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Summary

During the summer of 2010, the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing (PCS) undertook several projects designed to fulfill legislative mandates to incorporate risk and needs assessments into sentencing and design probation/parole guidelines. The Commission (1) conducted a thorough review of 29 current risk and needs assessments, including those designed for general, violent, and psychopathic offenders, and those designed to assess dynamic needs, to determine the most frequently cited risk factors; (2) compiled a list of references to studies that validated current risk and needs assessments; and (3) examined sample PSIs from several Pennsylvania counties to determine the extent to which risk and needs factors are contained in local PSIs. The Commission identified over 125 separate risk factors and found that static risk factors, such as criminal history, employment, and education, were the most commonly cited risk factors in the validated risk assessments and sample PSIs.

The Commission determined that several steps must be taken prior to incorporating risk assessments into sentencing practices and using them as a basis for probation and parole guidelines: (1) The Commission needs information on the type of risk and needs information currently collected within each of the 67 Pennsylvania counties; and (2) The Commission must conduct analyses to determine the extent to which validated risk and need factors predict recidivism among Pennsylvania offenders.

This report details the procedures and findings from each of the three summer projects and concludes with two recommendations for future work: (1) The Commission proposes a study to evaluate risk and needs factors among offenders in four Pennsylvania counties; and (2) The Commission recommends that SGS Web, the state’s current database for sentencing data, be modified to include questions regarding offender risk factors.
Introduction

During the summer of 2010, the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing (PCS) undertook several projects, designed as initial steps towards implementing two mandates from Pennsylvania’s State Legislature. The Reform Legislation of 2008 (Act 81) mandated that the Commission take measures to improve the consistency of sentencing practices across the state. Among other things, this act mandated that the Commission create guidelines for parole and resentencing decisions. Senate Bill No. 1145 of 2009 amended Title 42 of Pennsylvania’s Code of Law (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) with a mandate that the Commission adopt a risk and needs assessment instrument to be used at sentencing.

Over the course of the summer of 2010, the Commission took several steps to identify and develop an appropriate risk and needs assessment:

1. The Commission conducted a thorough review of current risk and needs assessments to determine the most frequently cited risk factors.
2. The Commission compiled a list of references to studies that validated current risk and needs assessments.
3. The Commission examined sample Pre-Sentence Investigation reports (PSIs) from several Pennsylvania counties to determine the presence of risk information in local PSIs.

This report describes the findings from each of these three projects. It concludes with plans for a future study of risk among Pennsylvania offenders and recommendations as to how the Commission may modify SGS Web, the Commission’s database for sentencing data, to collect risk information.

Risk and Needs Assessments

In order to incorporate risk into current sentencing practices, the Commission needed information on the types of validated risk assessments currently used among offender populations and the risk factors contained in these assessments, including both static and dynamic risk factors. To this end, the Commission conducted a thorough review of current risk and needs assessments. The Commission sought to answer two questions during the course of this review:

1. What risk factors, either static or dynamic, are most frequently cited in risk assessments?
2. What types of dynamic risk factors are cited in risk and needs assessments?

The Commission was particularly interested in identifying dynamic risk factors and assessments. Dynamic risk factors, such as anger management techniques and criminal thinking styles, change over time and are often amenable to rehabilitative efforts, whereas static risk factors, such as gender and race, are stable over time and not amendable to rehabilitative efforts. By incorporating dynamic risk assessments into current sentencing practices and guidelines, judges may be able to better tailor sentences to the rehabilitative needs of offenders and, as result, decrease their likelihood recidivism.
Description of Risk Assessments

The Commission conducted a search for validated risk assessments designed to assess general risk, violent tendencies, psychopathic traits, and dynamic risk and needs factors. General risk assessments provide scores predicting the likelihood of recidivism among all types of offenders. Violent risk assessments provide scores predicting the likelihood of violence among offenders. Psychopathic assessments provide a score indicating the degree to which offenders possess traits of psychopathy or antisocial personality disorder. Dynamic risk assessments provide scores indicating offenders’ need for treatment in specific areas, such as anger management.

General risk assessments can be classified according to their generation. First generation risk assessments are based upon clinical judgment. As such, they include no formal scoring procedures and cannot be used to validly compare risk across offenders. Second generation risk assessments were the first formal risk assessments. They assess static risk factors, such as age and criminal history. Each risk factor is associated with a score. The scores for each factor are added together to produce an overall risk score.

Third generation risk assessments assess both static and dynamic risk factors. They are often divided into subsections or scales. For instance, the LSI-R, a third generation risk assessment and one of the most popular risk assessments, contains nine sections: Criminal History, Education/Employment, Financial, Family/Marital, Accommodation, Leisure/Recreation, Companions, Alcohol/Drug Problem, Emotional/Personal, and Attitudes/Orientation. Scores for third generation risk assessments may be additive, as in the second generation risk assessments. Alternatively, each subsection or scale of the risk assessment may produce its own score, thus enabling administrators to better identify the offender’s particular areas of risk and need.

Fourth generation risk assessments assess a broader range of static and dynamic risk factors than those included in the second and third generation risk assessments. In addition, fourth generation risk assessments assess offenders’ strengths. Fourth generation risk assessments produce separate scores for offenders’ risks, needs, and strengths. Scoring in fourth generation risk assessments is based on more complex statistical techniques than those used in second or third generation risk assessments. Fourth generation risk assessments are typically implemented within larger agency databases to aid in the case management of offenders.

Findings

The Commission indentified 29 validated risk and needs assessments (a full list of risk and needs assessments can be found in Appendix A), including 14 general offender risk assessments, 3 violent risk assessments, 4 psychopathic risk assessments, and 8 dynamic risk assessments. After identifying the 29

---

1 Descriptions of generations were derived from: Brennan, T., Dieterich, W., & Ehret, B. (2009). Evaluating the predictive ability of the Compas risk and needs assessment. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36, 21-40.
validated risk assessments, the Commission created a spreadsheet to tabulate the risk factors contained in each risk assessment. In total, the Commission identified over 125 separate risk factors, which were divided into seven categories (a full list of the risk factors can be found in Appendix B). Categories of risk include:

- Demographics
- Criminal History
- Psychosocial factors
- Mental health
- Antisocial/Psychopathic traits
- Substance abuse
- Dynamic predictors

Static predictors, in particular criminal history, were the most frequently cited risk factors, followed by psychosocial factors, substance abuse, dynamic factors, mental health, antisocial personality/psychopathic traits, and demographics. The most frequently cited risk factors in each of the seven categories include:

- Demographics
  - Current age

- Criminal history
  - Prior adult convictions
  - Age at first arrest
  - History of probation/parole violations
  - History of incarceration
  - History of violence
  - History of victimization

- Psychosocial factors
  - Current employment
  - Criminal associates or friends
  - Current level of education
  - Social support/quality of relationships
  - Residential stability

---

2 Frequencies are based on general risk assessments, as the results would be skewed by taking into account risk factors included in more specific assessments, such as those designed to assess for violence or psychopathy. For instance, if we took into account frequencies of the risk factors across all reviewed risk assessments, antisocial/psychopathic traits would be overrepresented because the Commission examined 4 assessments specifically designed to assess for psychopathy. However, looking at the total number of times that risk factors were cited across all types of risk assessments would not change the results substantially.
Mental health

- Serious mental illness (e.g., psychotic disorders, bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder)
- Emotional state
- Interpersonal anxiety

Antisocial/Psychopathic traits

- Intimidating/controlling/manipulative personality
- Lack of remorse or guilt for offenses
- History of early childhood maladjustment

Substance abuse

- History of illegal substance use or abuse
- Current substance use or abuse
- Negative consequences associated with current illegal substance use

Dynamic predictors

- Procriminal attitudes
- Impulsivity
- Responsibility for actions
- Anger management deficits

The Commission also compiled a list of studies that validated the 29 risk assessments included in the review (see Appendix C for a full list of references by risk assessment). Published articles assessing the validity and reliability are available for every risk assessment except the Risk Screen Tool (RST) and the Offense Group Reconviction Scale, Version 3 (OGRS 3). The RST was designed for use specifically in the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (PA DOC). As such, validity and reliability studies were conducted internally and not published. However, the RST incorporated questions from validated risk assessments, including the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R). The OGRS 3 was designed by the Ministry of Justice in the United Kingdom. It also includes risk factors from validated risk assessments.

Overall, studies have found that each of the 29 risk assessments produce valid and reliable predictions of risk. The general risk assessments produce valid and reliable predictions of recidivism. The violent risk assessments produce valid and reliable predictions of future violence. The psychopathic assessments produce valid and reliable assessments of offenders’ tendency towards psychopathy. The dynamic risk assessments produce valid and reliable assessments of offenders’ needs in areas such as anger management.
Local Data Collection Practices in Pennsylvania

Based on the risk factors contained in validated risk assessments, the Commission developed a coding form, which was used to examine sample PSIs and determine the extent to which information on static and dynamic risk factors could be located in them. The Commission examined 25 sample PSIs from 24 counties in Pennsylvania (a full list of these counties can be found in Appendix D).3

The most frequently cited risk factors in the sample PSIs are listed below. These risk factors were explicitly asked of offenders in 95-100% of the sample PSIs:

- Age
- Race
- Gender
- Prior adult arrests
- Prior adult convictions
- Previous youth dispositions
- Current level of education
- Current level of employment
- Nature of the current offense

The sample PSIs also contained narrative information concerning offenders and their backgrounds. Depending on the consistency of the narrative portions of the PSIs, both between and within counties, narratives could be coded and used in future studies of recidivism.4

The Commission identified several risk factors that were included in the narrative portions of the sample PSIs. The most frequently cited risk factors included in narrative portions of the sample PSIs are listed below.5

---

3 The sample PSIs may not be representative of all Pennsylvania counties. Some of the sample PSIs included were from the early 1990’s. Counties’ may have updated their forms since then.

4 Narrative information is unstructured and, as such, it may vary greatly depending upon the offender, the probation officer completing the PSI, and the county. Therefore, the presence of risk information in narratives does not indicate that the information is collected consistently across offenders. Nor does the absence of risk information indicate that the offender does not present risk in that area.

5 Although these are the most frequently cited risk factors in the narrative portions of the PSIs, they are not cited nearly as frequently as the aforementioned risk factors. At most, risk factors in the narrative portions of sample PSIs were identified in about 40% of cases, whereas the most frequently cited risk factors that were explicitly asked of offenders in the sample PSIs were present in 95-100% of cases.
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- Serious mental illness (e.g., psychotic disorders, bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder)
- Active symptoms of serious mental illness
- History of mental health treatment
- Current or previous illegal substance use or abuse
- History of substance abuse treatment
- Influence of drugs or alcohol on current offense
- Residential stability
- Childhood victimization/parental abuse

Dynamic risk factors were notably absent from most of the sample PSIs. Responsibility for action was the most frequently cited dynamic risk factor. However, it was only included in three sample PSIs (13%); and it was not specifically asked of offenders, but rather included in the narrative portion of three sample PSIs.

In summary, the review of sample PSIs indicates that the sample PSIs contain sufficient information on offenders’ demographics, criminal histories, education levels, employment, and, possibly, mental health and substance use. However, substance abuse and mental health information may vary more between offenders, as it is most often contained in narrative portions of PSIs rather than explicitly asked of offenders. The sample PSIs contained little to no information concerning dynamic risk factors.

It is important to note that PSIs are not routinely collected for all offenders. PSIs are only required when an offender is sentenced to greater than one year. Even in those cases, PSIs may be waived by the sentencing judge. Tom Young, Chief Probation Officer in Centre County, indicated that the most risk information may be contained in case files for offenders involved in guilty plea cases (both misdemeanors and felonies) in which the judge orders a PSI. Slightly less information is contained in case files for offenders involved in Accelerated Rehabilitative Disposition cases (ARD; most often associated with DUI offenders). The least amount of information is contained in case files for offenders involved in guilty plea cases in which the sentencing judge waives the PSI, which may amount to more than half of offenders.

**Recommendations**

Based on findings from the review of risk assessments and sample PSIs, the following recommendations can be made.

1. The Commission should include both static and dynamic risk factors in any future risk assessment that may be used at sentencing. Third generation risk assessments may provide the best models for future assessments.
2. The Commission must conduct further research to evaluate the extent to which risk information is currently collected on offenders and the ability for this risk information to predict recidivism.
3. The Commission should modify SGS Web to include questions related to validated risk factors. This would enable the Commission to analyze risk factors and recidivism at a statewide level.

The results of the aforementioned validity and reliability studies indicate that the risk and needs factors most commonly associated with recidivism (e.g., education, employment, substance use) are, indeed, good predictors of future crime. Although each of the reviewed risk assessments produced valid predictions of risk, the third generation risk assessments provide the most comprehensive information on offenders’ risks and needs. They provide information that could aid judges in the selection of appropriate sanctions and rehabilitation programs. As such, any attempts to incorporate risk assessments into sentencing should take into consideration the risk factors contained in third generation risk assessments.

It is also important to consider that many offenders do not receive a PSI. PSIs are only required for offenders whose sentence will be greater than one year. As such, we have no information on the extent to which risk information is collected for offender’s who do not receive PSIs, which may be the majority of offenders. Therefore, from October 2010 through June 2011, the Commission will undertake several additional projects to: (1) garner knowledge as to the prevalence of risk information currently contained in offender files; and (2) increase the Commission’s ability to evaluate risk factors and recidivism at a statewide level.

**Proposed Study on Risk and Recidivism in Pennsylvania**

To garner knowledge as to the extent to which risk information is currently collected in Pennsylvania counties, particularly among offenders whose PSI is waived, the Commission will conduct a multisite study of offender risk files in four counties, including Centre, Berks, Philadelphia, and Delaware counties. The Commission will code data from offender files with a modified version of the coding sheet used to examine sample PSIs.

Not only will the proposed study enable the Commission to collect information on the extent to which risk and needs information is currently collected in the four counties, but it will also allow the Commission to conduct preliminary analyses of risk and recidivism among offenders in four Pennsylvania counties. Findings from the proposed study may form the foundation for incorporating risk assessments into sentencing and/or probation and parole guidelines.

**Proposed Modifications to SGS Web**

In order to evaluate the relationship between risk factors and recidivism at a statewide level, as opposed to the county level, the Commission plans to modify SGS Web to include questions related to validated risk factors. Based on the most frequently cited risk factors identified in the reviewed risk assessments and the type of information present in the sample PSIs, the Commission recommends that the risk factors listed below be incorporated into SGS Web. Underneath each risk factor are suggested ways to ask the questions, based on the ways in which questions are asked in validated risk assessments.

- Age at first arrest
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* List the exact age at first arrest.
* Was the age at first arrest < 16 years or 16 years or greater?
* Was the age at first arrest <16 years, 16-25 years, or 26 years or greater?

➤ History of probation/parole violations
  * List the exact number of probation/parole violations.
  * List the exact number of times probation/parole has been revoked.
  * Has probation/parole ever been revoked?

➤ History of incarceration
  * As an adult, has the offender ever been incarcerated upon conviction?
  * Has the offender been incarcerated upon conviction zero times, one time, or more than one time?
  * As an adult, has the offender ever been incarcerated upon conviction in a local facility? State facility? Federal facility?
  * If previously incarcerated, what was the facility’s classification, low, medium, or maximum security? If offender was incarcerated more than once, select the highest security facility.

➤ Current level of education
  * Select the offender’s current level of education from the following: Less than high school, some high school, high school diploma/GED, some college, Associates degree, Bachelors degree, Graduate school.
  * Does the offender have less than a high school education?

➤ Current employment
  * Select the offender’s employment status at the time of arrest: Employed full-time, employed part-time, unemployed, retired or on disability.
  * Was the offender employed at the time of arrest?

➤ Residential stability
  * How many times has the offender moved in the past year?
  * Has the offender moved more than 3 times in the past year?
  * Has the offender been at the same address for the past 6 months?
  * Which option best describes the offender’s living situation at the time of arrest: With a significant other, with friends, with family, alone, in a shelter, homeless, or other?

➤ Marital status
  * Which option best describes the offender’s marital status at the time of arrest: Single, married, cohabitating, separated, divorced, or widowed?
➢ Serious mental illness
   * Does the offender have a history of serious mental illness, including psychotic disorders, bipolar disorder, or major depressive disorder?
Appendix A

General Risk Assessments

COMPAS (Correctional Officer Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions)

General Statistical Index of Recidivism (GSIR)

IORNS (Inventory of Offender Risks, Needs, and Strengths)

LS/CMI

LSI-R (Level of Service Inventory-Revised)

LSI-R: SV (Level of Service Inventory-Revised: Screening Version)

OGRS 3 (Offender Group Reconviction Scale, Version 3)

ORAS-CSST (Ohio Risk Assessment System- Community Supervision Screening Tool)

ORAS-CST (Ohio Risk Assessment System- Community Supervision Tool)

ORAS-PAT (Ohio Risk Assessment System- Pretrial Assessment Tool)

ORAS-PIT (Ohio Risk Assessment System Prison Intake Tool)

ORAS-RT (Ohio Risk Assessment System- Reentry Tool)

RST (Risk Screen Tool)

SAQ (Self-Appraisal Questionnaire)

Violent Risk Assessments

HCR-20 (Historical-Clinical-Risk Management)

START (Short-Term Assessment of Risk, Needs, and Treatability)

VRAG (Violence Risk Appraisal Guide)

Psychopathy Risk Assessments

PCL-R (Psychopathy Checklist-Revised)

PCL-SV (Psychopathy Checklist-Screening Version)

PPI-R (Psychopathic Personality Inventory - Revised)
LSRP (Levenson's Self-Report Psychopathy Scale)

**Dynamic Risk Assessments**

CSS-M (Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified)

HIQ (Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire)

HIT (How I Think Questionnaire)

NAS (Novaco Anger Scale)

LCSF (Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form)

MCAA (Measures of Criminal Attitudes and Associates)

PICTS (Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles)

TCU-CTS (Texas Christian University-Criminal Thinking Scale)
Appendix B

Static Predictors

Demographics

Current age
Gender
Culture/ethnicity

Criminal History

Nature of current offense
Multiple current charges/offenses
Age at first arrest
Previous youth dispositions
Prior adult arrests
Prior adult convictions
Previous probation sentence
Previous incarceration
Current incarceration
Barriers to release
History of probation/parole violations
History of institutional misconduct
Unauthorized absences
Failures to appear
Failed drug tests
Failures to comply with sentencing conditions
Outstanding charges
Gang participation
Criminal versatility

Offense specific

DUIs
Sex offenses
Fire setting
Shoplifting
White collar crime/organized crime/hate crime/terrorist activity

Violence specific

History of violence
Prior arrests for violent felonies
Prior convictions for violent felonies
Frequency of injury to victims
Use of weapons
Infractions for violence
Current violence
Young age at first incidence of violence
Domestic violence
Stalking/harassment
Victimization

Physical health/disability

Tattoos

Psychosocial factors
Current education
Ever suspended/expelled from school
Low intelligence
Learning disability
Current employment
Employment history
Underachievement
Job skills
Low wages
Participation/performance at work
Peer interactions at work
Authority interactions at work

Finances
Worrying about financial survival
Problems paying bills
Not enough money to get by
Reliance upon social assistance
Current housing
Residential stability
Homelessness
Absence of a verifiable address
Immigration issues

Current neighborhood
Level of crime in neighborhood
Gang activity in neighborhood
Drug activity in neighborhood

Family criminality
Parent ever jailed
Parent has had drug problems
Mother ever arrested
Partner/spouse criminality

Current marital/partner situation

Social support
Lack of personal support
Social isolation
Relationships
Family relationships
Peers outside of age range

Other Social Factors
Parenting concerns
Transportation
Language barriers

Criminal associates
Friends have been arrested
Friends who have been gang members

Social activities
Boredom proneness
Lack of engaging in leisure activities
Promiscuous sexual behavior

General Social Skills

Mental Health

Serious Mental Illness
Does offender have history of serious mental illness?
Does offender have active symptoms of major mental illness?
Is offender currently prescribed psychiatric meds?
Medication adherence
History of mental health treatment
Treatability
Mental state
Emotional State
Self-care
Interpersonal anxiety
Suicide
Self-harm
Suicide attempts

Antisocial personality/Psychopathy
Does offender have history of a personality disorder?
Does offender have history of psychopathy?
Does offender have history of early maladjustment?
Short temper
Often does things without thinking
Intimidating/controlling/manipulative
Lack of remorse or guilt
Pathological lying
Grandiose sense of self-worth
Seen as cold and callous
Glib/superficial charm
Shallow affect

Substance Abuse
Does offender have history of substance abuse?
Current illegal drug use
Current negative consequences associated with substance abuse
History of substance abuse treatment
Current perceived benefit of substance abuse treatment
Influence of alcohol or drugs on current offense
Is offender unresponsive to treatment?
Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)

Dynamic Predictors
Lack of insight
Negative attitudes
Impulsivity
Future plans lack feasibility
Exposure to destabilizers
Noncompliance with remediation attempts
Stress
Coping
Irresponsibility
Risk-taking
Motivation as a barrier
Problem-solving/self-management skill deficits
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Anger management deficits
Racist/sexist behavior
Poor behavioral controls

**Criminal attitudes**
Law does not help average people
Minor offenses, such as drug use, do not hurt anyone
Things stolen from rich people will not be missed
Responsibility for actions
Lack of concern for others
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The following is a list of the 24 counties represented in the 25 sample PSIs and the years in which the sample PSIs were collected, if available. One county was represented more than once.
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