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 some stakeholders are incorporating the
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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.

II. Offenders Assessed

Probation officers in the Grant County Correctional Services division conduct a full offender risk and needs assessment (RNA) as part of the Presentence Investigation (PSI) reporting process. Cases involving a level A, B, or C felony require a PSI report; for D-level felonies, PSI reports are discretionary and in practice are often waived. PSI reports are not provided for misdemeanors or during plea negotiations.

In Grant County, probation caseloads are divided by risk level. Each probation officer oversees a caseload dedicated to the supervision of offenders with the same level of risk. If the court does not order a PSI report, probation officers still complete a full RNA for every offender, once placed on community supervision, to assign an appropriate supervising probation officer and to inform case planning efforts.

III. Assessment Process

Grant County began using an offender risk and needs assessment tool in 2001, when they adopted the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R). ³ Grant County probation officers used the LSI-R until 2011, when the state transitioned to a new standard tool called the Indiana Risk Assessment System (IRAS). ⁴ With a technical assistance grant from the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), the Indiana Judicial Center and Department of Corrections partnered with researchers from the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute to develop and help implement the IRAS, an adaptation of the Ohio Risk Assessment System

³ Developed by Don Andrews and James Bonta in 1995, the LSI-R is a commercially available risk and needs assessment tool comprised of 54 items across 10 subscales. For more information about the LSI-R, refer to the Multi-Health Systems, Inc. website at: http://www.mhs.com/product.aspx?gr=saf&prod=lsi-r&id=overview.

⁴ The IRAS may be found at: http://nicic.gov/Library/027571. For additional information about the statewide initiative, see: http://indianacourts.us/times/2011/04/risk-assessment/.

---

² NCSC interviewed a Grant County judge, probation officer, prosecutor and defense attorney.
The IRAS, comprised of separate assessment tools designed for use at different stages of the criminal justice process (pretrial, community supervision, prison intake, and reentry), assesses offender recidivism risk and criminogenic needs. A statewide validation study is currently underway.

On rare occasions, probation officers may override the IRAS risk level. PSI reports display the original score, but the adjusted risk level appears with a statement explaining the override. Probation officers reassess community-supervised offenders on the IRAS at twelve month intervals for the duration of their probation term.

Grant County stakeholders view the LSI-R and the IRAS as generally similar, but indicated that the LSI-R flagged substance abuse needs at a higher rate than the IRAS. To address this perceived gap locally, Grant County probation officers supplement the IRAS with the Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory (SASSI), a specialized substance abuse assessment tool.

In addition to the SASSI, the Grant County Correctional Services division uses a number of other supplementary assessment instruments. In every case for which a PSI report is ordered, probation officers use the SASSI and the Criminal Thinking Scale (CTS). The CTS is a specialized criminal thinking assessment developed by Texas Christian University (TCU) professor Kevin Knight to capture dimensions of criminal thinking such as entitlement, justification, personal irresponsibility, power orientation, cold heartedness, and criminal rationalization. In sex offense cases, probation officers also complete the Static - 99, a 10-item actuarial risk assessment instrument developed by Karl Hanson and David Thornton in 1999 for use with adult male sex offenders. In problem-solving court cases, the locally developed Housing, Employment and Family Function (HEFF) assessment, the Mental Health Screening Form III (MHSF-III), and the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories may also be administered to the offender, but results from these assessments do not appear in typical PSI reports.

IV. Assessment Report

Prior to adoption of the IRAS, Grant County used a PSI report that contained a narrative offender RNA section describing the offender’s LSI-R risk level (low, moderate, or high risk) and any offender needs identified by the tool. A new PSI reporting standard, mandated for use in all counties statewide, was developed in conjunction with the IRAS. The new report format describes the offender’s risk level on the IRAS and the offender’s need level by

---

5 The University of Cincinnati Center for Criminal Justice Research (CCJR) developed the ORAS in 2009 and offer similar services to other states and jurisdictions with interest in adapting the system. For more about the risk assessment services available, see the CCJR website: http://www.uc.edu/corrections/services/risk-assessment.html.
6 The IRAS includes a separate assessment for each of the four identified stages of the criminal justice process, as well as a short screener tool designed for use at the community supervision stage to trigger a full version of the risk and needs assessment.
7 Additional information on the SASSI instrument can be found at http://www.sassi.com/.

---

8 To access the CTS and other assessments developed by researchers at the Texas Christian University Institute of Behavioral Research, see http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/pubs/datacoll/cjtrt.html.
The IRAS domain levels also appear in a summary bar graph.

In addition, the new Indiana PSI report includes a section that captures any complementary assessment information, which in Grant County includes a narrative description of results from the SASSI and the CTS. Probation officers also make case plan and sentencing recommendations in the final section of PSI reports. Their recommendations include whether or not a person can be successfully supervised in the community, the sentence length (executed and suspended), length of probation, and the types of programming to address the offender’s identified needs. Judges also receive, attached to the PSI report, copies of the offender’s summary assessment results and the proposed case plan. Some judges also request copies of the hand-scored IRAS, SASSI, and/or CTS instruments to permit an itemized review.

In 2012, Grant County probation officers provided approximately 160 PSI reports to the court.

V. Use of Assessment Information

General reception. The use of evidence-based sentencing practices in Grant County began in 1999 or 2000 with stakeholder participation in a three-day “What Works” training event on effective recidivism reduction and prevention hosted by the Indiana Department of Corrections. Teams from five Indiana counties, including Grant County, attended the event. Each team developed a holistic evidence-based implementation plan as part of the event. Grant County representatives implemented their plan in 2001 and have continued to update the original plan as the effort has evolved.

Initially, some Grant County stakeholders were more receptive to the use of evidence-based practices than others. Some thought that the introduction of “What Works” concepts provided an invaluable framework for guiding efforts to make more informed decisions about how to better manage offenders. Others expressed concerns about applying results based on general predictors of recidivism in individualized decisions about offenders. Local stakeholders initially resistant to the use of RNA information appear to be more supportive of the initiative now, in part because of opportunities to openly discuss these concerns and in part because of subsequent trainings that all stakeholders have received on the appropriate uses of the tool and the limitations of the science. A local criminal justice stakeholder group meets routinely to discuss issues and concerns about the use of RNA information as they arise.

In addition to the body report, appended case plan, and appended IRAS-CST scoring sheet as seen in the Appendix example, scoring sheets from other proprietary offender assessments used (such as the SASSI) are appended to the Grant County PSR as appropriate.

10 Grant County representatives included the Community Corrections Director, two judges, a defense attorney, and the county prosecutor.
11 After the conference, Grant County officials focused on developing comprehensive programs and research-based curricula with treatment providers, motivational interviewing, and other principles of effective intervention.
12 The Indiana Judicial Center has sponsored trainings on risk and needs assessment since the adoption of the IRAS. These included a dedicated training event with attorneys when Grant County shifted from the LSI-R to the IRAS and rolled out the new PSI reporting format.
Although Grant County stakeholders appear to support the use of the IRAS as a valid assessment instrument, some skepticism has been shared regarding assessment reliability. Some local stakeholders expressed the concern that two similarly trained probation officers may not score an offender the same way on an assessment. This concern was voiced more in relation to assessments completed by probation officers in other counties, who may be relatively new to conducting RNAs, compared to the quality assessments conducted by local probation officers.\textsuperscript{13} Indiana has taken a step to help achieve greater consistency in assessment scoring statewide by requiring that all probation officers successfully complete an IRAS certification before they are permitted to conduct an assessment on an offender. They must also successfully recertify every other year to continue to administer the IRAS. In addition to these state-level efforts, the Grant County Correctional Services division recently hired a full time staff person dedicated to the topic of evidence-based practices, including issues around effective implementation, staff skill building, and quality assurance. Grant County stakeholders envision that the role of this new position will include efforts to monitor the inter-rater reliability of local IRAS administrators.

\textit{Practical use of RNA information among stakeholders.} All stakeholders interviewed for this report indicated that RNA information can be useful in the sentencing process. Judges typically approve the proposed probation case plan, but may sometimes diverge from probation recommendations regarding imposition and length of imprisonment. Four judges in Grant County receive PSI reports.

For cases in which a plea agreement has been reached, the parties submit the plea agreement to the court, and a PSI report is ordered. The Grant County probation officer will provide a recommendation in the PSI report to accept or reject the plea agreement. At the sentencing hearing, the completed PSI report informs the court’s decision regarding acceptance of the plea agreement. If the plea agreement is accepted, the judge crafts a sentence within the parameters of the agreement. Prosecutors and defense attorneys generally leave plea agreements open-ended to allow for the probation department’s case plan recommendations. This lowers the number of rejected plea agreements because of potential mismatches between programming agreed upon by counsel in the case and the RNA-informed recommendations of the probation department.

\textsuperscript{13} Prior to the IRAS, the use of RNA information was not mandatory statewide. However, Grant County probation officers had been administering some form of a RNA tool for well over a decade. Empirical evidence suggests that both the length of time a particular RNA tool has been used by an agency and the provision of formal training to staff charged with administering the RNA tool have significant implications for assessment accuracy. See, for example, Flores, A. W., Lowenkamp, C. T., Holsinger, A. M., & Latessa, E. J. (2006). Predicting outcome with the Level of Service Inventory-Revised: The importance of implementation integrity. \textit{Journal of Criminal Justice, 34}, 523–529. See also Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Holsinger, A. M. (2004). Empirical evidence on the importance of training and experience in using the Level of Service Inventory–Revised. In National Institute of Corrections (Series Ed.), Topics in Community Corrections: Assessment issues for managers (pp. 49-53). Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
VI. Outcomes Tracked

The Supreme Court’s Indiana Court Information Technology Extranet (INcite) hosts an automated application designed to electronically score the IRAS tools and store completed IRAS data statewide. Statewide data on each of the IRAS tools are analyzed to inform legislative reviews and revisions of the criminal code. The INcite system interface allows assessment data to be exported into the local case management system. Grant County began entering assessment data into INcite in 2011. As part of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) evidence-based decision making (EBDM) project, Grant County is also in the process of developing a local dashboard to track outcome measures. 14

In addition, the Indiana Judicial Branch’s Division of State Court Administration compiles annual reports on probation activities for general distribution. These annual probation reports include statewide and county summary information such as case data on the number of felony and misdemeanor probation cases supervised and disposed (by method of disposition), the proportion of felony and misdemeanor probationers by supervision level, and the number of adult presentence investigations conducted by case type. 15 The Grant County problem-solving courts (Drug Court, Re-entry Court, Veterans Treatment Court) also reportedly receive detailed statistical information at minimum every six months, which includes the recidivism rates of problem-solving court participants by risk level. However, this level of detail is not currently available on the broader adult probation population.

14 NIC partnered with the Office of Justice Programs to select seven sites, including Grant County, to implement the framework entitled A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Court Systems. This framework lays out strategies for applying evidence-based decision making principles and techniques with the goal of risk and harm reduction. Additional information on the project can be found at http://nicic.gov/EBDM. Additional information about Grant County’s involvement in the EBDM project may be found at http://ebdmonoeless.org/ebdm-jurisdictions-grant-county-indiana.

15 To access the current and archived Probation Reports, visit http://www.in.gov/judiciary/admin/2467.htm.
## Appendix

**STATE OF INDIANA**  
**PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT**  
**FACE SHEET**

---

### Court Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State v</th>
<th>Case #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Ordered</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>Sentencing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Pros. Atty</th>
<th>Def. Atty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRANT CIRCUIT COURT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Prepared By</th>
<th>Probation Dept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRANT COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Offender's Personal Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Name</th>
<th>Alias(es)/Nickname(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSN:</th>
<th>DOB:</th>
<th>Age:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ID Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Eyes</th>
<th>Hair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Citizen</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>DOC:</th>
<th>FBI:</th>
<th>Driver's License:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issued By</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUSPENDED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Criminal Involvement

- Pending Charge
- Jail/Prison
- Felony
- Probation
- Detainer
- Jail/Prison Discipline
- Misdemeanor
- Parole
- Violation/Revocation
- Juvenile DOC Commit
- Juvenile Delinquent
- Community Corrections
- Juvenile Detention
- Resident Placement
- Sex Offender
- Felony Sent. Reduced to Misdem.
**Case/Offense Information**

- **Case #**: [redacted]
- **Present Offense(s)**:
  - Count I: 35-43-5-2(b)(1)/FC: Forgery
  - Count II: 35-43-4-2.5(b)(1)/FD: Auto Theft
- **Offense Date**: [redacted]
- ** Arrest Date**: [redacted]
- **Actual Jail Days**: 1
- **Release Type**: BOND
- **Sex/Violent Offense Registration**: NO
- **On Probation/Parole at Offense**: YES
- **Non-Suspendable Offense**: YES
- **Interstate Compact Required**: NO
- **A.C.E.**: N/A
- **Co-Defendants/Case #**: N/A
- **Circumstances Attending Commission of Offense**:
  - Count #1: The Defendant did make and/or utter a written instrument, in such a manner that it purports to have been made by another person, to wit: [redacted]
  - Count #2: The Defendant did knowingly or intentionally exert unauthorized control over the motor vehicle, [redacted]: with the intent to deprive the person of the vehicle's value or use.

**Marital Information**

- **Marital Status**: SINGLE
- **Spouse/Other's Name**: [redacted]
- **Spouse/Other's Address**: [redacted]
- **Number of Dependent Children**: 3
- **Support Order**: [redacted]
- **Current**: NO

**Education, Employment, Health**

- **High School**: [redacted]
- **Grad/GED**: NO
- **Ever suspended or expelled?**: YES
- **College/Vocational**: N/A
- **Employed**: NO
- **Employer**: N/A
- **Position**: N/A
- **Hire Date**: N/A
- **Hours Per Week**: N/A
- **IC 25 licensed/certified profession**: NO
- **Financial Status**: Not Stable
- **Mental Health Referrals**: YES
- **Physical Problems**: YES
- **Alcohol/Drug Use**: YES

**Contact Persons**

1. **Name**: [redacted]
   - **Relation**: [redacted]
   - **Address**: [redacted]
   - **Phone**: [redacted]

2. **Name**: [redacted]
   - **Relation**: [redacted]
   - **Address**: [redacted]
   - **Phone**: [redacted]
### Victim Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The victims in this case are [redacted] of [redacted], Indiana and [redacted] of [redacted], Indiana. A victim's letter was mailed on [redacted].

### Additional Information

**Direct Placement:** Yes

**Credit Time:** [redacted] actual day (bonded)

**PV on:** [redacted] Actual days

Sentenced on new charges under cause number [redacted] days jail. [redacted] actual days. [redacted] actual days (credit) towards the Probation violation under cause number [redacted].

**Mental Referrals**

The Defendant stated she has been diagnosed with [redacted]. The Defendant also feels she has [redacted].

**Physical Problems**

The Defendant stated she has [redacted] problems and has [redacted].

**Alcohol/Drug Use**

The Defendant stated she has abused alcohol, marijuana, and Benzodiazepines.

**Non-Suspendable Offenses**

Case [redacted] Based on the conviction [redacted].
### I. Sources of Information

The following sources were used to complete this presentence investigation report:

- The statements of the defendant.
- The reports of the Grant County Sheriff's Department.
- The records of the Grant County Prosecutors Office.
- The records of the Grant County Sheriff's Department.
- The records of the Grant County Probation Department.

### II. Legal History

#### A. Juvenile History

No Cases Entered

#### B. Adult History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Offense Date</th>
<th>Arrest Date</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>File Date</th>
<th>Disposition Date</th>
<th>Sentencing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion City Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Grant County, IN</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charges:** 35-43-4-3(a)/MA: Conversion

**Narrative:** 180 days jail, suspended. 6 months formal probation followed by 6 months informal probation.

**Additional Information:** Arrested on warrant for Failure to appear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Offense Date</th>
<th>Arrest Date</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>File Date</th>
<th>Disposition Date</th>
<th>Sentencing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion City Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Grant County, IN</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charges:** Count I: 9-21-8-52(a)(1)/MB: Reckless Driving

**Narrative:** 180 days jail, suspended. Formal probation until restitution is paid which is followed by informal probation until 20 hours Community Service.

**Additional Information:** Arrested on warrant for failure to appear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Offense Date</th>
<th>Arrest Date</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>File Date</th>
<th>Disposition Date</th>
<th>Sentencing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion City Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Grant County, IN</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charges:** Count I: 35-43-4-3(a)/MA: Conversion

**Narrative:** 1 year jail with 355 days suspended and served on probation.

**Additional Information:** Arrested on warrant for failure to appear. Released from jail

**PV No disposition.**
### Case Number: N/A
### Court: Grant Circuit Court
### Offense Date: N/A
### Arrest Date: N/A
### County: Grant County, IN
### File Date: N/A
### Disposition Date: N/A
### Sentencing Date: N/A
### Charges:
- Count I: 35-48-4-7(a)/FD: Possession Schedule I, II, III, or IV Controlled Substance
- Count II: Probation Violation
- Count III: Probation Violation
### Narrative:
18 months jail, suspended and served on probation. Cost, Interdiction fee ($200), A/D assessment, Curfew.

PV filed for failing to report to probation and new charges: Arrested on warrant. Hearing pending.

PV filed for new charges: Arrested on warrant. PENDING (Hearing date)

### Additional Information:

### Case Number: N/A
### Court: Grant Circuit Court
### Offense Date: N/A
### Arrest Date: N/A
### County: Grant County, IN
### File Date: N/A
### Disposition Date: N/A
### Sentencing Date: N/A
### Charges:
- Count I: 35-43-5-2(b)(1)/FC: Forgery
- Count II: 35-43-4-2.5(b)(1)/FD: Auto Theft

### Narrative:
PENDING

### Additional Information:

### Case Number: N/A
### Court: Marion City Court
### Offense Date: N/A
### Arrest Date: N/A
### County: Grant County, IN
### File Date: N/A
### Disposition Date: N/A
### Sentencing Date: N/A
### Charges:
- Count II: 35-42-2-1(a)(1)(A)/MA: Battery Resulting in Bodily Injury
- Count III: 35-44.13-1(a)(2)/MA: Resisting Law Enforcement
### Narrative:
- Ct 1: 120 days jail
- Ct 2: 120 days jail, concurrent.
- Ct 3: 120 days jail, concurrent.

### Additional Information:

### C. Summary of Legal History

This officer can not find a juvenile criminal history. As an adult the Defendant has been convicted of six (6) misdemeanors, one (1) felony, and three (3) probation violations. The Court has sentenced the Defendant to jail and probation. The Defendant has been ordered to completed community service hours, pay restitution comply with a curfew, and complete an alcohol/drug assessment.

The Defendant was out on bond for this offense when she was arrested for charges in Marion City Court.

The Defendant stated she has had no gang affiliations, has a suspended license, has had a jail write up for trafficking with an inmate (letters to her boyfriend has been convicted of a violent crime, has had no escape charges, and has no family at DOC.

### D. Criminal History Domain Level

- [ ] Low
- [x] Moderate
- [ ] High
- [ ] N/A (IRAS-CSST)
- [ ] N/A (IRAS-ST)
Ill. Present Offense

A. Official Version
See Information and Affidavit for Probable Cause and Warrant for Arrest.

B. Defendant Version
The Defendant made the following statement, "I was drinking and using Benzo's". "I was dancing and using with my son's dad." "I left him for another guy and he got me messed up (drugs)." "He saw the title of my girlfriend's car and said we should sell it." "I said no for a week." "He got me high and I finally gave in and told him to do what ever he wants to do it." "I don't remember signing the title, I don't remember much of that day." "I guess we stole the car."

IV. Victim Impact Statement

A. Victim's Statement
The victims in this case of , Indiana and of , Indiana. A victim's letter was mailed on 10-22-13.

That on this officer spoke with in person. He stated he turned in financial information to the detective.

B. Victim Notification
Per I hereby certify that the victim has been notified in writing of the date, time, and place of the sentencing hearing at least seven (7) days prior to sentencing.

Date Sent:
Victim Responded By: Telephone

V. Family/Social Background

A. Parental/Family Information
The Defendant stated she was born to and raised by and until she was taken by Child Protection Services and placed in a home at age eleven (11). The Defendant stated her parents separated when she was twelve (12). The Defendant stated she was placed with who raised her. The Defendant stated she was removed from her parents because of their fighting and drug use. The Defendant stated she was a "daddy's girl" and is talking to him. The Defendant stated she loves her father but understands he is "controlling". The Defendant stated she is now a "mommy's girl" and that "she is my best friend". The Defendant stated both of her parents have a criminal record and recalled how her mother thought she was helping her by providing her with pills. The Defendant described her childhood as that she "raised myself until my sister had custody". "She (sister) kept me busy; I got good grades and had a happy childhood." "My sister was very strict." The Defendant described her relationship with her sister as, "she is more like a mother to me than my own mother."

The Defendant stated she has a half sister and half brothers. The Defendant stated her half brothers are young and that she doesn't get to see them.

B. Personal Relationships (Significant Others)
The Defendant stated she is in an eighteen (18) month relationship with The Defendant stated is currently in jail. The Defendant stated she has one (1) child with

C. Dependents
The Defendant stated she has children, they are:

age , whose father is The Defendant stated is involved with CHINS and is currently in the custody of mother.

age and age , whose father is The Defendant stated has had custody of her daughters for the past years and that there is a child support order for The
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Defendant stated she had limited access to her daughters the custody but later was able to get her girls on weekends.

The Defendant stated a step brother raped her and she became pregnant. The Defendant stated her best friend had her get an abortion.

D. Family & Social Support Domain Level

☐ Low  ☑ Moderate  ☐ High  ☐ N/A (IRAS-CSST)  ☐ N/A (IRAS-ST)

E. Peer Associations

The Defendant stated her best friend is whom she has known for the past two and a half (2 1/2) years. The Defendant stated did not have a criminal record. This officer located the Jail Computer System. The Defendant stated since her daughters were born she has been more selective with the people she associates with. The Defendant stated 75% or better are positive people. This officer would note that the father’s of her children, her parents, and her best friend all have criminal records.

F. Peer Associations Domain Level

☐ Low  ☐ Moderate  ☑ High  ☐ N/A (IRAS-CSST)  ☐ N/A (IRAS-ST)

VI. Personal Background

A. Education

The Defendant stated she completed the 10th grade at and that during her 11th year she became pregnant and left school. The Defendant stated prior to 10th grade she was on the honor role but during the 10th grade her grades were “not good”. The Defendant stated she was involved with the choir, orchestra, softball, soccer, cheerleading, dance and martial arts. The Defendant stated some of the activities were through the PAL Club. The Defendant stated she was suspended for fighting.

B. Employment

The Defendant stated her last job was dancing at where she worked for four (4) months and could earn between $100 to $300 per night. The Defendant stated she quit that job at the request of her boyfriend. The Defendant stated she has also worked at (Housekeeping). The Defendant stated the longest she has held a job was nine (9) months.

The Defendant stated she has never served with any branch of the United States Armed Forces.

C. Financial Situation

The Defendant stated she has no income, no assets, owes on medical bills and child support, and was receiving food stamps.

D. Education, Employment & Financial Situation Domain Level

☐ Low  ☐ Moderate  ☑ High  ☐ N/A (IRAS-CSST)  ☐ N/A (IRAS-ST)

E. Residence, Neighborhood & Leisure Activities

The Defendant stated she has been moving around a lot during the last year. The Defendant stated her last home was at her mother’s which she described as being “good, half way decent”. The Defendant described the neighborhood as good. The Defendant stated there are no drug in the neighborhood unless at her mother’s home.

The Defendant stated she enjoys collecting dolphins, watching TV, reading, cleaning, and doing laundry. The Defendant stated she is not a member of any organization or club. The Defendant stated she is Christian and as a child attended Church.

F. Neighborhood Problems Domain Level

☑ Low  ☐ Moderate  ☐ High  ☐ N/A (IRAS-CSST)  ☐ N/A (IRAS-ST)

VII. Personal Health, Attitudes & Behavior

A. Physical Health

The Defendant described her physical health as “decent”. The Defendant stated she suffers from and has a
bad. The Defendant stated she is not taking any medication at this time but should be taking and has been prescribed pain medication for her back and knee.

B. Mental Health
The Defendant described her mental health as "I can deal with it". The Defendant stated she was diagnosed at Cornerstone with depression. The Defendant stated she feels she is also bipolar. The Defendant stated she is not taking any medication at this time but is supposed to be on Adderall. The Defendant stated she has a history of cutting herself. The Defendant stated at age 11 she was inpatient at [redacted] for beating up her sister and for "doing stuff with boys". The Defendant stated she has also been in counseling following her removal from her parent's custody at age 11.

C. Substance Abuse
The Defendant stated she first consumed alcohol at the age of seventeen (17) and the last time she consumed alcohol was at the age of twenty-three (23). The Defendant stated at 17 she was consuming alcohol four (4) times per week, usually a half (1/2) gallon each time. The Defendant stated she stopped drinking until she turned twenty-one (21). From the age of twenty-one (21) the Defendant stated she was consuming alcohol one (1) to two (2) times per week usually consuming two (2) to three (3) shots each time. The Defendant stated her use of alcohol has caused her legal problems.

The Defendant stated she first smoked marijuana at the age of twenty (20) and the last time she smoked marijuana was at the age of twenty-five (25). The Defendant stated at the age of 20 she was smoking marijuana everyday, all day, usually smoking a half (1/2) ounce per week. The Defendant stated she quit smoking when she was pregnant with her son but did smoke marijuana one (1) time after his birth. The Defendant stated her use of marijuana has not caused her any problems.

The Defendant stated she started abusing Benzodiazepines at the age of twenty-one (21) and the last time she abused Benzodiazepines was prior to her arrest. The Defendant stated she used Xanax, Klonopin, and Valium. The Defendant stated on the day she was arrested she had eaten 4 "xanex bars". The Defendant stated she was eating Benzodiazepines one (1) time per week. The Defendant stated her use of Benzodiazepines has caused her legal, family, and relationship problems. "I feel my family got pulled apart because of drugs so I didn't use a lot."

The Defendant denies using any other controlled substances.

D. Substance Use Domain Level
☐Low ☑Moderate ☐High ☐N/A (IRAS-CSST) ☐N/A (IRAS-ST)

E. Attitudes and Behavioral Orientation
The Defendant does not take responsibility for her actions and this crime. The Defendant stated her boyfriend got her high and that she did not remember signing the title. The Defendant does not take responsibility for any of her actions. She blames others for giving her alcohol and drugs, for people upsetting her until she needs to use alcohol and/or drugs. This officer feels that the Defendant minimizes her alcohol and drug use. The Defendant stated many times how messed up she was and how she did not remembering things.

F. Criminal Attitudes & Behavior Patterns Domain Level
☐Low ☑Moderate ☐High ☐N/A (IRAS-CSST) ☐N/A (IRAS-ST)

VIII. Risk & Needs Assessments

A. Indiana Risk Assessment System (IRAS)

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION TOOL (IRAS-CST)
As part of this report, the defendant was assessed for risk and needs through the Indiana Risk Assessment System Community Supervision Tool. The areas assessed by the Community Supervision Tool were criminal history; education, employment and finances; family and social support; neighborhood problems; substance use; peer associations; and criminal attitudes and behaviors.

The defendant's overall risk assessment score puts the defendant in the HIGH risk category to reoffend.

- Criminal History:
- Education, Employment, Financial Situation:
- Substance Abuse:
- Peer Associations:
O Criminal Attitudes and Behavioral Patterns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Criminal History</td>
<td>2.0 Education, Employment and Financial Situation</td>
<td>3.0 Family and Social Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Neighborhood Problems</td>
<td>5.0 Substance Abuse</td>
<td>6.0 Peer Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Criminal Attitudes and Behavioral Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Complementary Assessment Instruments

Criminal Thinking Scales:

The Criminal Thinking Scale, a self-report assessment instrument, measures criminal thinking traits as compared with a national normative sample. The Defendant’s scores on this tool indicate the following elevated scores:

Personal Irresponsibility (P I) refers to the degree to which an offender is unwilling to accept ownership for their criminal actions. High Scorers are willing to accept responsibility for their negative behavior and prefer to blame others for their behavior. THE DEFENDANT SCORED AT THE 50TH PERCENTILE.

Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory:

The SASSI is a self-report tool that measures various elements of alcohol/drug dependency. According to this tool, the Defendant was determined to have a “high probability” of having substance dependence.

---

IX. Evaluation/Summary

Comes now [redacted] and stands before the Grant County Circuit Court and the Honorable [redacted] after having pled guilty to Count #1 - Forgery, Class C Felony and Count #2 - Auto Theft, Class D Felony. The defendant and the State of Indiana have entered into an agreement which states that the defendant will agree that the sentence shall be:

On Count 1, four (4) years incarceration with two (2) years executed. Count 2, eighteen (18) months incarceration. The suspended portion of the sentence shall be served on supervised probation. That the Defendant shall pay Court cost. That all counts shall run concurrent to each other. That the Defendant shall admit the probation violation in [redacted] and receive 180 days incarceration and terminate probation. That the Defendant has the ability to pay restitution and shall pay restitution to the victim in an amount to be determined by the Court at the time of sentencing. That the Defendant shall comply with any other term/condition determined to be appropriate by the Grant County Probation Department and approved by the Court. In addition, as a condition of his supervision (probation/parole), you will be evaluated by the Reentry Court Staff for participation in the Grant County Reentry Court Program and, if admitted, be required to participate and successfully complete the program.

This officer believes the Court should consider the following factors in imposing sentence:

#1- The Defendant accepted the States plea agreement.

The defendant was interviewed at the Grant County Jail, and was helpful in completing this report. The Defendant made the following statement, "I was drinking and using Banzo's. I was dancing and using with my son's dad." "I left him for another guy and he got me messed up (drugs)." "He [redacted] saw the title of my girlfriend’s car and said we should sell it." "I said no for a week." "He got me high and I finally gave in and told him to do what ever he wants to with it." "I don't remember signing the title, I don't remember much of that day." "I guess we stole the car."

The Defendant stated she wanted the Judge to know that, "I am sorry, since I have been here (jail) I have had a lot of time to think on what lead up to my crime and I regret it." "All I can do is better my life and change." "I need to do better..."
for my kid’s; they are all that matters to me."  "I am no good to them in jail."

The Defendant was asked what she needs to do to change and she stated, "get a job to support my kids, get my children back (son is in CHINS and daughters are with their father), attend an anger management, parenting class, and N/A, and get back into church (get good people around me). The Defendant stated she needs to "stay busy". The Defendant stated if she needs to she will stay away from her current boyfriend and mother even though she doesn’t want to." The Defendant’s mother has a record and her current boyfriend is in jail.

The Defendant was asked what she thought about probation and she stated, "I am scared of probation". "Every time I get close to getting off probation I get into trouble." The Defendant was asked what she thought probation could do for her and she stated, "Support and help me do good."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggravating and Mitigating Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The aggravating factors are:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ The person has a history of criminal or delinquent behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ The person has recently violated the conditions of any probation, parole, community corrections placement, or pretrial release granted to the person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The mitigating factors are:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therefore this officer respectfully recommends to the Grant County Circuit Court and the Honorable [redacted] that the defendant [redacted] be sentenced for the crimes of Count #1- Forgery, Class C Felony and Count #2- Auto Theft, Class D Felony. This officer recommends that the Defendant be sentenced per the plea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,
## Adult Case Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>Risk Score</th>
<th>18550</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Problem Area:

- Objective to decrease risk:

### Education/Employment

- Lack of high school diploma/GED
- Currently unemployed (✓)

### Financial

- Problems/Reliance on assistance

### Family/Marital

- Non-rewarding marital
- Criminal Family Members

### Accommodations

- Resides in a high crime neighborhood
- Unsatisfactory housing

### Leisure/Recreation

- Absence of participation in pro-social, organized activity (✓)

### Companions

- Lack of pro-social friends/acquaintances

### Alcohol/Drug Problem

- Drug/alcohol use has caused problems in one or more areas of client's life (✓)
- Client will undergo a drug/alcohol assessment and follow through with recommendations made (✓)

### Emotional/Personal

- Moderate/severe interference with continued need for mental health care (✓)
- Psychological assessment indicated (✓)
- Client will meet with a mental health provider and follow recommendations

### Attitudes/Orientation

- Anti-social attitudes and beliefs supportive of crime (✓)
- Client will attend and complete a cognitive/behavioral program and after-care

### Overall Moderate-High Risk

- Curfew: 10p to 6am

### Place

- Voc Rehab

### Date

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indiana Risk Assessment System
COMMUNITY SUPERVISION TOOL (IRAS-CST)

Offender Information

Name

Date of Birth

Age at Assessment

Overview

Date

Assessor

Reason:

Re-Assessment

Risk Level

Total Risk Score

High

26

Domain Risk Levels / Scoring

High

Score: 6

Moderate

Score: 5

Score: 3

Score: 3

Score: 3

Score: 5

Low

1.0 Criminal History

2.0 Education, Employment and Financial Stability

3.0 Family and Social Support

4.0 Neighborhood Problems

5.0 Substance Abuse

6.0 Prior Incarcerations

7.0 Criminal Activity and Behavioral Problems

Other Areas of Concern

☐ Low Intelligence *

☐ Physical Handicap

☐ Reading and Writing Limitations *

☑ Mental Health Issues *

☐ No Desire to Change/Participate in Programs *

☐ Transportation

☐ Child Care

☐ Language

☐ Ethnicity

☐ Cultural Barriers

☐ History of Abuse/Neglect

☐ Interpersonal Anxiety

☐ Other

* If these items are checked it is strongly recommended that further assessment be conducted to determine level or severity.
1.0 Criminal History

1.1 Most Serious Arrest Under Age 18
☑ None - 0
☐ Yes, misdemeanor - 1
☐ Yes, felony - 2

1.2 Number of Prior Adult Felony Convictions
☐ None - 0
☑ One or two - 1
☐ Three or more - 2

1.3 Prior Sentence as an Adult to Jail or Secure Correctional Facility
☐ No - 0
☑ Yes - 1

1.4 Received Official Misconduct while Incarcerated as an Adult
☐ No - 0
☑ Yes - 1

1.5 Prior Sentence to Community Supervision as an Adult
☐ No - 0
☑ Yes - 1

1.6 Community Supervision Ever Been Revoked to Prison for Technical Violation as an Adult
☐ No - 0
☑ Yes - 1

Comments/Notes:

2.0 Education, Employment and Financial Situation

2.1 Highest Education
☐ High School Graduate or Higher - 0
☑ Less Than High School or GED - 1

2.2 Ever Suspended or Expelled from School
☐ No - 0
☑ Yes - 1

2.3 Employed at the Time of Arrest
☐ Yes - 0
☑ No - 1

2.4 Currently Employed/School
☐ Yes, Full-Time, Disabled or Retired - 0
☑ Not Employed or Employed Part-time - 1

2.5 Better Use of Time
☐ No, most time structured - 0
☑ Yes, lots of free time - 1

2.6 Current Financial Situation
☐ Good - 0
☑ Poor - 1

Comments/Notes:
3.0 Family and Social Support

3.1 Parents have Criminal Record
☐ No - 0
☑ Yes - 1

3.2 Satisfied with Current Marital or Equivalent Situation
☐ Yes - 0
☑ No - 1

3.3 Emotional and Personal Support Available from Family or Others
☑ Very Strong Support - 0
☐ None to Strong Support - 1

3.4 Level of Satisfaction with Current Level of Support from Family or Others
☑ Very satisfied - 0
☐ Not satisfied - 1

3.5 Stability of Residence
☐ Stable - 0
☑ Not Stable - 1

Comments/Notes:

4.0 Neighborhood Problems

4.1 High Crime Area
☑ No - 0
☐ Yes - 1

4.2 Drugs Readily Available in Neighborhood
☐ No, Generally Not Available - 0
☑ Yes, Somewhat Available - 1
☐ Yes, Easily Available - 2

Comments/Notes:
4.2 No one in the Neighborhood but "my mother".

5.0 Substance Abuse

5.1 Age First Began Regularly Using Alcohol
☑ 17 or Older - 0
☐ Under Age 17 - 1

5.2 Most Recent Period of Abstinence from Alcohol
☑ 6 months or longer - 0
☐ Less than 6 months - 1

5.3 Ever Used Illegal Drugs
☐ No - 0
☑ Yes - 1

5.4 Drug Use Caused Problems
☐ None - 0
☐ Past - 1
☑ Current - 2
5.5 Drug Use Caused Problems With Employment
☑ No - 0
☐ Yes - 1

Comments/Notes:

6.0 Peer Associations

6.1 Criminal Friends
☐ None - 0
☑ Some - 1
☐ Majority - 2

6.2 Contact with Past Criminal Peers
☐ No Contact with Criminal Peers - 0
☑ At Risk of Contacting Criminal Peers - 1
☐ Contact or Actively Seeks out Criminal Peers - 2

6.3 Gang Membership
☑ No, never - 0
☐ Yes, but not current - 1
☐ Yes, current - 2

6.4 Criminal Activities
☐ Strong Identification with Prosocial Activities - 0
☑ Mixture of Pro and Antisocial Activities - 1
☐ Strong Identification with Criminal Activities - 2

Comments/Notes:

7.0 Criminal Attitudes and Behavioral Patterns

7.1 Criminal Attitudes
☐ No/Limited Criminal Attitudes - 0
☑ Some Criminal Attitudes - 1
☐ Significant Criminal Attitudes - 2

7.2 Expresses Concern About Others
☐ Concerned about others - 0
☑ Concern for Immediate Family/Friends - 1
☐ No Concern for Others - 2

7.3 Feels Lack of Control Over Events
☐ Controls events - 0
☑ Sometimes lacks control - 1
☐ Generally lacks control - 2

7.4 Sees No Problem in Telling Lies
☑ No - 0
☐ Yes - 1

7.5 Engages in Risk Taking Behavior
☑ Rarely Takes Risks - 0
☐ Sometimes Takes Risks - 1
☐ Generally Takes Risks - 2
7.6 Walks Away from a Fight
☐ Yes - 0
☐ Sometimes - 1
☑ Rarely - 2

7.7 Believes in "Do Unto Others Before They Do Unto You"
☑ Disagree - 0
☐ Sometimes - 1
☐ Agree - 2

Comments/Notes: