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Case Decision.....Work Quietly On Your Own

- Imagine you are the Sergeant running the Domestic Violence (DV) unit

- Your primary responsibility is to investigate cases w/o an immediate arrest

- You have 4 new cases referred to you, but you can choose to investigate only one (too many cases, not enough resources....)

- Which case do you choose?

- Document why you chose that case – the features of the incident, suspect, victim that led to your decision
Case #1

On May 23rd at 15:40 hrs, Officer responded to a DV and victim, Robin, advised that her ex-husband, the suspect, picked her up and took her to get something to eat. The suspect became angry over a past argument and smacked the victim several times with his upper hand. The suspect pulled into a gas station lot where he then reached up under the victim's skirt and forcibly took her panties off. The suspect then grabbed the victim's hand and forcibly took a gold and amethyst ring off of her finger.

Case #2

On July 22nd at 1:01 PM Officers responded to a DV call. Complainant advised officer that she came to the above location to pick up her kids when the suspect, her boyfriend Markus, approached her while she was sitting in the car and hit her in the face with his fist. Complainant then advised officers she ran into the above location to try to use the phone, but the mother of suspect would not let her use it. Suspect then gained control of a knife swinging it at victim, striking her on the left arm. Victim’s injuries were non-critical. No medical attention was needed.
Case #3

On October 5th at 14:00 hours, Officers responded to Fight at 3590 West. Victim advised that her husband, suspect Sammy, had been drinking, he had observed her on the telephone and accused her of talking to her boyfriend. An argument ensued and the arguing went outside because the victim was trying to leave and they began fighting. The suspect body-slammed the victim in the yard next to the vehicle and he then straddled her, pinning her to the ground.

Case #4

On Feb 2nd at 15:38 hours, we responded to a disturbance and found victim sitting on the staircase at her apartment building. Victim told us that she lived in apartment #6 with her husband (suspect). She said that they had gotten into an argument because she found photos of another woman in his phone. They argued and during the argument the suspect grabbed her with his hand on the front of her face. She said he squeezed her face which caused an existing sore on her right lip to bleed. When she went outside to the neighbors to call the police the suspect followed her outside and told her to stop. Victim said that she refused and was continuing to try to get help when the suspect left in his truck.
Case Decisions

- Which case did you select?

- Why did you select that case?

Case Decisions

- Which case did you select? – (in)consistency in selecting cases across “Sergeants”
  - What are some of the implications of not being consistent in case selections?

- Why did you select that case? – (in)consistency in factors used to select cases
  - What are some of the implications of not being consistent with regard to the reasons for selecting a case?
Case Decisions

What if the case you chose has a suspect who is a racial/ethnic minority?

- Is it possible that case decisions like this could influenced by race/ethnicity, whether consciously or subconsciously?
- Even if there is no bias, would members of the community believe this? How does this impact trust & legitimacy?

Case Decisions

Imagine that one of the cases you did not investigate later ends in the murder of the victim (true for case #1)

- How do you explain your decision to do nothing further with that case?
- How defensible is your case decision process?
- Are you selecting the most important/risky cases?
Imagine you had full police reports on all three of these cases plus access to your agency’s RMS

• How long would it take to review all four cases and come to a decision?
• How much time would you spend if there were 6,000 cases referred to your unit each year?

Who should I stop, search for weapons?
Should I arrest this person or let them go?
Which cases or suspects should we investigate?
Who should we release from jail on bail?
Which defendant needs to be prosecuted?
Who should go to prison? Be released to community?
Lot’s of Decisions Being Made in CJ System Every Day.....

- How can we make consistent decisions?
- How can we make accurate decisions (i.e. high risk)?
- How can we make defensible decisions?
- How can we make timely decisions?
- How can we do more police work with fewer (and fewer) resources?

The 80/20 Rule As a Rational Decision Making Principle

- 20% of the places account for 80% of the crimes/calls for service
  - Identify “hot” places using density mapping, Risk Terrain Modelling (RTM), etc.
  - Increase police activities in hot spots (e.g., foot patrols, problem-solving)
  - Results in significantly reduced crime (Braga, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2012)
The 80/20 Rule As a Rational Decision Making Principle

- 20% of the people account for 80% of the crimes/calls for service

  - Focused deterrence strategies with high risk people in community associated with significant crime reductions (Braga & Weisburd, 2011)
  
  - Prioritizing correctional services to highest risk offenders decreases recidivism (Dowden & Andrews, 2006)

- Intelligence-led policing (ILP) – “a policing model built around the assessment and management of risk”*

*https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intelligence-led_policing

Is “Risk” a Legitimate Basis for Influencing CJ Decisions?

“Prediction of future criminal conduct is an essential element in many of the decisions rendered throughout our criminal justice system”

Forensic Risk Assessment

Attempt to identify the probability that a given individual will engage in a specific antisocial behavior within a defined follow-up period

- Probability vs. Absolutes
- Barefoot v. Estelle (1983)
  - “One hundred percent and absolute chance that Barefoot would commit future acts of criminal violence” (Dr. Grigson)

Forensic Risk Assessment

Attempt to identify the probability that a given individual will engage in a specific antisocial behavior within a defined follow-up period

- New violent crime
- New sexual offense
- Any new arrest
- Failure to appear

Choice specific to interest of person/agency requesting evaluation
Attempt to identify the probability that a given individual will engage in a specific antisocial behavior within a defined follow-up period

- 6 months
- 3 years
- 10 years

Errors will always occur – false positives & negatives

Goal is to use process that minimizes errors
Forensic Needs Assessment

Attempt to identify the dynamic or changeable factors in a person’s life that are potentially causally linked to his/her risk for recidivism

- Education & employment
- Housing
- Mental health
- Peer associations
- Family relationships
- Attitudes
- Leisure activities
- Alcohol & drug use

Forensic Risk Management

Development and implementation of a plan to reduce a person’s risk for recidivism by addressing his/her need areas

- Restrictions (e.g., peers, locations, firearms)
- Expectations (e.g., maintain employment, education)
- Supervision (e.g., low, mod, high)
- Monitoring (e.g., random drug/alcohol testing, GPS)
- Court-ordered treatments (e.g., BIP, sex offender group)
Risk Assessment Strategies

Unstructured Professional Judgment

- “Based on my 12 years of experience I would say this offender will almost certainly be arrested again…”
- Most common form of decision-making in CJ system

Actuarial Risk Assessment

- Statistical formulas that combine “risk factors” to maximize predictive accuracy
- Mechanical process – no discretion
- Life & driving insurance rates; Netflix, Amazon, Pandora

Actuarial Risk Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Aged 25 or older</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aged 18 - 24.99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ever Lived With</td>
<td>Ever lived with law for at least 60 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Index non-violent serious violations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prior non-sexual violence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prior Sex Offenses</td>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prior sentencing (excluding riots)</td>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Any convictions for non-contact sex offenses</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Any Unrelated Victims</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Any Stranger Victims</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Any Homicide Victim</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Add up scores from individual risk factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hanson’s Static-99 for recidivism by sex offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Static-99 score</th>
<th>5 years</th>
<th>10 years</th>
<th>15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Actuarial Risk Assessments

## Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG)

1. Lived with both biological parents to age 18 (except for death of parent)
   - Yes ............................................................................................................................ -2
   - No ............................................................................................................................ +3

2. Elementary school maladjustment
   - No problems ............................................................................................................ -1
   - Slight (minor discipline or attendance) or moderate problems ......................... +2
   - Severe problems (frequent disruptive behavior and/or attendance or behavior resulting in expulsion or serious suspensions) ........................................ +5

3. History of alcohol problems (one point for each)
   - Parental alcoholism 0 = -1
   - Teenage alcohol problem 0-2 = 0
   - Adult alcohol problem 3 = +1
   - Alcohol involved in prior offense(s) 4-5 = +2
   - Alcohol involved in index offense

4. Marital status
   - Currently or previously married or lived in common-law for 6 months ...... -2
   - Never married .................................................................................................... +1

---

# Risk Assessment Strategies

## Unstructured Professional Judgment

## Structured Professional Judgment

- “Checklist” of risk factors must consider
- Items supported by research and/or theory
- Evaluator has discretion in how items are combined & weighted
- Pilots pre-flight checklist; Surgical checklist

## Actuarial Risk Assessment
Statistical (actuarial) methods are more accurate in a broad range of decision-making activities (Grove & Mehl, 1996)

- Recidivism
- Sports (Oakland A’s)
- Job performance
- Academic functioning
- Response to treatment

Problems with unstructured risk assessment approach

- Choice of factors – overemphasize items that are not reliably associated with recidivism (severity of current offense)
- Overconfidence – people are overconfident in ability to predict; fail to acknowledge, learn from past errors
- Poor inter-rater reliability – 2 people assessing same offender often arrive at different conclusions
- Potential bias – conscious/unconscious bias based on race, ethnicity, gender, SES, etc.
Which Strategy Works Best?

“Every day many thousands of predictions are made by parole boards, college admission committees, psychiatric teams, and juries..... To use the less efficient of two prediction procedures in dealing with such matters is not only unscientific and irrational, it is unethical.”

- Grove & Meehl (1996)

Shouldn’t we try to improve decision-making in law enforcement and focus on the highest risk offenders when possible?

How do we find high risk offenders? Offender Recidivism 101

- BJS identified & tracked 272,111 inmates release from U.S. state prison in 1994
- 15 different states
- 2/3rds of all inmates released that year
- Collected pre-release data (e.g., offense, age, gender, time served)
- Recidivism = new arrest, conviction, return to prison within 3 years of release
Recidivism Facts

Percent of released prisoners in 15 States

- 67.5%
- 46.9%
- 25.4%

Recidivism Facts: Males

% Rearrested: By Gender

- Female: 57.6%
- Males: 68.6%
Recidivism Facts: Younger People

% Rearrested: By Age At Release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>% Rearrested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 or older</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Facts: Prior Offending

% Rearrested: By Number of Prior Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Prior Arrests</th>
<th>% Rearrested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 10</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recidivism Facts: Property Offending/Economic Support**

**% Rearrested: By Most Serious Conviction**

- Motor vehicle theft: 78.8%
- Larceny/theft: 74.6%
- Burglary: 74.0%
- Robbery: 70.2%
- Drugs (poss., dealing): 66.7%
- Assault: 65.1%
- Public-order (DUI, weapons): 62.2%
- Rape: 46.0%
- Homicide: 45.7%

---

**Well-Established Risk Factors**

- Criminal history (e.g., # arrests, age 1st arrest)
- Antisocial peer group/gang involvement
- Antisocial attitudes (e.g. hostile attributions)
- Personality disorder/psychopathy/impulsivity

**“The big 4”**

- Demographics (younger age, male, never married)
- Poor work history/unemployed
- Family problems (current & historical)
- Low IQ/cognitive impairment/poor school performance
- Substance abuse/dependence
- Prior failures on supervised release
How Are Actuarial Scales Developed?

- Public Safety Checklist (PSC) is a fully automated risk assessment scale
  - Used by Oregon’s Community Corrections to determine supervision levels
  - Available to CJ professionals and general public through the internet

The Public Safety Checklist for Oregon

How Are Actuarial Scales Developed?

1. Identify population or group you are trying to make predictions about
   - Offenders released from prison and offenders starting probation term in Oregon

2. Identify what are you trying to predict (outcome)
   - Recidivism – new “person” crime within 5 years of release from prison or start of probation

3. Find sample cases to use in developing scale (developmental or training sample)
   - 56,047 felony offenders released from prison or sentenced to probation between 2000 and 2005
How Are Actuarial Scales Developed?

4. Collect information on each case (i.e., possible risk factors) at time of release/start of probation (time 1)
   • LEDS – state arrest records
   • DOC – Dept. of Corrections files
   • OJIN – State’s judicial data system

   - age
   - gender
   - age of first arrest in LEDS
   - severity of current crime
   - # prior arrests in LEDS
   - prior theft conviction (y/n)
   - parole/prob. revocation (y/n)
   - prior incarceration (y/n)
   - multiple DOC custodies (y/n)
   - sentence (probation/prison)

How Are Actuarial Scales Developed?

5. Code outcome at end of follow-up time for each case (time 2)
   • Yes/no for person* arrest in 5 years since release

*PARTIAL LIST
813.010 - DRIVE UNDER INFLUENCE INTOX
163.160 - ASSAULT IV
166.065 - HARASSMENT
164.225 - BURGLARY I
163.190 - MENACING
162.315 - RESIST ARREST
163.195 - RECKLESSLY ENDANGER ANOTHER
163.165 - ASSAULT III
163.175 - ASSAULT II
163.187 - STRANGULATION
163.575 - ENDANGER WELFARE OF MINOR
166.220 - WEAPON USE UNLAWFUL
How Are Actuarial Scales Developed?

6. Identify individual factors that predict outcome (bivariate analyses)
   - **Correlation** (range -1 to 1, 0 = no relationship)
     
     \[-0.19 = \text{younger age at 1st arrest is associated with higher likelihood of new person arrest}\]
   
   - **Categorical analysis**

   ![Recidivism Rates by Age 1st Arrest](chart)

How Are Actuarial Scales Developed?

7. Combine individual risk factors to obtain most efficient and robust prediction (e.g., log. regression)

   ![Venn Diagram with Recidivism, Total # Arrests, Age at 1st Arrest](venn_diagram)

   **Does the addition of a new variable add enough to prediction of recidivism to include it in the final risk scale?**

Kris Henning, Ph.D. & Sgt. Greg Stewart
How Are Actuarial Scales Developed?

8. Identify item weights (often but not always done)

Unique predictive power of Age at 1st Arrest was higher, therefore give this factor more weight when calculating total risk score.

9. Calculate total risk score for each case

10. Examine distribution of scores and recidivism rates at each level to create risk groups/classifications (e.g., low, med, high)

There is no universally accepted threshold for determining “Low” or “High” risk.

Should “High” risk be:
- 10% chance of recidivating
- 50% chance
- 70% chance
How Are Actuarial Scales Developed?

- Natural breaks

Recidivism rates above 59% will be classified as “high risk”

- Capacity-based

We can effectively manage 15% of the cases as “high” risk – anyone with a score of 7 or higher

How Are Risk Scales Evaluated?

- **Ease of use** – risk scales that are complicated, costly, and time consuming are rarely adopted (fully automated PSC = $\mathbb{F}$)

- **High reliability** – similar risk scores should be produced by different raters (PSC = $\mathbb{F}$)
How Are Risk Scales Evaluated?

- High predictive accuracy – Different approaches:
  - Correlation - PSC & person crimes = .29, \( p < .001 \)
    
    “PSC scores predict recidivism at a statistically significant level, a level that exceeds random chance”
  - Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) & Area Under Curve (AUC) - PSC & new person crime = .70
    
    “There is a 70% chance that a randomly selected recidivist would have a higher PSC score than a randomly selected non-recidivist”

How Are Risk Scales Evaluated?

- High predictive accuracy – vs. other prediction methods
  - Unstructured professional judgment (research studies)
  - Other established actuarial risk scales (PSC = \( \hat{\theta} \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence Risk Scales</th>
<th>AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical, Clinical, and Risk Management (HCR-20)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Matrix 2000 for Violence (RM2000V)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Checklist - Person Crimes</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Statistical Infor. for Recidivism (GSIR)</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service Inventory (LSI/LSI-R)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Risk Scale (VRS)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUC’s for other scales from Yang, Wong, & Coid’s (2010) meta-analysis on violence prediction.
Limitations of Actuarial Scales

- Do not take into consideration any risk factors that are not on scale - PSC for example misses obvious risk factors like:
  - Detailed fantasies involving killing a 15-year old neighbor & burying body in back yard
  - Increasing addiction to heroin
  - Recent loss of job and bankruptcy
  - Re-acquaintance with former gang members
  - Escalating marital conflict

Limitations of Actuarial Scales: Reasonable Compromise

- Higher CJ Involvement (e.g., investigation, arrest, prosecution, supervision, treatment)
- Lower CJ Involvement (i.e., investigation, arrest, prosecution, supervision, treatment)
Actuarial Decision-Making in Law Enforcement: Example

- Portland Police Bureau (PPB; Oregon)
  - City population of ~550,000

- Domestic Violence Offenses
  - Mandatory arrest since 1977
  - 6,000+ DV reports per year (2005)

- Domestic Violence Reduction Unit
  - 7 officers (2005) - assigned to cover different geographic areas
  - 15 to 20% of shift spent reviewing cases
  - Investigate 400 to 600 per year

---

Actuarial Decision-Making in Law Enforcement

- Are we selecting the “right” cases?
  - Most likely to recidivate vs. easiest to find (i.e., work address on file)
- Are we selecting the same cases?
- How do we justify deferring 9 out of 10 cases?
  - Potential biases in decision-making (e.g., race, gender)
  - Liability concerns for failure to protect victims (e.g., Thurman v. City of Torrington; Castle Rock v. Gonzales)

>>> Need for risk scale and decision-making process
Portland’s Domestic Violence Risk Scale (DVRS-r)*

• 4,758 unique DV suspects from 2005
  ▪ Potential risk factors in RMS (e.g., suspect age & gender, prior DV reports, arrest history, restraining order violations, alcohol/drug offenses, age 1st arrest)

• Recidivism
  ▪ New local DV report as suspect
  ▪ 2-year follow-up, not necessarily same victim

• Results
  ▪ 34% recidivated
  ▪ 8 risk items contributed uniquely to prediction
  ▪ Overall assoc. with recidivism: \( r = .30^*, p < .001 \)

Portland’s Domestic Violence Risk Scale (DVRS-r)*

*R initial scale was created & implemented in 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK ITEMS</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender of Offender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age of 1st PPDS as Suspect</td>
<td>18 or Older</td>
<td>&lt; Age 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Current Incident Violated R/O or S/O</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prior DV or Family Disturbance Offenses</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>2 or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prior Arrests (Any Offense)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>5 or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prior Violent Offenses – Suspect</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>3 or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prior Alcohol/Drug Offenses</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Past Year DV or Family Disturbance Offenses</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>2 or More</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Portland’s Domestic Violence Risk Scale (DVRS-r)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Levels</th>
<th>Scale Scores</th>
<th>% Cases</th>
<th>% Any New Criminal Incident</th>
<th>% New DV Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest - 1</td>
<td>10 to 13</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 to 6</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest - 4</td>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Portland’s Revised Family Abuse Supplemental Report

- **Victim’s own risk assessment**
- **Risk items embedded in report**
Kris Henning, Ph.D. & Sgt. Greg Stewart

Revised Case Review & Assignment Process

DVRS-r Priority Level

P - 1
- Yes: Arrested
- No: Assigned
- Yes: Open Cases
- No: Assigned
- Yes: Advocate
- No: Other Factors
- Yes: Advocate
- No: Advocate

P - 2
- Yes: Arrested
- No: Assigned
- Yes: Open Cases
- No: Assigned
- Yes: Advocate
- No: Other Factors
- Yes: Advocate
- No: Advocate

P - 3
- Yes: Arrested
- No: Assigned
- Yes: Open Cases
- No: Assigned
- Yes: Advocate
- No: Other Factors
- Yes: Advocate
- No: Advocate

P - 4
- Yes: Arrested
- No: Assigned
- Yes: Open Cases
- No: Assigned
- Yes: Advocate
- No: Other Factors
- Yes: Advocate
- No: Advocate

*Pending or Suspended DV cases
ODARA, DAS, weapon use, choked victim, kids exposed, & other information on case

New cases downloaded each morning
DVRS-r items, total and priority level auto-calculated
Recommended case decision
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