and protective factors and predictive validity of each tool. As described above, one of the most significant challenges corrections agencies have faced is sharing critical information collected from the assessment from one agency to the next. To address this issue, a growing number of states are developing statewide and standardized assessment *systems* that allow information to more readily flow from one system point to the next. The development and implementation of an assessment system is a cornerstone of the Crime Reduction Act of 2009 and one of the most promising initiatives to improve public safety outcomes and reduce costs in Illinois.

Appendix A:  
Chart of Common Assessment Tools

Multi-Health Systems (MHS)			Northpointe, Inc.			Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)		
Tool	LS/IMI	LSI-R	COMPAS	ORAS-CSST (Community Supervision Screening Tool)	ORAS-CST (Community Supervision Tool)	ORAS-PAT (Pretrial Assessment Tool)	ORAS-PIT (Prison Intake Tool)	ORAS-RT (Reentry Tool)
Number of Items	43	54	Varies	4	35	7	31	20
Domains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal history</li> <li>• Education/ Employment</li> <li>• Family/Marital</li> <li>• Leisure/Recreation</li> <li>• Companions</li> <li>• Alcohol/Drug problem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal history</li> <li>• Education/ Employment</li> <li>• Financial</li> <li>• Family/Marital</li> <li>• Accommodation</li> <li>• Leisure/Recreation</li> <li>• Companions</li> <li>• Alcohol/Drug problem</li> <li>• Emotional/Personal</li> <li>• Attitudes/Orientation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal history</li> <li>• History non-compliance</li> <li>• History of violence</li> <li>• Current violence</li> <li>• Criminal associates</li> <li>• Substance abuse</li> <li>• Financial problems</li> <li>• Vocational/educational</li> <li>• Criminal attitudes</li> <li>• Family criminality</li> <li>• Social environment</li> <li>• Leisure</li> <li>• Residential instability</li> <li>• Criminal personality</li> <li>• Social isolation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of prior felonies</li> <li>• Current employment</li> <li>• Availability of drugs</li> <li>• Number of criminal friends</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal history</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Employment/Finances</li> <li>• Family/Social support</li> <li>• Neighborhood problems</li> <li>• Substance abuse</li> <li>• Antisocial associations</li> <li>• Antisocial attitudes/Behavioral problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal history</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Residential stability</li> <li>• Substance abuse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age</li> <li>• Criminal history</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Employment/Finances</li> <li>• Family/Social support</li> <li>• Substance abuse</li> <li>• Criminal lifestyle</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age</li> <li>• Criminal history</li> <li>• Social bonds</li> <li>• Criminal attitudes</li> </ul>
Generation	4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>
Case Management Tool	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Strengths	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cost	Per-use	Per-use	No Per-use Cost / Not Public Domain	Public Domain	Public Domain	Public Domain	Public Domain	Public Domain



Appendix B:  
Illinois Collaborative on Reentry  
Alternatives to Incarceration Workgroup  
Chart on Offender Assessments

Review of Assessment Instruments-Compiled for the ATI Workgroup  
 By Nikki Vines, L.M.S.W., Doctoral student, Jane Addams College of Social Work

LSI-R (Level of Services Inventory Revised)	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains an interview and self report survey</li> <li>• 54-item scale comprised of ten subscales: Prior Criminal History, Education/Employment, Financial Situation, Family/Marital Relationships, Accommodation, Use of Leisure Time, Companions, Alcohol/Drug Use, Emotional/Mental Health, and Attitudes/Orientation. Developed by Andrews and Bonta (1995).</li> </ul>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of its development, it was seen as a more explicit, empirically based, and theory-guided approach and a broader selection of criminogenic factors. In addition, some of these factors were designed to be dynamically sensitive to change.</li> </ul>
Cautions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feminist researchers object to use of the LSI-R due to:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) claims of gender neutrality based on social learning theory</li> <li>2) the interchange of needs and risks</li> <li>3) assertions of accurate classifications (Holtfreter &amp; Cupp, 2007)</li> </ol> </li> <li>• “Accurately gauging recidivism risks for both sexes should incorporate salient background factors suggested by pathways research. Feminists contend that measuring these actors in quantifiable terms, such as the yes/no format of LSI-R items, does not fully capture the diversity of circumstances shown to encourage desistance from crime” (Holtfreter &amp; Cupp, 2007).</li> <li>• “Some research suggests that actuarial risk assessment instruments over classify female offenders, which results in more restrictive supervision” (Silver &amp; Miller, 2002 in Holtfreter &amp; Cupp, 2007). Female offenders are more likely to be over classified than males (Holtfreter &amp; Cupp, 2007).</li> <li>• “Gendreau et al.’s (1996) meta-analysis is widely cited as support for the LSI-R’s gender neutrality, however the authors themselves recognize that their findings contributed little to the prediction of recidivism among females” (Holtfreter &amp; Cupp, 2007).</li> <li>• External validity is questionable as many studies involving women aimed to examine predictive validity with unique populations.</li> <li>• The operational definition of recidivism and time to recidivism are not consistent across 11 studies of females.</li> <li>• LSI-R does not measure objective poverty conditions.</li> <li>• “Although there is sufficient evidence supporting the LSI-R’s predictive validity with samples of males, the evidence is less clear for females” (Gendreau, Little &amp; Goggin, 1996).</li> </ul>

<b>Women's Risk Needs Assessment (WRNA) &amp; Women's Supplemental Risk Needs Assessment (WSRA) a.k.a Gender Responsiveness Trailer</b>	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains an interview and self report survey (Supplement is just self-report paper-and-pencil survey)</li> <li>• Developed by members of the Women's Issues Committee of the MO Dept. of Corrections in collaboration with researchers at the Univ. of Cincinnati.</li> <li>• Measures gender-responsive needs of women offenders.</li> <li>• Comprised of multiple subscales, each asks questions which tap an underlying domain self-esteem, self-efficacy, parenting and relationship problems, and childhood and adult victimization.</li> <li>• The supplement is designed to supplement existing dynamic risk/needs assessments such as the Level LSI-R and the Northpointe Compas.</li> <li>• Informed by literature searches, focus groups with correctional administrators, treatment practitioners, line staff and women offenders.</li> </ul>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment items are measured through behavioral criteria, thereby requiring few subjective judgments on the part of the practitioners or respondents.</li> <li>• Needs which were not unique to women (e.g., housing or accommodations, mental illness, financial circumstances, family support and others) were contextualized in gender responsive terms.</li> <li>• A number of items identify strengths (self efficacy, self-esteem, support from others, and educational assets).</li> <li>• The scales and the final assessments were tested among three prison samples (Colorado, Minnesota, and Missouri), three probation samples (Mau, Minnesota, and Missouri) and two pre-release samples (Colorado and Missouri).</li> <li>• Public domain (free)</li> </ul>
Cautions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tests of the two instruments in post-release settings were not as successful as the tests for the probation and institutional sites. In all likelihood, the dynamic items which were assessed while participants were incarcerated changed upon their release. Results may have been better if the assessments were administered during the first months on parole.</li> </ul>

Review of Assessment Instruments-Compiled for the ATI Workgroup  
 By Nikki Vines, L.M.S.W., Doctoral student, Jane Addams College of Social Work

<b>COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions)</b>	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COMPAS is an automated decision-support software package that integrates risk and needs assessment with several other domains, including sentencing decisions, treatment and case management, and recidivism outcomes.</li> <li>• It allows users to track offenders from intake to case closure to support sequential case management monitoring, information feedback, and decision making.</li> </ul>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In contrast to the LSI-R, which was designed primarily around a social learning explanation, COMPAS reflects a broader theoretical base and include key constructs from low self-control theory, strain theory or social exclusion, social control theory (bonding), routine activities–opportunity theory, subcultural or social learning theories, and a strengths perspective.</li> <li>• COMPAS includes a number of strength and protective factors including job and educational skills, history of successful employment, adequate finances, safe housing, family bonds, social and emotional support, noncriminal parents and friends.</li> <li>• Integration of the risk and needs domain with separate domains of sentencing decisions, institutional processing and placement decisions, case management decisions, treatments given (type and amount), and various outcomes (across time).</li> <li>• COMPAS uses “separate samples of males and females to develop gender-specific calibrations of all risk and need factors and second by evaluating its predictive and classification models on separate male and female samples” (Brennan, Dieterich &amp; Erhart, 2009). No significant differences in alpha levels between males and females, suggesting that the scales are equally reliable for men and women.</li> <li>• A majority of the scales reach levels of internal consistency and predictive validity that are within generally acceptable ranges. Regarding internal consistency, most of the scales have alpha coefficients equal to or greater than .70, with only three exceptions, and the latter were close to acceptable levels.</li> </ul>
Cautions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are mixed results regarding ethnicity. Brennan, Dieterich &amp; Erhart (2009) found that the COMPAS recidivism models preformed equally well for African American and White men at predicting the arrest outcomes. There is only one previous study that examined the predictive accuracy of the COMPAS for different ethnic groups-Fass, Heilbrun, DeMatteo, &amp; Fretz (2008) which reported much weaker results for African American men. However, the study’s results are unreliable, given the small overall sample size and extremely small effective sample sizes for the ethnic groups.</li> <li>• Studies to date are encouraging and suggest that the COMPAS risk models reach levels of reliability, predictive validity, and generalizability that are at least equal to those of other major instruments in offender risk assessment, however instrument validation is in the early stages.</li> </ul>

<b>THE GAIN (GLOBAL ASSESSMENT OF INDIVIDUAL NEEDS)</b>	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GAIN is a comprehensive biopsychosocial assessment tool. It is a progressive and integrated series of measures and computer applications designed to support a number of treatment practices. It is used with both adolescents and adults. It contains eight core sections (Background, Substance Use, Physical Health, Risk Behaviors and Disease Prevention, Mental and Emotional Health, Environment and Living Situation, Legal, and Vocational).</li> </ul>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used in outpatient, intensive outpatient, partial hospitalization, methadone, short-term residential, long-term residential, therapeutic community, and correctional programs.</li> <li>It includes items designed to support most state and federal reporting requirements, to compare to community samples from the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA), and to estimate changes in the cost to society (based on the work of Dr. Michael French and his colleagues)</li> <li>Can be administered by computer or with paper and pencil.</li> <li>The psychometrics of the GAIN and the scale norms have been established for both adults and adolescents overall and by level of care (within age).</li> <li>Scale has high internal consistency and reliability.</li> </ul>
Cautions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Norms by gender have not been generated (researchers are in the process of doing this) Researchers are also looking at variability in the degree of co-occurring mental disorders and involvement in family, school, work, welfare, and juvenile and criminal justice systems.</li> </ul>

<b>Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)</b>	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of ORAS produced five assessment tools designed to predict the likelihood of recidivism at different points in the criminal justice process (The Pretrial Assessment Tool, The Community Supervision Tool, The Community Supervision Screening Tool, The Prison Intake Tool, and the Reentry Tool.)</li> </ul>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These tools not only are used to assign supervision levels, but are also designed to assist case managers in targeting dynamic risk factors and identifying barriers to treatment.</li> <li>• Overall, the results from the validation are favorable, indicating that each tool was able to clearly distinguish between groups of offenders with escalating rates of recidivism. Concurrent validity also was examined by comparing the predictive power of each assessment tool to the LSI-R and the Wisconsin Risk/Needs instruments. These results revealed that the instruments for the Ohio Risk Assessment System performed as well if not better than both of the other instruments.</li> <li>• ORAS is similar to the LSI-R but is public domain (like the WRNA), so the assessment is free to use.</li> </ul>
Cautions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further validation is needed. (follow up time in validation study involving 1800 participants was only one year).</li> <li>• The findings are preliminary-certain types of cases are underrepresented in the population (e.g., sex offenders, Hispanic offenders, female offenders). The underrepresentation in the population leads to small numbers of these types of offenders in the sample.</li> <li>• Gender neutral</li> </ul>

<b>The Service Planning Instrument (SPIn)</b>	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A model for assessing risk, need and protective factors in adult populations. It can be used in probation, parole, re-entry and custodial settings where there is a requirement to assess risk of recidivism and identify service needs.</li> <li>• The primary objective in using SPIn is helping case workers develop service plans for their criminal justice clients.</li> </ul>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides scoring that is helpful for classifying offenders according to overall risk level so that adequate supervision resources can be assigned.</li> <li>• Provides capabilities to link assessment results in an immediate way to the process of individualized case planning and appropriate service provision. SPIn helps with case planning by identifying need areas that can be easily linked to interventions and other services for adult offenders.</li> <li>• Incorporates the measurement of protective factors or strengths. The assessment of protective factors focuses case plans to capitalize on strengths and helps develop resources for offender success.</li> <li>• Customization of the program is offered</li> <li>• Compatible with Youth Assessment Screening Instrument (YASI)</li> </ul>
Cautions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a web-based program, private domain (costly)</li> <li>• Is a new assessment (2009)</li> </ul>

<b>The Service Planning Instrument for Women (SPIn-W)</b>	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Service Planning Instrument for Women (SPIn-W™) contains 100-items that assess risk, need and protective factors that have demonstrated relevance for increasing responsivity in case work with justice involved women.</li> <li>• While, the content of SPIn-W overlaps with traditional risk/need assessment in general populations of men and women, SPIn-W items related to child custody and parenting issues, domestic violence, mental health, social support, and community living. Items in assessment domains related to attitudes, aggression, interpersonal skills, and cognitive skills have been tailored to take into account how these areas of risk are manifested in female offender populations.</li> </ul>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was developed from research and field practice with criminal justice involved women. Provides scoring that is helpful for classifying offenders according to overall risk level so that adequate supervision resources can be assigned.</li> </ul> <p><i>Same Strengths as SPIn:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides capabilities to link assessment results in an immediate way to the process of individualized case planning and appropriate service provision. SPIn helps with case planning by identifying need areas that can be easily linked to interventions and other services for adult offenders.</li> <li>• Incorporates the measurement of protective factors or strengths. The assessment of protective factors focuses case plans to capitalize on strengths and helps develop resources for offender success.</li> <li>• Customization of the program is offered</li> <li>• Compatible with Youth Assessment Screening Instrument (YASI)</li> </ul>
Cautions	<p><i>Same Cautions as SPIn:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a web-based program, private domain (costly)</li> <li>• Is a new assessment (2009)</li> </ul>



<b>The Wisconsin Department of Corrections Risk Assessment Instrument a.k.a. Admission to Adult Field Caseload Risk Classification Instrument a.k.a. DOC 502 Risk Assessment Instrument</b>	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is used not only to estimate risk probabilities for supervision purposes, but also to help determine staff workload and deployment.</li></ul>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A revised version of the instrument is under development.</li></ul>
Cautions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 2009 validation study reveals over classification. A high percentage of offenders are classified as high risk, which is counter to the goal of risk classification: to differentiate the population by risk and allocate resources accordingly. The current risk score provides little differentiation of the population, especially with the parole population, where 93% of offenders are classified as high risk. As a result of the 2009 validation study, the instrument is under revision.</li></ul>