

Use of Risk and Needs Assessment Information at Sentencing: Travis County, Texas

**CENTER FOR SENTENCING INITIATIVES
RESEARCH DIVISION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE
COURTS**

PROJECT DIRECTOR

Pamela M. Casey, Ph.D.

PROJECT MANAGER

Jennifer K. Elek, Ph.D.

PROJECT STAFF

Kathryn A. Holt

Tracey D. Johnson

Shelley Spacek Miller

Hon. Roger K. Warren (Ret.)

December 2013



Center for Sentencing Initiatives

This report was produced by the National Center for State Courts' Center for Sentencing Initiatives (CSI). CSI conducts research, provides information and tools, offers education and technical assistance, facilitates cross-state learning and collaboration, and works closely with the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators to implement their resolution In Support of Sentencing Practices that Promote Public Safety and Reduce Recidivism. To learn more about CSI, visit www.ncsc.org/csi

I. About this Report

In August 2011, the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators adopted a resolution recommending that “offender risk and needs assessment information be available to inform judicial decisions regarding effective management and reduction of the risk of offender recidivism.”¹ The resolution noted that supervision and treatment decisions informed by valid and reliable offender risk and needs assessment (RNA) information is a critical component of effective strategies to reduce recidivism.

This report is one in a series describing the experiences of individual jurisdictions using RNA information to inform sentencing decisions. These profile reports are not intended to be a comprehensive study of all stakeholder views in a jurisdiction regarding the use of the assessment information. Rather, they offer a current picture of how

¹ Conference of Chief Justices and Conference of State Court Administrators. (2011). *Resolution 7 In Support of the Guiding Principles on Using Risk and Needs Assessment Information in the Sentencing Process*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts (available <http://ccj.ncsc.org/~media/Microsites/Files/CCJ/Resolutions/08032011-Support-Guiding-Principles-Using-Risk-Needs-Assessment-Information-Sentencing-Process.ashx>). CCJ and COSCA include the highest ranking judicial officer and court administrator from every state and U. S. Territory. The resolution endorsed a set of guiding principles developed by a National Working Group. For a description of the guiding principles, see Casey, P., Warren, R. K., & Elek, J. (2011). *Using Offender Risk Assessment Information at Sentencing: Guidance for Courts from a National Working Group*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts (available <http://www.ncsc.org/sitecore/content/microsites/csi/home/Topics/~media/Microsites/Files/CSI/RNA%20Guide%20Final.ashx>).

some stakeholders are incorporating the information into their sentencing practices.

The reports identify the population of offenders for which RNA information is obtained and the assessment instruments used in the jurisdiction, describe the assessment report provided to the court, discuss how the assessment information is used, and report on any outcomes typically tracked by the jurisdiction. When available, the report also provides an example of the assessment information provided to the court. In addition to these individual jurisdictional profiles, a forthcoming report will identify common practices and lessons learned across jurisdictions using RNA information at sentencing.

Travis County Update

NCSC staff initially interviewed stakeholders in Travis County in late 2010 as part of a project to develop guiding principles for using RNA information at sentencing.² At the time, the Travis County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD) was in its fourth year of a reengineering effort, referred to as Travis Community Impact Supervision (TCIS), to incorporate evidence-based practices, including the use of offender assessment information to inform supervision and treatment strategies, into its operations.³ Travis County CSCD thoroughly documented and provided outcome data on the success of the TCIS initiative; as a result, TCIS continues to serve as a model for other jurisdictions.⁴

² See Casey, Warren & Elek (2011) at footnote 1.

³ The department website is: http://www.co.travis.tx.us/community_supervision/default.asp.

⁴ For general information and reports on the effort, see Travis Community Impact

When NCSC contacted Travis County in the fall of 2013 to update the initial interview information, staff learned that Travis County was in the process of changing its RNA instrument to the Texas Risk Assessment System (TRAS), the instrument adopted for statewide use. Thus some of the information in this report will be changing. The report discusses Travis County's operations prior to the adoption of the TRAS.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The staff of the Center for Sentencing Initiatives at the National Center for State Courts gratefully acknowledges the Travis County criminal justice stakeholders who took time to participate in our interviews and share their experiences for this report.⁵

We also extend our appreciation to the Pew Public Safety Performance Project for its support of this effort. For more information on the Pew project, please visit www.pewstates.org/publicsafety.

II. Offenders Assessed

In Travis County, CSCD conducts full offender RNAs for adult felony offenders. The RNA is completed as part of the presentence investigation process, and results are included in the diagnostic report that is prepared for the court. A diagnostic report is mandatory for all felony offenders for which a community supervision sentence has been deemed appropriate, although certain case types are exempt. For example,

Supervision (TCIS) Initiative web page at http://www.co.travis.tx.us/community_supervision/TCIS_Initiative.asp.

⁵ In 2010, NCSC interviewed a Travis County judge, four probation officers, and three prosecutors. Staff followed up with the CSCD Assistant Director in 2013 to update the information.

special dockets designed to expedite first-time offender drug cases and felony cases that have been reduced to misdemeanors as part of the plea bargaining process typically do not require a diagnostic report. Offenders who plead guilty and for whom a straight prison sentence is assured are also entitled to a diagnostic report but often choose to waive this right.

In addition to providing RNA information at sentencing, CSCD also provides this information pre-plea. Pre-plea diagnostic reports containing RNA information are not statutorily required nor are they issued for particular case types; instead, they are ordered by the court on a case-by-case basis in a manner that varies depending on the philosophy of the presiding judge. One judge, for example, orders a pre-plea diagnostic report only if the parties agree that the information provided by the report will substantially affect plea negotiations for probation. Other judges will order a pre-plea diagnostic report if the offender is probation-eligible, even if the state is recommending a straight prison sentence. Attorneys may also request pre-plea diagnostic reports in a variety of circumstances. For example, defense attorneys sometimes request a diagnostic report to help them determine whether or not the conditions proposed by the prosecutor are appropriate for their client.

Alternatively, the defense and prosecution may firmly disagree on the conditions of a plea and request a diagnostic report to facilitate agreement. In all cases, however, the presiding judge decides whether or not to order the diagnostic report, and the court officer (a liaison that represents the probation department at all court hearings) then submits the request to a specialized unit of the Travis County CSCD for processing.

PROVIDING RNA INFORMATION PRE-PLEA IN TRAVIS COUNTY

To manage due process concerns about conducting pre-plea presentence investigations, the Travis County CSCD Diagnostic Unit officer conducting the RNA interview is not permitted to ask the alleged offender questions about the charged offense. Moreover, if the individual admits to the offense or discloses other information pertinent to the judgment of guilt, the officer must omit these references from the official record and from the diagnostic report that is provided to the court.

The CSCD estimates that approximately 40-50% of their diagnostic reports are issued pre-plea. Reportedly, many stakeholders would welcome the opportunity to access pre-plea diagnostic reports for all cases. Some judges often order diagnostic reports pre-plea. Others, while acknowledging the value of a diagnostic report, express concern about the availability of staff resources to prepare the reports. These judges may limit their requests to specific cases and reject requests from attorneys wishing to use a report as a form of discovery.

III. Assessment Process

Prior to the winter of 2013, Travis County CSCD used the Wisconsin Risk Assessment tool and the Strategies for Case Supervision (SCS) system to assess offender risk and needs.⁶ The Wisconsin Risk Assessment is an 11-item non-proprietary risk assessment instrument that was originally developed and validated in the state of Wisconsin in the late 1970s; the Texas Community Justice

⁶ Also referred to as the DOC-502.

Assistance Division (CJAD) of the Department of Criminal Justice adapted the instrument and reported on a validation study in a 2005 report.⁷ The Wisconsin Risk Assessment was most recently validated for use in Travis County in 2006.⁸ Typically, the Wisconsin Risk Assessment tool is used in conjunction with the Client Management Classification (CMC) system, an interviewing and case planning system designed to identify offender needs and responsivity factors for use in the development of a meaningful case plan.⁹ To complement the risk assessment tool, a modified version of the CMC, called Strategies for Case Supervision (SCS), was adopted statewide.¹⁰ As noted earlier, however, Texas officials recently adopted the Texas Risk Assessment System (TRAS) as the new statewide standard, and Travis County is in the process of transitioning to that instrument. The TRAS is a modified

version of the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS), which was originally developed by University of Cincinnati researchers in 2010.¹¹ University of Cincinnati researchers have been hired to develop and help implement the TRAS.

In addition to the general offender risk and needs assessments described above, specialized assessments are also conducted on an as-needed basis. This includes mental health and substance abuse. Screening.¹²

Currently, Travis County CSCD uses a centralized diagnostic unit (also referred to as the Diagnostic Unit) of 10 officers, 2 seniors, and 1 manager to conduct all presentence investigations (including the above assessments). Any reassessments are completed by the offender's supervising probation officer.

IV. Assessment Report

In addition to providing current offense and criminal history information, the diagnostic report summarizes information about an offender known to be correlated with recidivism or positive adjustment in the context of probation supervision. The report,

⁷ Texas Department of Criminal Justice – Community Justice Assistance Division. (2005). *Validation of risk assessment instrument*. Austin, TX: Author (available at <http://cjadweb.tdcj.state.tx.us/Research/Documents/Risk%20Assessment%20Validation%202005.pdf>).

⁸ See Bryl, J., Fabelo, T., & Nagy, G. (2006, August). *Travis Community Impact Supervision. Guiding justice decisions with risk assessment instruments*. Washington, DC: The JFA Institute (available at http://www.co.travis.tx.us/community_supervision/tcis/travisincubator3.pdf).

⁹ See Baird, C., & Neuenfeldt, D. (1990). *Improving correctional performance through better classification: The Client Management Classification System*. Madison, WI: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

¹⁰ See pp. 10-13 in Fabelo, T., & Nagy, G. (2006, June). *Travis Community Impact Supervision. Better diagnosis: The first step to improve probation supervision strategies*. Washington, DC: The JFA Institute (available at http://www.co.travis.tx.us/community_supervision/tcis/TravisIncubator2.pdf).

¹¹ See p. 16 in Latessa, E. J., Lemke, R., Makarios, M., Smith, P., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2010). The creation and validation of the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)*. *Federal Probation*, 74, 16-22. Retrieved from http://www.uscourts.gov/uscourts/FederalCourts/PPS/Fedprob/2010-06/02_creation_validation_of_oras.html.

¹² Mental health questions are included on the substance abuse evaluation (SAE) and the Addiction Severity Index (ASI). In addition, some individuals are assessed in the jail with the Texas Recommended Assessment Guidelines (TRAG). As needed, probation will contract with outside professionals to obtain a full psychological evaluation.

as constructed prior to the use of the TRAS, contains a “diagnosis matrix,” a color-coded chart which identifies the offender’s risk level and SCS category (see Appendix). It also provides tabular information about the offender’s criminogenic needs and responsivity factors that are of moderate to high concern for the specific individual, with further explanation provided in bulleted format. These visuals provide an “at-a-glance” synopsis of the offender for both the court and the supervising officer, should the offender be placed on probation supervision. Using standardized language derived from the SCS instrument, the diagnostic report also contains a short narrative that highlights the key results of the diagnosis.

The diagnostic report in Travis County lists the standard conditions of supervision required by law and specifies the strategies that may be used as part of the supervision plan. Unlike the old PSI report format, the diagnostic report does not explicitly recommend whether or not the offender should be placed on probation. The diagnostic report only describes the diagnosis for an individual and identifies the types of conditions that would apply, should the court decide to place the individual on probation.

Currently, a total of approximately 130 diagnostic reports are prepared per month.

V. Use of Assessment Information

General reception. Court stakeholders initially had some reservations about changing the PSI report. However, once implemented, most seemed pleased with the report format. Judges and attorneys have stated that the new diagnostic report is better organized, more comprehensive, permits a

more comparative analysis of problem areas, and is easier to use to identify an individual’s problem areas than the old PSI report.

Practical use of RNA information among stakeholders. Generally, judges and attorneys appear to routinely use and rely upon the diagnostic reports prepared by the CSCD Diagnostic Unit staff to inform decision-making at sentencing. These stakeholders appear to trust the probation unit to formulate informed case plan decisions about treatment services appropriate to each probation-eligible adult offender and typically rely on recommendations from the CSCD Diagnostic Unit regarding specific conditions of probation. With the assessment-driven change in court culture, the district attorney’s office now often negotiates plea conditions using general language such as “treatment and counseling as recommended by the probation department.” This trust is likely due, in part, to the decision within the Travis County CSCD to establish a well-trained, centralized Diagnostic Unit and to publicize the successes of their evidence-based policies using empirical data from routine fidelity studies and other performance measures. Interestingly, some attorneys and judges have found that sharing the diagnostic report with defendants can also help certain offenders understand how the court’s decision is in their own best interests.

As the evidence-based diagnostic reports gained relevance in the court community, attorneys pushed to receive the reports more quickly for review – a testament to the perceived value of the report information. The Travis County CSCD worked with the Bar to expedite that process and generally return diagnostic reports to the court and to

attorneys within 5-10 days from the initial order.

Attorneys have raised objections involving individual diagnostic reports in some cases. Defense attorneys, for example, have requested the review of a case to ensure that the assessment was conducted properly (called *restaffing*), but these objections are infrequent and are handled internally on a case-by-case basis.

VI. Outcomes Tracked

The Travis Community Impact Supervision (TCIS) initiative prompted an organizational realignment of the probation department to support a more effective, evidence-based operational model. Continuous monitoring and evaluation activities have been a cornerstone of the initiative. The Travis County CSCD disseminates all findings from TCIS evaluations to the court. Routine evaluations shared with the court include a biannual report of revocation rates for each judge and an annual report on treatment program evaluation results.

For offender outcomes, the Travis County CSCD primarily tracks absconsion rates,

noncompliance rates, revocation rates (including rates for individual judges' courts), and recidivism (re-arrest) rates. A comparison study of felony probationers pre-TCIS realignment (January-June 2006) and of felony probationers post-TCIS realignment (July-October 2007) revealed significant decreases in re-arrest rates by risk level that are attributed to the new evidence-based approach. Pre-TCIS, 26% of low-risk, 26% of medium-risk, and 34% of high-risk felony probationers had been rearrested within one year of probation placement. With the evidence-based approach (post-TCIS), Travis County observed rearrest rates of 6% for low-risk (a difference of -77%), 13% for medium-risk (a difference of -50%), and 31% for high-risk felony probationers (a difference of -9%) one year after placement.¹³ All major reports documenting evaluations of this initiative are publicly available on the [TCIS website](#).¹⁴

¹³ Nagy, G. (2012, January). *Travis Community Impact Supervision (TCIS)*. Travis County, TX: Travis County Adult Probation Department (available http://www.co.travis.tx.us/community_supervision/tcis/IncubatorProgReport_12.pdf).

¹⁴ The TCIS website is: http://www.co.travis.tx.us/community_supervision/TCIS_Initiative.asp

EXAMPLE: ES/HIGH RISK
 MILLER, M.
 01/10

Appendix

**TRAVIS COUNTY ADULT PROBATION DEPARTMENT
 P. O. Box 2245, Austin, Texas 78768 (512) 854-4600
 EXAMPLE DIAGNOSTIC REPORT-PSI**

NAME (Last) Miller	(First) Melanie	(Middle) R	(Maiden)	COURT DATE 09/06/07
Aka: Mary Miller		TRN	CAUSE NO.	
		TRS		
SSN	APD	FBI NO.	SID NO.	DL NO.
MAILING ADDRESS		PHYSICAL ADDRESS		CITIZENSHIP
		Same		United States
PHONE NUMBER		OTHER NUMBER		ALIEN NO.
512-		512-		None
PLACE OF BIRTH	DOB	AGE	SEX	RACE
Texas	09/19/1960	46	Female	Caucasian
MARITAL STATUS		DEPENDENTS		EDUCATION
Single		1		10th grade
MONTHLY INCOME		MONTHLY EXPENSES		
\$817.00		\$714.00		
OFFENSE				OFFENSE TYPE
FORGERY				State Jail Felony
PENALTY RANGE				OFFENSE DATE
180 days - 2 years confinement, 2-5 years supervision, Fine up to \$10,000.				12/xx/06
CO-DEFENDANT				DATE OF ARREST
None				12/xx/06
PLEA		CUSTODIAL STATUS		DATE OF PLEA
Has Not Pled		Personal Bond		N/A
DETAINERS/ CHARGES PENDING				
None				
PROSECUTOR		DEFENSE ATTORNEY		RESTITUTION
				None
SENTENCING JUDGE		COURT		
		xxth District Court		
PROBATION OFFICER			PROBATION MANAGER	
DIAGNOSTIC UNIT			DIAGNOSTIC UNIT	

EXAMPLE: ES/HIGH RISK
MILLER, M.
01/10

PRESENT OFFENSE NARRATIVE:

On December xx, 2006, at approximately 2:15 pm, Austin Police Department (APD) Officer K. and Officer P. responded to a report of a forgery passing at ABC Cash Express located at 517 A Ave. Upon arrival they met with Mary Smith who stated that a female, identified as Melanie Miller, the defendant, was attempting to cash a fake 7-11 check worth \$2962.30. Mary called the Bank of America to confirm if the check was real. Bank of America told her that the account number on the check did not exist. Mary advised the defendant, who also presented a letter trying to prove that the check was good. Mary added that the paper used for the check was regular paper, not paper that is consistent in the preparation of checks. She continued to state that the business has cashed valid 7-11 checks in the past and the check number was too small.

When Mary told the defendant and her cousin, identified as Esther Jones, that she was calling the police, the defendant and Jones got scared and left the scene. The defendant (and Jones) returned to the scene and explained to Officer K. and Officer P. how she got the check. The defendant stated that she enrolled herself in a Yahoo post for a Christmas job or to receive financial assistance for Christmas. She stated that she got paid in many ways, including gift cards and this check with number 0009999337. The defendant said that the check was delivered from Canada. The letter that came with the check was from Alliance Processing Center. It was an Award Notification Letter telling the defendant that she had won \$50,000 and that they were mailing her an assistance check of \$2962.30 to help her pay for tax and administrative expenses involved with her winnings. The defendant was upset and stated that she did not know that the check was not real.

The defendant stated that she did not know who sent her the check, and did not have an explanation for why the check was stated to be from Dallas, TX, but mailed from Canada. It should be noted that the phone number on the check returns to Ontario, Canada, not Texas.

SUMMARY OF CRIMINAL HISTORY: (PRIOR RECORD)

DATE	ARRESTING AGENCY	OFFENSE	DISPOSITION
06/00/80	PD, Austin, Texas	Credit Card Abuse	12/00/80, Three years probation
03/00/80 (Offense date)	SO, Travis County, Texas	Theft by Check	07/00/82, 20 days Travis County Jail
02/00/86 (Offense date)	PD, Austin, Texas	Burglary of Habitation	07/00/86, 10 years Shock Probation; 04/00/88, Revoked, 90 days Travis County Jail
10/00/87	PD, Austin, Texas	Theft	02/00/88, 60 days Travis County Jail

EXAMPLE: ES/HIGH RISK
 MILLER, M.
 01/10

11/00/87	PD, Austin, Texas	Theft	02/00/88, 60 day Travis County Jail
08/00/87 (Offense date)	PD, Austin, Texas	Forgery by Possession with Intent to Pass	01/00/88, Eight years TDCJ
11/00/94 (Offense date)	Park Police, Austin, Texas	Theft of Property	11/00/95, Four days Travis County Jail
01/00/95	PD, San Marcos, Texas	Criminal Mischief	03/00/95, Fined

Sources available to this department indicate that the defendant has been convicted of three prior felony offenses and served two prior terms of probation for Credit Card Abuse and Burglary of Habitation. There was no record found for the Credit Card Abuse probation. The Burglary of Habitation probation term was revoked on 04/00/88 due to committing the subsequent offense of Forgery by Possession with Intent to Pass on 08/00/87 and failure to report as directed.

PENDING CASES: None.

VICTIM IMPACT STATEMENT:

Victim: None
Loss: None

SUMMARY EVALUATION SOCIAL INDICATORS:

Based on the SCS protocol, the following shaded areas in the Potential Concern and Salient Problem categories indicate criminogenic risk factors placing this individual at greater risk of recidivating.

Domains	Not An Issue (NI)	Potential Concern (PC)	Salient Problem (SP)
Criminal Behavior	<i>Minimal or no arrest record. Mostly Pro-Social.</i>	<i>Criminal history. Moderate criminal value system.</i>	<i>Lengthy criminal history. Entrenched criminal value system.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lived off prostitution. ● Nine prior offenses of theft, forgery, or burglary. ● One prior felony term of probation revoked.
Peer Relations	<i>Generally positive and associations with non-offenders</i>	<i>Occasional association with other offenders</i>	<i>Frequently associates with other offenders; associates with drug dealers or gang members.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Offenses were generally committed with accomplices.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Pimps or people around her made her commit the offenses she has in her prior history. ●Now isolates herself because she admits she is easily influenced by people. ●Thinks she is really weak and does whatever anyone tells her to do.
Assaultive Behavior	<i>No assaultive behavior</i>	<i>Single episode of assaultive behavior</i>	<i>Multiple episodes of assaultive behavior</i>
Alcohol Use	<i>None or Social.</i>	<i>Episodes of abuse; negative results from use; some disruption of functioning.</i>	<i>Frequent episodes of abuse with disruption in multiple areas of life; serious disruption of functioning</i>
Drug Use	<i>Never used; history of experimental use with no Current Use</i>	<i>Episodes of abuse; negative results from use; some disruption of functioning</i>	<i>Frequent episodes of abuse with disruption in multiple areas of life; serious disruption of functioning</i>
Sexual Behavior	<i>No evidence of inappropriate sexual behavior</i>	<i>Non-victim, sex related offense such as prostitution</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● History of Prostitution 	<i>Any sex offender conviction or incidents with a sexual element</i>
Vocational/ Employment –Work Skills	<i>Full-time employment and/or student/homemaker</i>	<i>Sporadic full and/or part-time employment history, including brief periods of unemployment</i>	<i>No employment record, unskilled, unmotivated, or involved in illegal activity</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Unemployed 50% of the time or more. ●Disabled for four years. ●History of unskilled labor. ●Longest job reported was five to six months long and she quit because she was pregnant with her son.
Family/ Marital Relations	<i>Stable/ Supportive/ Effective Controls. No Abuse</i>	<i>Some Disorganization and Stress/ Marginal Controls. Prior Abuse.</i>	<i>Major Disorganization or Stress/Ineffective Controls. Current Abuse.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●In CPS custody since the age of eight. ●Mother was physically abusive. ●Recently found out her father is her mother's biological brother and that he raped her mother when she was 12 or 13 years of age.

EXAMPLE: ES/HIGH RISK
 MILLER, M.
 01/10

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Reports being molested while in foster homes. ●Ran away from foster home at the age 16 and ended up on the streets. ●Was forced to prostitute herself since the age 16. ●Had several children and all but one have been placed under adoption. ●Only son is 17 years of age now. ●Married once in the 80's but marriage was annulled one week later.
--	--	--	--

Additional problem areas that may interfere with the individual's adjustment and/or compliance with probation.

Medical Health	<i>Sound physical health; health issues but does not interfere with social functioning</i>	<i>Handicap or illness that interferes with social functioning</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Suffers from asthma and should be taking albuterol but has run out. ●Recently suffered head trauma because a tree fell into her window and on her and was prescribed depakote for the pain. 	<i>Serious or chronic illness</i>
Residential	<i>Self-Sufficient, Stable environment</i>	<i>Short-term periods of residential instability</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Lived at current address for three years. ●Lives with 17 year old son. ●Has been stable for the past eleven years. ●Was at Salvation Army homeless shelter with son eight years ago. ●Grew up in 24 different foster homes until the age of 16 when she ran away and ended up on the streets. 	<i>Chronic residence problems with frequent address changes homelessness, or shelter care</i>

Education	<i>GED or HS; higher education</i>	<i>No GED or HS</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Dropped out school during the tenth grade. ●Received remedial education and had trouble learning. ●Believes foster parents did not care about her education. ●Obtained her GED in 1993 while on parole. ●Does not remember how many times she was suspended from high school or why she was suspended. 	<i>Unable to read or write</i>
Financial Management	<i>Current income exceeds expenses. Living within means</i>	<i>Expenses exceed income; unstable income</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Receives Social Security disability, food stamps, and TANIF for 17 year old son. ●Offense committed for monetary gain. ●Has \$103 left over after all expenses are paid. 	<i>Expenses exceed income and excessive debt; inability to meet basic living needs</i>
Mental Health Status	<i>No Mental Health problems</i>	<i>Past or present Mental Health problems that could potentially interfere with functioning</i>	<i>Serious Mental Health problems that presently interfere with functioning</i> Has active MHMR diagnosis since December 2005. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Currently receives services from the MHMR/ANEW program. ●Currently on several psychotropic medications, that despite taking them, the defendant still has symptoms present. ●Receives pension for psychiatric disability.

EXAMPLE: ES/HIGH RISK
 MILLER, M.
 01/10

CLASSIFICATION AND SUPERVISION GROUP:

Initial Risk	SCS Score				
	SIS	SIT	ES	CC	LS
Low	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Blue
Medium	Yellow	Blue	Blue	Blue	Red
High	Red	Red	XXX	Red	Red

This person is High Risk of recidivating and falls into the Environmental Structuring (ES) strategy group.

Characteristics: These offenders make choices due to their inability to solve problems correctly and their naiveté and social gullibility. ES offenders tend to have below average mental capacity. They are often impulsive, because they are less capable of weighing the consequences of their behavior for either themselves or others. They have a low ability to perceive the motives and concerns of others and are easily led by more sophisticated individuals. Even though malice is rare in their motivation, offenders can become involved in assaultive offenses due to a lack of insight.

Supervision Strategy: Will require intensive supervision and referrals to enhance skill levels as well as improve interactions with others. Will also require collateral contacts with family members.

URINE SPECIMEN RESULTS:

Results from the urine specimen collected on 08/21/07; Tested Negative for THC, Cocaine, PCP, Amphetamines, Opiates Status: Negative; Assessment.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE EVALUATION RESULTS:

Based on Lack of current indicators, Travis County Adult Probation is recommending No need for treatment.

CONDITIONS OF PROBATION:

If placed under the supervision of the Travis County Adult Probation Department the following conditions would be appropriate:

Treatment Conditions

- Assign to Mental Health Specialized Caseload and continue to participate in MHMR/ANEW for an assessment of services.

Control Conditions

- Do not open or maintain a checking account until approved, in writing, by the Court and/or your Supervision Officer.

EXAMPLE: ES/HIGH RISK
MILLER, M.
01/10

“Off Grid” Conditions (Conditions that apply because of the special nature of the offense):

--