Re-validation of the Nonviolent Offender Risk Assessment Instrument:
Study Findings
Current Instrument
In 1994, Virginia’s legislature directed the newly-created Sentencing Commission to:

- Develop an empirically-based risk assessment instrument predictive of a felon’s relative risk to public safety to determine appropriate candidates for alternative sanctions
- Apply the instrument to nonviolent felons recommended for prison, with a goal of placing 25% of those offenders in alternative sanctions
In 2003, the General Assembly directed the Commission to determine, with due regard for public safety, the feasibility of adjusting the instrument threshold to recommend additional low-risk nonviolent offenders for alternative punishment.

The Sentencing Commission concluded that the threshold could be raised from 35 to 38 points without significant risk to public safety.

- Change became effective July 1, 2004.
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Offenders must also meet certain eligibility criteria
Nonviolent Risk Assessment  
**Section D**  
**Offender Name:**

**Ineligibility Conditions**

A. Was the offender recommended for Probation/No Incarceration on Section B?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

B. Do any of the offenses at sentencing involve the sale, distribution, or possession with intent, etc. of cocaine of a combined quantity of 28.35 grams (1 ounce) or more?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

C. Are any prior record offenses violent (Category III listed in Table A of the Guidelines Manual)?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

D. Are any of the offenses at sentencing violent (Category III listed in Table A of the Guidelines Manual)?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

E. Do any of the offenses at sentencing require a mandatory term of incarceration?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

If answered YES to ANY, go to “Nonviolent Risk Assessment Recommendations” on cover sheet and check Not Applicable. If answered NO to ALL, complete remainder of Section D worksheet.

**Offense Type**  
Select the type of primary offense

- Drag  
- Fraud  
- Larotry  

**Additional Offense(s)**  
If YES, add 5

**Offender**  
Score factors A to D and enter the total score

A. Offender is a male  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

B. Offender's age at time of offense
   - Younger than 30 years  
   - 30 - 40 years  
   - 41 - 45 years  
   - Older than 46 years  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

C. Offender not regularly employed (during 2 years prior to arrest date)  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

D. Offender age 26 or more and never married (at time of offense)  
   - Information above not available (i.e., unable to interview defendant, defendant's lack of cooperation, etc.)  
   - Enter the total

**Arrest or Confinement Within Past 18 Months**  
(prior to instant offenses)

**Prior Felony Convictions and Adjudications**
Select the combination of adult and juvenile felony convictions/adjudications that characterizes the offender's prior record.

- Adult felony convictions only  
- Juvenile felony convictions or adjudications only  
- Both adult and juvenile felony convictions/adjudications

**Prior Adult Incarcerations**
Number:  
- 1 - 2  
- 3 - 4  
- 5 or more

**Total Score**

38 or less, check Recommended for Alternative Punishment.  
39 or more, check NOT Recommended for Alternative Punishment.

Go to Cover Sheet and fill out Nonviolent Risk Assessment Recommendations.
Current Risk Assessment Instrument:
Significant Factors in Assessing Risk

Relative Degree of Importance

- Offender Age
- Prior Felony Record
- Offense Type
- Not Regularly Employed
- Male Offender
- Prior Adult Incarcerations
- Prior Arrest w/in Past 18 Mos.
- Additional Offenses
- Never Married by Age 26
## Risk Assessment Outcomes for Nonviolent Offenders *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Recommended for Alternative</th>
<th>Not Recommended for Alternative</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>6,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>6,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Offenders recommended by the sentencing guidelines for prison or jail incarceration
Study Methodology
Identification of Offenders for the Study

- Offenders were identified from the sentencing guidelines database

- Selection criteria:
  - Felony fraud, larceny, and drug offenders
  - Sentenced in FY2005 and FY2006
  - Recommended for incarceration by the sentencing guidelines (jail or prison)
  - Meets risk assessment eligibility requirements
  - No worksheet errors
Offenders Meeting Selection Criteria by Most Serious Offense

Drug: 6,099
Larceny: 3,887
Fraud: 2,456

Total = 12,442
Selection of Study Sample (based on approved design)

- Staff drew a sample of 1,799 offenders who met the selection criteria
- Staff selected cases based on a stratified random sampling technique to increase the likelihood of including offenders with juvenile adjudications of delinquency
  - Criminological studies have shown that juvenile record and the age of first contact with the juvenile justice system are often correlated with subsequent offense behavior as an adult
## Composition of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Juvenile Record</th>
<th>Juvenile Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total sample: 1,799 offenders**

For the analysis, the sampled cases were weighted to reflect each subgroup’s actual proportion in the population.
Virginia Criminal History Records

- Staff requested and received criminal history records ("rap sheets") from the Virginia State Police
  - These only reflect criminal arrests and convictions within Virginia
  - Records were provided in database format
  - Staff examined the data to remove duplicate records and records incorrectly matched to offenders in the sample, and to identify offenders for whom no rap sheet was found
Virginia Criminal History Records

- For much of this data (25,439 arrest records, or more than 2/3), the VCC offense code was missing (only statute or text description was available)
  - Staff researched cases and filled in VCC offense codes with the best available information
  - Having offense identifiers is helpful in the analysis phase
- For 5,307 of the 36,025 arrest records, there was not a court disposition
  - Staff used other criminal justice databases to identify and fill in convictions wherever possible
Out-of-State Criminal History Records

- Sentencing Commission staff completed the necessary forms and procedures to request out-of-state criminal history records from the FBI.
- Request was reviewed by a FBI special board and approved.
- Sentencing Commission received out-of-state rap sheets in two forms: paper copies and PDF (image) files on disc.
- For the 15 states that do not participate in the FBI’s electronic rap sheet system, these records came on paper (532 rap sheets).
- For the remaining states, the records came in PDF (image) files.
Out-of-State Criminal History Records

- Since none of these records were in database format, staff examined the rap sheets
  - Needed information was recorded on a specially-designed data collection form
  - This information was then automated and added to existing databases
- These records were used to supplement prior record, if necessary, as well as to identify recidivism activity
A total of 137 cases had to be excluded from the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offender has prior violent felony</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender has current violent felony</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender still in prison</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap sheet could not be located</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism Measures

- As with prior nonviolent offender risk assessment studies, the official measure of recidivism is a new felony conviction within 3 years.

- However, multiple measures of recidivism were collected:
  - Any new arrest
  - New felony arrest
  - Any new conviction
  - New felony conviction

  New conviction is measured as a new arrest within three years of release that ultimately resulted in a conviction.
Analytical Approach

- Two analysts have been working largely independently of one another using two different statistical techniques
  - Staff have been discussing and reconciling differences in the two statistical models to develop an improved final model
Study Findings
Offender Characteristics – Prior Record

Prior Felony Convictions
- 0: 38.3%
- 1: 15.7%
- 2+: 46.1%

Prior Incarcerations
- 0: 26.1%
- 1: 23.3%
- 2 to 3: 22.0%
- 4+: 28.6%

Prior Juvenile Record
- No: 81.9%
- Yes: 18.1%

Total = 1,662

Analysis is based on the sample weighted to reflect the population of offenders eligible for risk assessment
Criminal History Records

Offenders with Arrests/Charges Outside of Virginia

33.6%

Most common jurisdictions for out-of-state arrests/charges:
- Maryland
- North Carolina
- Washington DC
- Tennessee
- Federal

Offenders with Arrests/Charges in Virginia Only

66.4%

Total = 1,662
Type of Disposition Received

- No Incarceration: 17.6%
- Jail up to 12 months: 49.4% (Median Sentence: 6 months)
- Prison 1 year or more: 33.0% (Median Sentence: 18 months)

Total = 1,662

Analysis is based on the sample weighted to reflect the population of offenders eligible for risk assessment
Three-Year Recidivism Rates (following release to community)

Any New Arrest: 53.6%
New Felony Arrest: 39.5%
Any New Conviction: 42.7%
New Felony Conviction: 27.1%

New conviction is measured as a new arrest within three years of release that ultimately resulted in a conviction.

1,509 of the 1,662 offenders could be tracked for the full three years.

Analysis is based on the sample weighted to reflect the population of offenders eligible for risk assessment.
Recidivism Rate (New Felony Conviction within Three Years) by Offense Group

- Larceny: 32.4%
- Fraud: 26.9%
- Drug: 23.8%

Total = 1,509

Analysis is based on the sample weighted to reflect the population of offenders eligible for risk assessment.
Recidivism Rate (New Felony Conviction within Three Years) by Juvenile Record

Analysis is based on the sample weighted to reflect the population of offenders eligible for risk assessment.
Recidivism Rates (New Felony Conviction within Three Years) by Offender Characteristics

### Age
- Under 21: 31.7%
- 21 to 29: 28.7%
- 30 to 43: 25.1%
- 44+: 22.7%

### Sex
- Male: 28.7%
- Female: 23.0%

Total = 1,509

Analysis is based on the sample weighted to reflect the population of offenders eligible for risk assessment
Recidivism Rate (New Felony Conviction within Three Years)

Analysis is based on the sample weighted to reflect the population of offenders eligible for risk assessment.
Recidivism Rate (New Felony Conviction within Three Years)

Recommendation of the Current Risk Assessment Instrument
For Offenders Who Received Points on the Marital or Employment Factors

- Recommended for an Alternative: 16.6%
- Not Recommended for an Alternative: 33.4%

Total = 963

Analysis is based on the sample weighted to reflect the population of offenders eligible for risk assessment.
Scoring of Employment Record on Current Risk Assessment Instrument

- Staff identified offenders in the study for whom an automated Pre/Post-Sentence Investigation (PSI) record was available.

- Staff further analyzed offenders who did not receive points on the employment factor on the current risk assessment tool.
  - The PSI revealed that nearly 36% of those offenders had not been regularly employed during the two years prior to arrest and, therefore, should have received points on the risk assessment instrument.
Scoring of Employment Record on Current Risk Assessment Instrument

- A check box was added to the Nonviolent Offender Risk Assessment form in FY2011 to indicate when offender information is not available

   **Offender**  Score factors A to D and enter the total score
   
   A. Offender is a male .......................................................... 8
   
   B. Offender’s age at time of offense
      - Younger than 30 years .................................................. 13
      - 30 - 40 years ................................................................. 8
      - 41 - 46 years ................................................................. 1
      - Older than 46 years ...................................................... 0
   
   C. Offender not regularly employed (during 2 years prior to arrest date) ........................................... 9
   
   D. Offender age 26 or more and never married (at time of offense) ..................................................... 6

   ☐ Information above not available (i.e., unable to interview defendant, defendant’s lack of cooperation, etc.)

- In addition, data entry procedures were modified to track instances where scores were missing in certain data fields
  
  - In FY2011, the check box was marked or information was missing relating to unemployment or marital status in 14.4% of eligible cases
  
  - Some offenders would not have been recommended for an alternative sanction if unemployment or marital status had been accurately scored
Proposed Model for Drug Offenders
Assessing Risk for Drug Offenders
Comparison of Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Logistic Regression</td>
<td>Logistic Regression</td>
<td>Survival Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>5 days – 6.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Offenders</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Not included in final analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Sanctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- While survival analysis allowed for the use of a slightly larger number of offenders in model development, the model resulting from the logistic regression method provides superior predictive ability.

- As a result, the model identified using logistic regression was selected as the final model.
## Significant Factors in Assessing Risk for Drug Offenders
### Comparison of Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Juvenile Record Combination</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Juvenile Record Separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Arrest/Commitment w/in 18 mos.</td>
<td>Prior Arrest/Commitment w/in 12 mos.</td>
<td>Prior Arrest/Commitment w/in 12 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Adult/Juvenile Felony Combination</td>
<td>Prior Adult Felony Convictions</td>
<td>Prior Adult Felony Convictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Adult Incarcerations</td>
<td>Prior Adult Incarcerations</td>
<td>Prior Adult Incarcerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense Type – All Drug Offenders Get Same Score</td>
<td>All Drug Offenders Get Same Score</td>
<td>Drug Offense Type (Possession vs. Dist.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Offenses – Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Regularly Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married by Age 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant Factors in Assessing Risk for Drug Offenders

Model 1

Relative Degree of Importance

- Prior Adult Felony Convictions
- Prior Adult Incarcerations
- Gender / Prior Juvenile Adjudication
- Offender Age
- Arrest/Confinement w/in 12 mos.

The model currently in use correctly identifies 82.6% of non-recidivists.

The proposed model correctly identifies 84.0% of non-recidivists.

A validation technique called bootstrapping was used to assess the degree of variation of this statistic across different subsamples. This figure was found to be stable across 750 subsamples.
### Scoring Significant Risk Assessment Factors for Drug Offenders

- **Offender Age at Time of Offense**
  - Points
  - Younger than 21 years: 9
  - 21 to 29 years: 6
  - 30 to 43 years: 3
  - Over 43 years: 1

- **Gender**
  - Offender is Male: 2

- **Prior Juvenile Adjudication**
  - Female with prior juvenile adjudication: 1
  - Male with prior juvenile adjudication: 7

- **Prior Adult Felony Convictions**
  - Points
  - Number: 0: 0
  - 1 – 2: 1
  - 3: 5
  - 4 or more: 15

- **Prior Adult Incarcerations**
  - Points
  - Number: 0: 0
  - 1 – 3: 1
  - 4 or more: 8

- **Prior Arrest or Confinement Within Past 12 Months (prior to offense)**
  - If YES, add 3

**TOTAL SCORE**
### Scoring Significant Risk Assessment Factors for Drug Offenders:

**Risk Assessment Scores**

**Comparing Current and Proposed Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Proposed Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Offenders scoring at or below point value</td>
<td>Percent of Offenders scoring at or below point value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Significant Risk Assessment Factors for Drug Offenders: Comparing Current and Proposed Models

Example:
Proposed Threshold = 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Model</th>
<th>Not Recommended for Alternative</th>
<th>Recommended for Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Model</td>
<td>Not Recommended for Alternative</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended for Alternative</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Rate: 39.2%

Recidivism Rate: 14.2%
Scoring Significant Risk Assessment Factors for Drug Offenders: Comparing Current and Proposed Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rec. for Alt. on Current Model, Not Rec. on Proposed: Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Not Rec. for Alt. on Current Model, Rec. on Proposed: Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Model for Larceny/Fraud Offenders
Assessing Risk for Larceny/Fraud Offenders
Comparison of Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Analysis</td>
<td>Logistic Regression</td>
<td>Logistic Regression</td>
<td>Survival Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>12 days – 6.8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Offenders</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Not included in final analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Sanctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While survival analysis allowed for the use of a slightly larger number of offenders in model development, the model resulting from the logistic regression method provides superior predictive ability.

As a result, the model identified using logistic regression was selected as the final model.
## Significant Factors in Assessing Risk for Larceny/Fraud Offenders
### Comparison of Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Offense Type Combination</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Offense Type Combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age at Offense &amp; Age at 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Adult Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Arrest/Commitment w/in 18 mos.</td>
<td>Legally Restrained at Time of Offense</td>
<td>Legally Restrained at Time of Offense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Adult/Juvenile Felony Combination</td>
<td>Prior Adult Felony Convictions</td>
<td>Prior Adult Felony Convictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Adult Incarcerations</td>
<td>Prior Adult Incarcerations</td>
<td>Prior Adult Incarcerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense Type – Larceny Offenders Get Higher Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Offenses – Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Regularly Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married by Age 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant Factors in Assessing Risk for Larceny/Fraud Offenders

Model 1

**Relative Degree of Importance**

- Prior Adult Incarcerations
- Offender Age
- Prior Adult Felony Convictions
- Gender / Type of Offense
- Legally Restrained at Time of Offense

This proposed model correctly identifies 79.3% of non-recidivists. The model currently in use correctly identifies 76.3% of non-recidivists.
## Scoring Significant Risk Assessment Factors for Larceny/Fraud Offenders

### Offender Age at Time of Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 21 years</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 29 years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 43 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 43 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

- **Primary offense is Fraud**
  - Offender is Female: 1
  - Offender is Male: 10

- **Primary offense is Larceny**
  - Offender is Female: 13
  - Offender is Male: 9

### Prior Adult Felony Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Convictions</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prior Adult Incarcerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Incarcerations</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legally Restrained at Time of Offense

- If YES, add 6

TOTAL SCORE: [Blank]
### Scoring Significant Risk Assessment Factors for Larceny/Fraud Offenders: Risk Assessment Scores
Comparing Current and Proposed Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Proposed Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Offenders scoring at or below point value</td>
<td>Reconviction Rate for offenders scoring at or below point value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Significant Risk Assessment Factors for Larceny/Fraud Offenders: Comparing Current and Proposed Models

Example:
Proposed Threshold =32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Proposed Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Recommended for Alternative</td>
<td>Not Recommended for Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended for Alternative</td>
<td>Recommended for Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Rate: 26.8%
Recidivism Rate: 17%
### Scoring Significant Risk Assessment Factors for Larceny/Fraud Offenders: Comparing Current and Proposed Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rec. for Alt. on Current Model, Not Rec. on Proposed: Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Not Rec. for Alt. on Current Model, Rec. on Proposed: Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>