PVDMI

Part of an overall strategy designed to reduce risk of recidivism, enhance success on parole, and utilize resources in the most effective manner.

- 2006 Expert Panel—California Logic Model
- 2007 Rehabilitation Strike Team
- Little Hoover Commission
- Independent Review Panel
The PVDMI: Structured Decision-Making Tool

- 2008 survey of 37 parole-granting states found that 32 (86%) used such tools.¹
- 27 used them to set conditions of parole.
- 22 used them to determine level of supervision.
- 19 states are also adopting such tools to guide responses to violations of parole.

¹Findings From the APAI International Survey of Releasing Authorities, Association of Paroling Authorities International, April 2008
### Structured Decision-Making Tool

**Violation Severity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Mandatory Referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most Intensive</td>
<td>Mandatory Referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Referral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Least Intensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Referral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Violation Severity

- Technical and Non-Technical violations are rated for severity.
- Ratings are based upon Board of Parole Hearing Standards.
- Sex Offenders and High-Risk Sex Offenders have appropriate enhancements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Non-sex Offender</th>
<th>Sex Offender</th>
<th>High Risk Sex Offender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk to Re-Offend

- DAPO required a risk assessment that was validated on California offenders.
- COMPAS was years away from validation.
- Pressure was on to produce a solution in weeks or months rather than years.
- Decision made to construct the California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA).
Constructing the CSRA

• Combined effort of:
  – CDCR Division of Parole Operations
  – CDCR Research
  – The 2007 Rehabilitation Strike Team
  – UCI Center for Evidence-Based Corrections
  – Washington State Institute for Public Policy
  – Assessments.com
  – UCLA
California Static Risk Assessment

• Computes the risk to re-offend.
• Uses static risk indicators—characteristics that do not change—to predict risk.
  – Gender
  – Age
  – Offense History
• The CSRA is an actuarial risk tool.
How Actuarial Risk Prediction Works

• Insurers want to know the likelihood that a driver will be in an accident
• They use their extensive records data to determine what factors are related to drivers experiencing an accident
• The model:

\[ \text{Risk (accident)} = \text{age} + \text{gender} + \text{zip code} + \text{prior accident history} + \ldots \text{etc.} \]
CSRA Foundations

- Level of Service Inventory—Revised
- Modifications by Robert Barnoski of WSIPP
- Elements of the COMPAS
- These tools provided the “starting point” for the development of the CSRA
Construction and Validation

• CDCR research selected 103,000 offenders released in FY 2002-03.
• DOJ matched offenders to their arrest histories, prior and subsequent to release.
• OISB provided additional offender characteristics data.
• DJJ matched for juvenile histories.
• DAPO provided violation information.
Development of the Model

- Sample divided randomly into construction and validation groups.
- Developed items and weights on the construction group.
- Validated instrument on the validation group.
Results: 22 Items to Predict Recidivism

- Demographics: Age at release, gender
- Number of felony sentences
- Felony sentences for murder/ manslaughter, sex, violent, weapons, property, drug and escape offenses
- Misdemeanor sentences for assault, sex, weapons, property, drug, alcohol and escape offenses
- Revocations of probation or parole supervision
What does the CSRA predict?

**Measures of Re-offending**

- **Arrest**
  - Captures the most criminal behavior.
  - Most likely to “over-capture.”

- **Conviction**
  - Highest standard of proof.
  - In California, instances of criminal behavior do not always result in conviction for a new offense.

- **Return to Custody**
  - Most direct impact on institutions population.

**CSRA uses arrest as the outcome--most conservative outcome for protection of public safety.**
CSRA Scoring

- Low Risk
- Moderate Risk
- High Risk in Three Categories:
  - Violent Re-offending
  - Property Re-offending
  - Substance Abuse Re-offending
CSRA Scores and Recidivism
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## Accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>AUC</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Recidivism Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSRA</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>103,000 releases</td>
<td>Felony arrest</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPAS</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>515 California parolees</td>
<td>Return to prison</td>
<td>Farabee and Zhang (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History Computation</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>28,519 Federal offenders</td>
<td>Re-conviction, re-arrest w/out dispo. available, supervision revocation</td>
<td>US Sentencing Commission (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSI-R</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>22,533 Wash. offenders</td>
<td>Any conviction</td>
<td>WSIPP (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Static Risk Assessment</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>51,648 Wash. offenders</td>
<td>Felony conviction</td>
<td>WSIPP (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weaknesses

- Decisions are based on aggregate, or group, performance.
- Does not include dynamic (changeable) factors.
- May be “blind” to important factors that may make a difference, positively or negatively, for the individual.
Strengths

- Promotes efficiency, consistency and objectivity in decision-making
- Has an empirical basis
- Is more accurate than practitioner judgment alone
- Best results when combined with practitioner judgment
Importance of Overrides

• No actuarial tool is 100% accurate all the time.
• Overrides are expected.
• Question: How many is enough? How many is too much?