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Introduction
Risk Assessment

- Process of evaluating and managing **likelihood** of future offending
  - Incompletely understood
  - Probabilities change across time
  - Interaction between characteristics & situations

- Can be:
  - Unstructured
  - Structured
    - Mechanical
  - Allow for professional judgment
Process of Risk Assessment
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Adapted from Health Level Seven (2010)
Overview of Risk Assessment Approaches
Evolution of Risk Assessment

- **First Generation**
  - Unstructured professional judgment

- **Second Generation**
  - Focus on static factors

- **Third Generation**
  - Consideration of dynamic factors & criminogenic needs

- **Fourth Generation**
  - Integration of case planning & intervention

---

1st Generation

- Unstructured professional judgment

- Advantages
  - Convenient, flexible
  - Inexpensive
  - Widely accepted
  - Able to inform treatment and management
1st Generation

- Unstructured professional judgment
- Disadvantages
  - Training and expertise
  - Lack of transparency
  - Highly susceptible to biases
  - Lack of consistency
  - Accuracy no better than chance

“Flipping Coins in the Courtroom”

Ennis & Litwack (1974)
2nd Generation

- Empirically-based, comprised of static risk factors

Advantages

- Transparent and objective
- Good reliability and predictive accuracy
- (Relatively) quick and easy
2nd Generation

- Empirically-based, comprised of static risk factors
- Disadvantages
  - Atheoretical
  - Do not allow for change over time
  - Limited identification of treatment targets
  - Limited integration of intervention
  - Decisions based on group norms
3\textsuperscript{rd} Generation

- Empirically-based and include wider variety of factors
  - Dynamic risk factors, criminogenic needs

- Advantages
  - Transparent
  - Sensitive to change over time
  - Good reliability and predictive accuracy
  - Theoretically sound
  - Identification of treatment targets
3rd Generation

- Empirically-based and include wider variety of factors
  - Dynamic risk factors, criminogenic needs
- Disadvantages
  - Repeated administration required to detect change
  - Potentially shorter shelf life
  - More time consuming
  - Decisions based on group norms
  - Limited integration of intervention
4th Generation

- Integration of risk management, treatment targets and modalities, and assessment of progress

- Advantages
  - Transparent
  - Sensitive to change over time
  - Good reliability and predictive accuracy
  - Theoretically sound
  - Allow for clinical judgment
  - Incorporates intervention
4th Generation

Integration of risk management, treatment targets and modalities, and assessment of progress

Disadvantages

- Repeated administration required to detect change
- Potentially shorter shelf life
- More time consuming
- More training and expertise
- Smaller research base
Risk Assessment in the U.S.

- Hundreds of different risk assessment tools available
- Rise in use of structured risk assessment in U.S.
- Varying in:
  - Evidence
  - Intended population
  - Intended outcome
  - Content
  - Approach
  - Length
  - Cost
Selecting a Risk Assessment Tool
Selecting a Risk Assessment Tool

Answer the following questions:

1. What is the evidence?
2. What is your outcome of interest?
3. What is your population?
4. What is your setting?
1. What is the evidence?

- No one instrument produces *most* accurate assessments

- Some evidence of superiority as a function of:
  - Outcome
  - Population
  - Implementation

See Desmarais & Singh (2014) and Skeem & Monahan (2011) for an overview.
Additional Considerations

- Generalizability of research studies to use in practice
  - Research assistants ≠ professionals
  - Time
  - Resources
  - Training

- Allegiance effects
  - Better performance in studies conducted by tool author

Desmarais & Singh (2013)
2. What is your outcome of interest?

- Some instruments perform better in assessing likelihood of particular outcomes
  - General vs specific form of violence
  - Context or setting of violence
  - Timing of violence
- Some instruments more/less relevant to clinical practice
  - Prediction vs management
  - Item content and composition
Important Considerations

- ‘Violence’ is not one behavior
  - Frequency
  - Severity
    - Physical vs nonphysical
    - Sexual vs nonsexual
    - Weapon?
  - Setting
    - Institution vs community
    - Private vs public
  - Timeframe
    - Imminent vs short-term vs long-term
  - Target(s)
Important Considerations

- Types of factors:
  - Static vs. dynamic factors
    - Historical vs. static factors
    - Stable vs. acute dynamic factors
  - Distal vs. proximal factors
  - Risk vs. protective factors
Protective Factors

- Any characteristics that reduce the risk of adverse outcome
  - More than the absence of a risk factor
- 4 reasons to integrate into risk assessment:
  1. Balanced view of offender
  2. Predictive validity
  3. Therapeutic alliance
  4. Professional mandate

Rogers (2000); de Ruiter & Nicholls (2011); Desmarais et al. (2012)
3. What is your population?

- Some instruments developed for specific populations
- Some instruments perform better for some subgroups
- Limited evidence of predictive validity for other subgroups

Desmarais & Singh (2013)
4. What is your setting?

- Information available
- Time available to complete a risk assessment
- Staff resources, training and background
- Cost

Desmarais & Singh (2013)
Using Risk Assessment to Inform Clinical Practice
Risk Assessment → Risk Reduction

- Accurate and reliable assessments do not reduce violence
- Must be:
  - implemented with fidelity
  - communicated to others
  - integrated into comprehensive case plan
  - reviewed and amended over time
Successful Implementation

- Steps to successful implementation in practice:
  1. Prepare
  2. Establish stakeholder and staff buy-in
  3. Select and prepare the risk assessment tool
  4. Prepare policies and essential documents
  5. Training
  6. Implement pilot test
  7. Full implementation
  8. Ongoing tasks for sustainability

Vincent, Guy, & Grisso (2012)
“Improper risk communication can render a risk assessment that was otherwise well-conducted completely useless or even worse, if it gives consumers the wrong impression.”

Heilbrun, Dvoskin, Hart & McNiel (1999, p. 94)
Communicating Assessment Results

- Completing the form and/or report ≠ communication

Recommended practices

- Be explicit
- Know your target audience
- Qualify limitations of assessment
- Contextualize the risk
- Describe plausible scenarios and contingencies
Case Conceptualization

- Identify those factors to relevant to this person’s functioning and outcomes
  - What is the “root cause” of the behavior?
  - Are there “gateway” factors?
  - Do factors cluster together representing an underlying vulnerability or strength?

- Consider both positive and negative formulations
  - What do things like when they are going well?
  - What do things like look when they are going poorly?

Scenario Planning

- Consider plausible scenarios or trajectories that might happen *during* the assessment timeframe
- Scenarios may include:
  - Repeat scenario or a flat trajectory
  - Twist scenario or sideways trajectory
  - Escalating or improving scenario
    - Doom (worst case) scenario
    - Optimistic (best case) scenario

Additional Considerations

- You should answer the following questions:
  - Nature
    - What is the outcome of concern?
  - Target
    - Who is likely to be hurt?
  - Severity
    - What is the likely injury or harm to self or others?
  - Timeline:
    - When might this occur?
  - Frequency
    - How often is it likely to occur?
  - Context
    - What might trigger it? What might prevent it?
  - Likelihood
    - How likely is it that this will happen?
Integration into Treatment Planning

- Risk-Need-Responsivity Model
  - Best practice for assessing and treating offenders
  - Framework for linking risk assessment with clinical practice and prioritizing treatment

- Reduced violence with adherence to:
  1. Risk principle
  2. Need principle
  3. Responsivity principle

Andrews & Dowden (2006); Andrews & Bonta (2010); Lowenkamp et al. (2006)
Risk Principle

- Match level of risk
  - Higher risk → more resources
  - Lower risk → fewer resources
- Over-intervening → increase adverse outcomes
  - Increase risk factors
  - Reducing protective factors
Need Principle

- Target individual risk factors relevant to risk of adverse outcomes

- Examples
  - Substance use
  - Mood
  - Attitudes
Responsivity Principle

- Take into account factors that can affect treatment outcomes
  - Examples
    - Intellectual functioning
    - Maturity
    - Mental health symptoms
    - Learning style
    - Motivation
  - Build upon individual strengths
Risk Management & Treatment Plan

- Consider all components of the risk assessment
  - Draw from case conceptualization and scenario planning
- Identify and balance short-term and long-term goals
  - Yours, the system’s and your client’s
- Use a stepwise, integrated approach that targets and prioritizes individual risks and needs
  - Step 1 – Stability
  - Step 2 – Improve functioning and reduce risk
Additional Considerations

- Given his/her level of functioning (cognitive and mental health), maturity, and motivation:
  - What structures and supports need to be in place?
  - What are the urgent/critical issues?
  - What do we work on now to provide the foundation for future progress?
  - How do we measure:
    - improvements or success?
    - setbacks or failure?
Review and Amendment

- Both the assessment and risk management/treatment plan have a shelf-life
- Identify and implement mechanism and timeline for review
  - Modify as necessary
- Not necessary to start from scratch
  - What has changed (for better or worse)?
  - What is the same?
  - What do we need to do differently?
Broken Leg Dilemma

- Life events and circumstances change limiting applicability of risk assessment and plan
  - Examples
    - Physical incapacity
    - Setting
    - Interpersonal relationships
    - Employment
    - Intervention

Buchanan, Binder, Norko & Swartz (2012)
Case Application
Short-Term Assessment of Risk and Treatability (START)

- Structured professional judgment scheme
- 20 dynamic items
  - Each rated for current strength and vulnerability
  - Relevance to individual client (currently and historically)
- Assess short-term risk of:
  - Externalized aggression (violence)
  - Internalized aggression (suicide, self-harm)
  - Related high-risk behaviors (self-neglect, substance abuse, victimization, unauthorized absence, other)
Status of START

- Used in diverse settings
  - Psychiatric (civil and forensic), corrections, VA
  - Institution and community
- Adolescent version to be published Summer 2014
- Recognized as:
  - Best practice for assessment and management of violence and related risks (UK Department of Health, 2007)
  - Promising practice for assessment of inpatient aggression (Daffern, 2007)
  - Leading practice in mental health services (Accreditation Canada, 2011)
- Translated into 8 different languages
- Implemented in more than a dozen countries
**Item Example: 2. Relationship**

- **Key Features:**
  - Interest in building and sustaining close bonds with others
  - Demonstrated capacity to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>VULNERABILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maximally Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderately Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Minimally Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Item Example: 8. Substance Abuse

- Key features:
  - Use of illegal substance(s), alcohol, prescribed medications, or over the counter drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>VULNERABILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Item</td>
<td>2 Maximally Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abstains. Drinks in moderation. Restricts intake. Remains responsible. Respects pertinent laws. Protects others from ill effects (i.e., is aware of the consequences of irresponsible use). Accepting of treatment (if needed).

Completing START involves integrating past and current evidence to estimate and manage future risks.

Work:
- Top to bottom
- Left to right
Case Study 1

- Mr. Bloggs
Case Study 2

- Mr. Rabot
Thank you!

- **Contact information:**

  **Dr. Sarah L. Desmarais**  
  Assistant Professor  
  Department of Psychology  
  North Carolina State University  
  Phone: (919) 515-1723  
  Email: sdesmarais@ncsu.edu  
  Faculty Page: [http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/sldesmar](http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/sldesmar)  
  Lab website: [www.ncsuforensicpsychology.com](http://www.ncsuforensicpsychology.com)