

## Understanding Risk Assessment in Arkansas Juvenile Court: Tips for the Practitioner in a Time of Change



D'lorah L. Hughes\*

*Assistant Professor*

The juvenile justice system in Arkansas has changed substantially in the past century.<sup>1</sup> Recently, the legislature has focused its efforts on reducing the commitment of juvenile offenders.<sup>2</sup> In 1989, the Arkansas Senate found that the number of juveniles committed to Youth Services Centers was quickly increasing and many of the juvenile offenders in secure detention were not in need of commitment.<sup>3</sup> The Arkansas General Assembly recommended that the Governor establish a committee to review and establish the criteria to commit a juvenile to the Youth Services Centers.<sup>4</sup> The Center for the Study of Youth Policy ("CSYP") analyzed case file infor-

mation for the 365 male and 38 female youth committed to Youth Services Centers and the 106 juveniles committed to the Department of Corrections for the first nine months of 1989 as a basis for the committee report.<sup>5</sup>

The CSYP/Committee report found that 44 percent of males and 73 percent of females had only low risk or medium risk scores; a finding which suggests that a substantial number of the juvenile offenders placed in Youth Services Centers did not belong in secure detention facilities but would be best served in non-institutional programs.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, the Governor appointed the Juvenile Justice Task Force to review the report and determine how to im-

---

\*The author would like to thank two women whose assistance and support made this article possible. First, my Research Assistant Emily Bridges who possesses unending stores of diligence, dedication and patience and is irreplaceable. And second, I would like to thank Professor Karen Koch whose editing and sounding board skills are immeasurable.

1. See Russell K. Van Vleet and Donna Gay, *Arkansas and Arizona: Reforming Troubled Youth Corrections Systems, Arkansas: New Beginnings*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Youth Policy, 3-9 (June 1992).

2. See *id.* at 9-15.

3. *Id.* at 12.

4. *Id.*

5. *Id.* 12-13.

6. *Id.*

plement its findings.<sup>7</sup> The Task Force's work resulted in the codification<sup>8</sup> of a mandate for the use of the Risk Assessment System for Arkansas Juvenile Offenders. This system was developed by the Commitment Criteria Review Committee and distributed by the Administrative Office of the Courts.<sup>9</sup>

Twenty years later, Arkansas still utilizes this same Risk Assessment tool and little has changed in the Youth Services picture for committed juveniles. In 2007, 621 juveniles were committed to DYS. Forty-two percent of these commitments were for misdemeanor level offenses.<sup>10</sup> Statistics also show that during the first three quarters of 2008, more than 90 percent of all commitments to DYS were for non-violent offenses.<sup>11</sup>

Lack of an adequate risk assessment tool in Arkansas is not the sole problem with commitment or with the juvenile justice system, nor is it the sole solution. Much work remains in reforming the system; the need for expanding sources of funding, the development community based treatment options for juveniles who require mental health or substance abuse treatment, and the creation of intervention programs to prevent delinquency just to name a few. While an improved risk assessment instrument will not directly address all of these issues, it will reduce the confinement of juveniles who do not pose a serious risk of

re-offense and it will help match those in the delinquency system to the right kinds of interventions and programs.

This article seeks to provide the juvenile practitioner with a basic understanding of the concept of risk assessment and how it is currently used in Arkansas juvenile courts. Because the current instrument, the Risk Assessment System for Arkansas Juvenile Offenders, is undergoing a revision, this article also hopes to provide the juvenile practitioner with tips on how to best serve juvenile clients until the new risk assessment tool is implemented.

### Risk Assessment Basics

Risk Assessment is a means of classifying juveniles based on their potential to cause harm to others in the community and on the likelihood they will reoffend.<sup>12</sup> As of 2003, 86 percent of state juvenile justice systems across the country utilized risk assessment.<sup>13</sup> Ideally, risk assessment instruments allow juvenile courts to target juvenile offenders with both appropriate sanctions and treatment.<sup>14</sup> If used properly, risk assessment will not only improve decisions about treatment and disposition but will improve public safety.<sup>15</sup>

---

7. *Id.* at 14.

8. ARK. CODE ANN. § 9-27-330(a)(1)(B)(i) (2008 & Supp. 2009).

9. Van Fleet and Gay, *supra* note 1, at 15.

10. Pat Arthur & Tim Roche, *Juvenile Justice Reform in Arkansas: Building a Better Future for Youth, their Families, and the Community*, A Report in Collaboration with the Arkansas Division of Youth Services, 5 (May 2008).

11. *Id.*

12. Donna B. Towberman, *A National Survey of Juvenile Risk Assessment*, 43 JUV. & FAM. CT. J. 61 (1992).

13. Craig S. Schwalbe, *Risk Assessment for Juvenile Justice: A Meta-Analysis*, 31 LAW HUM. BEHAV. 449 (2007).

14. *Id.*

15. Arthur & Roche, *supra* note 10, at 19.

## UNDERSTANDING RISK ASSESSMENT IN ARKANSAS JUVENILE COURT

Typically, risk assessment tools assign numerical scores for a set of risk factors and place the juvenile into a class ranging from “low-risk” to “high-risk” based on this score.<sup>16</sup> The assumption behind these scores is that a “high-risk” juvenile needs placement in a more secure facility and/or more intensive treatment, while lower levels of treatment and security are acceptable for a “low-risk” juvenile.<sup>17</sup> Criminal offense history, severity of the current offense, age at the time of the offense and drug abuse are all common factors measured in risk assessment instruments.<sup>18</sup>

Risk assessment can be done at various stages of the juvenile justice process. An assessment can be completed at the intake or detention stage and used as a baseline tool to determine whether a minor can be returned home or should be detained.<sup>19</sup> At later stages in the process such as disposition or sentencing, risk assessment can assist in decision-making regarding what level of security the child requires or what type of treatment is needed.<sup>20</sup>

When used at the time of detention, the risk assessment instrument has been described as “essentially a triage device that brings structure, uniformity, and predictability to the detention decision-making process.”<sup>21</sup> The instrument provides a score and classification for the juvenile, but the juvenile court retains discretion to choose a different detention outcome.<sup>22</sup>

Implementation of a valid risk assessment instrument is important for a variety of reasons. First, incarceration can be particularly harmful to youth, often increasing recidivism rather than decreasing its occurrence.<sup>23</sup> This is particularly true for low-risk youth whose exposure to more serious criminal conduct may “toughen” them and actually encourage more serious criminal behavior.<sup>24</sup>

Secondly, committing juveniles who do not require secure detention and are unlikely to commit more crime takes services and resources away from those who do pose a risk to the community.<sup>25</sup> Placement in secure juvenile residential facilities is expensive; upwards of \$150 per day per youth.<sup>26</sup> The average cost of

---

16. Schwalbe, *supra* note 13, at 450.

17. Towberman, *supra* note 12, at 61.

18. Schwalbe, *supra* note 13 at 450.

19. Donna B. Towberman, *A National Survey of Juvenile Risk Assessment*, 43 JUV. & FAM. CT. J. 61 (1992).

20. *See id.*; *See also* David Steinhart, *Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment: A Practice Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform*, Annie E. Casey Foundation 8 (2006) (available at <http://www.aecf.org/upload/PublicationFiles/JJ3622H5038.pdf>).

21. David Steinhart, *Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment: A Practice Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform*, Annie E. Casey Foundation 9 (2006) (available at <http://www.aecf.org/upload/PublicationFiles/JJ3622H5038.pdf>).

22. *Id.*

23. *See* Arthur & Tim Roche, *Juvenile Justice Reform in Arkansas: Building a Better Future for Youth, their Families, and the Community*, A Report in Collaboration with the Arkansas Division of Youth Services, 4 (May 2008).

24. *Id.*

25. *Id.* at 19.

26. *Id.* at 5.

confining youth in Arkansas's most secure facility is \$60,000.<sup>27</sup> As more money is spent on maintaining these facilities, less can be used for non-residential community-based alternatives. Programs such as family interventions, drug and alcohol programs and mental health treatment are "virtually non-existent" throughout Arkansas.<sup>28</sup> but are crucial to rehabilitating our youth. The cost of even a few misplaced juveniles could fund at least the start of a more useful community program.

Finally, committing low-risk, non-violent offenders does not prevent recidivism. In fact, the most significant factor in increasing the odds of recidivism is the experience of incarceration.<sup>29</sup>

### Risk Assessment in Arkansas

Risk Assessment is mandated under the Arkansas Code when a juvenile is found to be delinquent and the Court wishes to commit the juvenile to a Youth Services Center.<sup>30</sup> The Code specifically requires the use of the Risk Assessment System for Arkansas Juvenile Offenders distributed and administered by the

Administrative Office of the Courts ("AOC").<sup>31</sup> The Court must also forward this risk assessment to the Division of Youth Services along with any other pertinent information about the juvenile.<sup>32</sup>

The Arkansas Risk Assessment System is based on six (6) risk factor areas: (1) offense type – degree of seriousness, (2) the number of prior felony adjudications, (3) the number of prior misdemeanor adjudications, (4) the juvenile's age at first adjudication, (5) prior out of home placements and (6) specific considerations related to or involved in the instant offense such as (a) drug use, (b) involvement of weapons, (c) personal injury to victim and (d) involvement of gang or peer group activity.<sup>33</sup> A juvenile is deemed "high risk" and commitment to DYS is recommended with a score of ten (10) points or higher.<sup>34</sup> A score of seven (7) to nine (9) indicates eligibility for commitment but in a less restrictive placement and a "low risk" score of six (6) points or below makes a juvenile offender ineligible for secure placement.<sup>35</sup> While the statute requires *consideration* of the risk assessment score, the judge retains discretion to either

---

27. *Id.*

28. *Id.*

29. Brent B. Benda & Connie L. Tollet, *A Study of Recidivism of Serious and Persistent Offenders Among Adolescents*, J. CRIM. JUST. Vol. 27, No. 2, at 111-126 (1999).

30. ARK. CODE ANN. § 9-27-330(a)(1)(B)(i) (2008 & Supp. 2009).

31. *Id.*

32. ARK. CODE ANN. § 9-28-208 (2008).

33. See Risk Assessment System for Arkansas Juvenile Offenders Objective Commitment Criteria, attached; See also *Jones v. Arkansas*, 332 Ark. 617, 620-21, 967 S.W.2d 559, 560-61 (1998).

34. *Id.*

35. *N.A. v. State*, No. CA 03-1426, 2004 WL 2294378, at \*2 (Ark. App. Oct. 13, 2004).

follow or ignore the assessment, placing the juvenile somewhere that is consistent with his/her best interests.<sup>36</sup>

There are a variety of types of risk assessment methods utilizing various risk factors, point scales and methods of analysis.<sup>37</sup> For our purposes, it may be most helpful to look at risk assessment instruments through their historical development, dividing them into categories of first, second and third generation.<sup>38</sup> Arkansas has what can best be described as a second-generation risk assessment tool.

In first generation risk assessment, juvenile justice professionals completed the assessment without the aid of a structured tool, relying merely on their personal impression on the youth.<sup>39</sup> This is the weakest of the three methods, as a mere impression cannot be uniformly or reliably applied.<sup>40</sup>

Second generation risk assessment uses statistical information to predict recidivism and classify juvenile offenders.<sup>41</sup> The emphasis is on classifying the risk and often relies solely on static risk factors like offense history.<sup>42</sup> Arkansas's risk assessment tool falls into this category because it is limited to stat-

ic factors that focus on the juvenile's criminal record and the seriousness of the current offense. Out of ten questions, five relate to the current offense and five ask about the juvenile's criminal history. None of these factors can or will be changed with mitigators such as lifestyle or education, nor will they be changed by rehabilitation or treatment. The current offense will always be the same, as will the criminal history. While there is one section on the form that allows for aggravating or mitigating factors, it carries no weight in the point value or assessment score.

Third generation risk assessment tools often contain a wide variety of dynamic risk factors like school-related problems and family history of mental health issues.<sup>43</sup> These instruments use statistical information to "inform intervention planning" and classify the risk of recidivism.<sup>44</sup> In other words, assessment of dynamic factors allows for a more detailed analysis of both the risk the child poses and the treatment the child needs.

The Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) is a third generation instrument measuring forty-two items spanning from information on the cur-

---

36. *See id.*

37. This article does not attempt to discuss in full the variables that affect predictive validity of risk assessment instruments. There is a significant body of work on the factors that affect juvenile risk of recidivism that is beyond the scope of this article.

38. Craig S. Schwalbe, *Risk Assessment for Juvenile Justice: A Meta-Analysis*, 31 LAW HUM. BEHAV. 449, 450 (2007).

39. *Id.*

40. *Id.*

41. *Id.*

42. *Id.*

43. Craig S. Schwalbe, *Risk Assessment for Juvenile Justice: A Meta-Analysis*, 31 LAW HUM. BEHAV. 449, 450 (2007).

44. *Id.*

rent offense to the juvenile's feelings and goals.<sup>45</sup> DYS currently uses this tool during their intake process once a juvenile has been committed.<sup>46</sup> While the YLS/CMI is a reliable instrument it is only useful when well implemented. DYS reports that out of 621 commitments in 2007, only 82 assessments were completed. Additionally, DYS staff need "more qualified training" in how to properly utilize the tool.<sup>47</sup>

While a second generation tool is a start and can be of limited assistance, Arkansas needs to transition to a third generation risk assessment tool in order to reduce over-reliance on residential detention facilities and ensure that low-risk youth are not improperly included in the system. The ideal risk assessment instrument is one that includes factors that are "most predictive of criminality"<sup>48</sup> and third generation instruments tend to have higher levels of predictability.<sup>49</sup> Whether Arkansas expands its use of the YLS/CMI or develops a new instrument, any measurement of risk and need must allow for the consideration of dynamic factors in order to be useful.

In addition to the types of factors reviewed, Arkansas's risk assessment tool's effectiveness is further limited by the way it is used in the state's juvenile justice system. Currently, the Risk Assessment System is only triggered when there is a recommendation that the juvenile be committed to the Division of Youth Services.

While it is important that a risk assessment be done before a serious step such as commitment, it may be useful for DYS to determine program placement at an earlier stage, and use a reliable standardized risk and needs assessment as a method of intervention. By matching a juvenile with appropriate treatment early on, the juvenile court might be able to prevent him/her from ever arriving at a place where commitment is at issue.

Additionally, juvenile court staff and any others who may conduct a risk assessment should be given guidance and proper training. The current tool provides no instruction on its use, definition of terms, or methodology. For example, the Arkansas Risk Assessment System asks for the number of prior out of home placements and the juvenile is assessed one point if he/she has had one or two or two points if he/she has had three or more.<sup>50</sup> While the form states that the out of home placement should be for delinquency, it does not provide any guidance to the assessor on how to count the placement if there are dependency issues as well, or if the juvenile was placed on more than one occasion during the same case. Even DYS staff, who have been using a reliable and valid risk assessment instrument since 2007, "need more qualified training" to ensure consistent use and proper application of the tool.<sup>51</sup> Risk assessment is not as simple as checking a box "yes" or "no" or assigning two points for every misdemeanor.

---

45. *Id.*; for copyright reasons the actual YLS/CMI materials cannot be reproduced here. See [http://downloads.mhs.com/YLSCMI/yls\\_cmi-brochure.pdf](http://downloads.mhs.com/YLSCMI/yls_cmi-brochure.pdf) for a brochure on the YLS/CMI assessment tool.

46. Pat Arthur & Tim Roche, *Juvenile Justice Reform in Arkansas: Building a Better Future for Youth, their Families, and the Community*, A Report in Collaboration with the Arkansas Division of Youth Services, 19 (May 2008).

47. *Id.*

48. Donna B. Towberman, *A National Survey of Juvenile Risk Assessment*, 43 JUV. & FAM. CT. J. 61, 62 (1992).

49. Craig S. Schwalbe, *Risk Assessment for Juvenile Justice: A Meta-Analysis*, 31 LAW HUM. BEHAV. 449, 458 (2007).

50. Arkansas Risk Assessment Form at 1; see attached.

51. Arthur & Roche, *supra* note 46, at 19.

## UNDERSTANDING RISK ASSESSMENT IN ARKANSAS JUVENILE COURT

Though Arkansas has made progress, there are many low-risk juveniles erroneously committed to secure placement because the Division of Youth Services and juvenile courts are not properly and consistently using risk assessment instruments.<sup>52</sup>

### Changes to Arkansas Risk Assessment

Commendably, many in the Arkansas juvenile justice system are committed to making the necessary changes and developing a risk assessment instrument that will reduce commitments of low-risk youth and assist in making appropriate and more effective placement decisions.<sup>53</sup> Over the last few years two of the major players in the juvenile justice system, DYS and the AOC have made vast strides in reforming this vital tool.

DYS obtained the assistance of the National Center for Youth Law (NCYL) to develop a plan for reforming Arkansas's juvenile justice system.<sup>54</sup> The report, published in May of 2008, focuses on reducing reliance on

incarceration and increasing the number and use of community-based programs.<sup>55</sup> Based on research including interviews with judges, parents, youths, attorneys and others, the report found a causal link between over-incarceration and a shortage of available treatment alternatives, failure to assess the risks and needs of juveniles and other factors.<sup>56</sup> Recommendations for reform included a standardized needs and risk assessment tool.<sup>57</sup>

In June of 2008, the AOC and the Arkansas Judicial Council's Juvenile Committee formed a subcommittee to review the current risk assessment system.<sup>58</sup> The members of this subcommittee include public defenders, prosecutors, juvenile court officers, DYS employees and juvenile judges from around the state of Arkansas.<sup>59</sup> The Committee met again in August of 2008 with the primary goal of reworking the current Risk Assessment tool and implementing training for juvenile court staff and judges on the new instrument. The AOC Committee hopes to implement a new system beginning in January 2010.<sup>60</sup>

---

52. Pat Arthur and Tim Roche, *Juvenile Justice Reform in Arkansas: Building a Better Future for Youth, their Families, and the Community*, A Report in Collaboration with the Arkansas Division of Youth Services, 19 (May 2008).

53. *Id.*

54. *See generally, id.*

55. *Id.*

56. *Id.* at 18.

57. *Id.*

58. Interview with Connie Hickman Tanner, Director of Juvenile Division Courts, Administrative Office of the Courts (May 22, 2009, discussing New Developments in Arkansas's Juvenile Justice System).

59. *Id.*

60. After the new tool is implemented you should contact your local Juvenile Court for additional information. A follow-up article analyzing the new assessment tool and discussing the response to this change should be available in the 2010 edition of this publication.

### Tips for the Practitioner

Risk Assessment can be very effective both in determining risk and assessing need. Until Arkansas adopts a new instrument, the following practice tips will assist the juvenile defense attorney in representing his/her client well under the current system.

- **Complete a risk assessment using the current instrument.**

Though this article has outlined a few of the problems, the current system is still in place and mandatory. Until a new form is implemented, you should know what score the court is likely to see for your client. This will also allow you to prepare to argue that the risk assessment score is lower or higher than your assessment.

- **Remember that this is NOT adult criminal court.**

Juvenile Practice is a specialty niche area that requires expertise and should be treated as such. Though the juvenile court system is an adversarial system that parallels the adult criminal court system, there are significant differences that one must be aware of in practice.

- Though the rules of evidence and criminal procedure generally apply, there may be additional rules specific to juvenile court.
- Dispositions, or sentencing, in juvenile court offer a much wider range of options. Since the goal of the juvenile system is primarily rehabilitative, focus is often on treatment and issues possibly unrelated to the underlying charge.

- Parents and/or guardians play a much greater role though the juvenile is still the client.

- **Interview the juvenile and his/her family extensively.**

As mentioned above, a case in juvenile court is often about far more than the alleged criminal act. Juvenile courts often want to know who the juvenile is as much as they want to know what your client did or did not do at the time in question.

- Phrase your questions carefully keeping in mind the child's age, background and abilities into consideration. Children are not just small adults and should be interviewed differently.<sup>61</sup>
- Consider interviewing the child separately from the parent/guardian. Ask both about who lives in the house, what each person is like, where they work, etc.
- Gather information on all of the children in the household; grade in school, mental health, criminal history, substance abuse, etc.
- Gather the same information for all adults in the house and both parents, regardless of where they reside.

- **Create a placement plan of your own.**

If you are facing a situation where the court is considering commitment and completing a risk assessment, one of the best tools you have is the plan you create. Develop a plan that reflects the treatment your client desires but still takes into consideration the seriousness of the offense. You may need to

---

61. For more resources on interviewing children, see ANNE GRAFFAM WALKER, HANDBOOK ON QUESTIONING CHILDREN: A LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE (2d ed. 1999). See also the National Juvenile Defender Center at [www.njdc.info/index.php](http://www.njdc.info/index.php).

## UNDERSTANDING RISK ASSESSMENT IN ARKANSAS JUVENILE COURT

seek assistance in not only educating yourself about the resources available in your community, but also educating yourself about your client's needs.

Be prepared with alternatives or compromise plans and be ready to implement the plan if the court agrees. Make sure that the treatment facility has space available. Lastly, send the juvenile to the facility for an intake interview in advance of the court date to ensure that it is a good fit and that your client will agree to go.

- **Utilize professionals from other fields.**

As a juvenile defense lawyer you are often called upon to act as counselor, social worker, and psychologist all rolled into one. Resist the urge to practice in fields where you have no expertise. Call on others to get assessments and analysis of the juvenile's mental or physical health, reading ability or other related concerns. Often these reports may already exist at the juvenile's school, doctor or with the court from a prior case. Collaborating with others can assist you not only in developing the best defense for your client, but addressing many of the other issues your client may face.

This information can be provided to the court at the same time as the risk assessment. Ideally, anything relevant to the question of whether the juvenile requires detention or commitment should be provided to the court as soon as is feasible in your case. One may be able to avoid the court's consideration of commitment to DYS as a viable sentencing option, thus avoiding the use of the current risk assessment tool.

- **Develop a relationship with the juvenile's probation officer.**

Too often in the adversarial system we draw lines where they do not need to exist.

While it is correct that the juvenile probation officer works at the behest of the court, he/she is also the person in the system who likely has the most contact with your juvenile client. Be cognizant of your role and theirs, but recognize that they may possess information about the juvenile that you do not and they often have years of experience and insight to offer as well. Talk with them if for no other reason than to know how they view your client. Whether you ask for their opinion or not, they will be sharing it with the court on the hearing date.

- **Get involved in juvenile issues in your community.**

Politics, for better or worse, is a reality of juvenile justice. Programming and treatment facilities are expensive and the public worries both about the well being of children and public safety. Involvement with these issues will help you, as a practitioner, stay current with the changes in law and resources available for your juvenile clients.

### Conclusion

The Arkansas Juvenile Court is charged with the mandate to "give preference to the least restrictive disposition consistent with the best interests of the juvenile and welfare of the juvenile and the public."<sup>62</sup> In order to meet that charge, Arkansas must continue to reform its juvenile justice system. The development and implementation of a new risk assessment instrument is a crucial part of meeting that mandate. Practitioners should be aware of the developments and transitions taking place, and use all of the current resources available for representing juvenile clients.

---

62. ARK. CODE ANN. § 9-27-329(d) (2008 & Supp. 2009).

### **Risk Assessment System for Arkansas Juvenile Offenders Objective Commitment Criteria**

The Risk Assessment System is designed to achieve three goals:

- 1) **Protection of the Public:** by ensuring commitment eligible juveniles receive priority attention.
- 2) **Protection of the Juvenile:** by ensuring that the most serious cases receive the most prompt and intensive assistance.
- 3) **Consistent Examination of Risk:** by ensuring that all circumstances pertinent to the juvenile are addressed, based on objective circumstances for each specific juvenile.

The most important part of the Risk Assessment System is the Risk Assessment Guideline. The Guideline is to be used by the Circuit, Juvenile Division Court in documenting the basis of the Court's commitment decision. The Risk Assessment System is designed to identify six risk factor areas associated with the juvenile's past history and present circumstances. These areas include:

- 1) The offense type - the degree of seriousness;
- 2) The number of prior felony adjudications;
- 3) The number of prior misdemeanor adjudications;
- 4) The juvenile's age at first adjudication;
- 5) Prior out-of-home placements;
- 6) Specific considerations related to or involved in the instant offense

UNDERSTANDING RISK ASSESSMENT IN ARKANSAS JUVENILE COURT

Risk Assessment Guideline Form - Page 1

**Adjudicated Offense History**

	<b>Instant Offense</b>	<b>Most Serious Prior Offense</b>	
<b><u>Offense Type</u></b>			
Misdemeanor/Unclassified Felony	2 points	1 point	_____
D and C Felony	5 points	3 points	_____
B and A Felony	7 points	5 points	_____
Y Felony	10 points	7 points	_____

**Number of felonies in past three years**

0 to 3	0 points		_____
4 to 6	1 point		_____
7 Plus	5 points		_____

**Number of misdemeanors in past year**

0 to 3	0 points		_____
4 to 6	1 point		_____
7 Plus	2 points		_____

**Age at first adjudication**

13 and under	1 point		_____
14 and over	0 points		_____

**Prior out-of-home placements**

None	0 points		_____
1 to 2 for delinquency	1 point		_____
3 or more for delinquency	2 points		_____

**Instant offense related to drug use**

No or unknown	0 points		_____
Yes - alcohol/marijuana	1 point		_____
Yes - cocaine/heroin	2 points		_____

**Instant offense involved use of weapon**

No or unknown	0 points		_____
Yes	1 point		_____

**Instant offense resulted in personal injury to victim**

No or unknown	0 points		_____
Yes	1 point		_____

**Instant offense involved or related to gang or peer group activity**

No or unknown	0 points		_____
Yes	1 point		_____

**Risk Assessment Guideline Form - Page 2**

**Aggravating/Mitigating Factors:** (Describe additional and clearly documented information not otherwise incorporated in the risk score for this youth.)

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

**Risk Assessment Scores**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Score Range</b>	<b>Placement Options</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>
High Risk	10 points or above	commitment recommended	_____
Medium Risk	7-9 points	commitment eligible but less restrictive placement preferred	_____
Low Risk	6 points and below	not usually eligible for secure placement	_____