



SCREENING AND ASSESSMENT TOOLS DATABASE

**Gina Vincent, Ph.D.
Valerie Williams, MA, MS
University of Massachusetts Medical School**

In assisting different sites of the MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change Initiative, it was requested that a variety of different mental health tools be reviewed. The National Youth Screening & Assessment Project (NYSAP) developed the Screening and Assessment Tools Database to standardize the process of collecting and reviewing literature about screening and assessment tools designed for use with juvenile justice-involved youth. The database includes information about the use and utility of mental health, needs assessment, and risk for recidivism or violence assessment tools.

Attached please find a blank template of the Screening and Assessment Tools Database and an example report that the database generates.

The database provides essential things to consider when juvenile justice agencies wish to record and organize information on mental health, risk and needs tools. The process of evaluating a screening or assessment tool encompasses more than simply collecting and reviewing literature. Attention needs to be given to the purpose of the tool, the population/setting the tool was designed for, the population/setting that was actually researched, and the existing psychometric evidence gathered. The present database provides a template for a consistent method of recording important characteristics of mental health screening and assessment tools and can serve as a model for juvenile justice agencies interested in selecting a tool.

Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory

YLS/CMI

of versions 1

version notes:

authors: R. D. Hoge, Ph.D. & D. A. Andrews, Ph.D.
Software by Allvest Information Services, Inc.

tool type: assessment

type notes:

RA tool? Yes availability: private use Cost per case? Yes if yes, purchase cost: \$5.80

Cost for software? Yes If yes, cost: Cost per case?

Cost for tech support? Where to obtain tool: Multi-Health Systems, www.mhs.com

Have a copy of manual? Yes Have a copy of coding sheet? Yes

purpose: a standardized inventory for use with juvenile offenders that assesses risk for recidivism as well as needs factors that assist in case management

admin. time: 20-30 +interview + fill

scales: 6 Sections to the YLS. Section 1: Assessment of Risk/Needs has 42 items e divided into 8 subscales that include static and dynamic factors.

1. Prior and Current Offenses (5 items)
2. Family Circumstances/Parenting (6 items)
3. Education/Employment (7 items)
4. Peer Associations (4 items)
5. Substance Abuse (5 items)
6. Leisure/Recreation (3 items)
7. Personality/Behavior (7 items)
8. Attitudes/Orientation (5 items)

Other sections: II: Summary of Risk/Needs Factors, III: Assessment of Other Needs/Special Considerations, IV: Your Assessment of the Client's General Risk/Need level, V: Contact Level, VI: Case Management Plan

scoring: The YLS/CMI is in checklist format - the rater indicates if risk factors are present and indicate strength areas. A score for each subscale and an overall score is produced and converted into summary risk rating - of low, moderate, high, or very high risk. The summary risk rating is actuarial but there is a professional override option.

Respondent type: youth parents file info Other collateral (specify)-- Teachers, police, therapists, etc. Other source (specify)-- parents not required

Mode of Admin: computer self report paper-and-pencil self report interview interview + collateral info

degree required? No specify-- license required? No specify-- do examiners need training on the tool? Yes

who can admin tool? Probation officers, youth workers, psychologists, social workers, front-line staff, etc.

Relevant to MfC? Yes MfC memo: Tool being reviewed for implementation in LA

Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory

YLS/CMI

Norm sample: 264 adjudicated offenders (173 boys, 91 girls) who have received a probation or custody disposition. They ranged 12 to 17 years of age. It was collected between January 1995 to January 1996 in Ontario, Canada. The YLS/CMI forms were completed by the probation officers responsible for the youths at intake.

Target setting/pop: Youths in the juvenile justice system at all phases of the judicial decision-making process: pretrial detention, preadjudicatory diversion, disposition/sentencing, and case planning within institutional and community contexts.

Actual setting(s) researched: Probation, open/secure custody, residential, high school students

Studied in JJ settings? **Age range from manual:** youths aged 12 to 17 **Age range studied:** 12 to 17

Valid. studies for gender or minorities: Norm sample includes girls. Marshall et al. (2006) found YLS/CMI total scores postdicted assault charges but not institutional/community violence or past charges. Schmidt et al. (2005) found no sig difs by gender in the predictive validity (see below). No sig dif in the predictive validity of YLS total and subscale scores between Aboriginal and non-Native groups (Jung & Rawana, 1999)

Scales: 6 Sections to the YLS. Section 1: Assessment of Risk/Needs has 42 items e divided into 8 subscales that include static and dynamic factors.

- 1. Prior and Current Offenses (5 items)
- 2. Family Circumstances/Parenting (6 items)
- 3. Education/Employment (7 items)
- 4. Peer Associations (4 items)
- 5. Substance Abuse (5 items)
- 6. Leisure/Recreation (3 items)
- 7. Personality/Behavior (7 items)
- 8. Attitudes/Orientation (5 items)

Other sections: II: Summary of Risk/Needs Factors, III: Assessment of Other Needs/Special Considerations, IV: Your Assessment of the Client's General Risk/Need level, V: Contact Level, VI: Case Management Plan

Used for reassessments? **Notes:** Unsure if it can be used for reassessment -

Items address: violence MH substance use behavioral d/o suicide family strengths/protect. factors other factor - Offense History
Education
Leisure/recreation
Peer Associations

Sub/scales address: violence MH substance use behavioral d/o suicide family strengths/protect. factors other factor - Offense History
Education
Leisure/recreation
Peer Associations

Other info RE purpose or format of tool?: **At least 1 study demon. predictive validity?** Yes

Reliability info: Inter-rater: Poluchowicz et al. (2000) found ICC = .75 for the Total Risk score based on 33 cases coded by independently by two raters (unpublished study). Schmidt et al. (2005) ICCs ranged .71 to .85, except Peer Relations = .61 (didn't include offense history scale) between MH professionals and POs on 29 cases. **At least 1 study demon. interrater reliability?** Yes

Concurrent validity: Classification: Hoge & Andrews (1996) found risk/needs scores differentiated between people in three disposition categories (probation, open custody, secure custody). Jung (1996) compared a group of adjudicated offenders with a sample of high school students. The offender sample obtained significantly higher YLS/CMI total and subscale scores. (Offender group, N=263, Nonoffender group, N=62).
CBCL: Schmidt et al. (2005) found YLS total scores positively correlated with all subscales of the CBCL
PCL:YV: Sig correlations btw YLS total score and factor scores of PCL:YV (Rowe, 2002)

Validity studies:

Results of a FA reported?: No

Predictive validity: Past General Offending: Jung & Rawana (1999) divided their sample into two groups: those who had reoffended within 6 months of the conclusion of their disposition, and those who had not. The reoffending group displayed higher YLS/CMI overall risk/need scores and subscale scores than the nonreoffending group.

Jung (1996) used a linear discriminant analysis based on the 8 YLS/CMI subscores to predict reoffending. The analysis yielded a 75.38% correct classification value (RIOC=20%).

Past Community/Institutional Violence: Marshall et al.(2006) found that for recorded incidents of violence the YLS/CMI AUC was 0.6. For number of charges and convictions, the YLS/CMI produced an AUC of .71 and for assaults, the YLS/CMI produced an AUC of .67.

Future General Reoffending: Schmidt et. Al (2005) conducted a prospective follow-up study for 3.5 years. The AUC for the overall YLS/CMI total score resulted in a value of .67 for serious Reoffending, a larger value than the .61 obtained on the Any Reoffending. AUC results for YLS ratings of low, moderate, and high and very high risk categories resulted in values of .65 for SR and .56 for AR.

Future Reoffending??: Rowe (2002) reported a significant correlation between total scores and reoffending for both males ($r=.35$, $p<.001$) and females ($r=.61$, $p<.001$). Rowe (2002) assessed the predictive power of total risk scores through survival analyses. Youths classified at high YLS/CMI risk levels recidivated at a significantly faster rate across time (Log rank = 60.50, $p<.001$).

Key citations: Jung (1996). Critical evaluation of the validity of the risk/need assessment with Aboriginal young offenders in northwestern Ontario. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Psychology, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Jung, S. & Rawana, E. (1999). Risk-need assessment of juvenile offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26, 69-89.

Poluchowicz, Jung & Rawana (2000) The interrater reliability of the Ministry Risk/Need Assessment Form for juvenile offenders. Presentation at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada.

Rowe (2002) Predictors of criminal offending: Evaluating measures of risk/needs, psychopathy, and disruptive behavior disorders. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.

Schmidt, F., Hoge, R., & Robertson, L. (2005, May). Reliability and validity analyses of the Youth Level of Services/Case Management Inventory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32(3), 329-344.

General Characteristics of Tool--Interrater Check

Juvenile Inventory for Functioning

JIFF

of versions 2

version notes: The JIFF was initially conceptualized as a screener for the CAFAS. There are two versions of the Jiff: One administered to the youth, and the other administered to the caregiver

authors: Hodges, K., (2004).

tool type: uncertain (could be either)

type notes: Mental health screen & service plan

RA tool? No

availability: private use

Cost per case? Yes

if yes, purchase cost: \$1.05 per fo

Cost for software? Yes

If yes, cost:

Cost per case?

Cost for tech support? Yes

Where to obtain tool: Kay Hodges, Ph.D.

Functional Assessment Systems, LLC

3600 Green Court, Suite 110

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

Phone: 734 769 9725

Fax: 734 769 1434

Email: hodges@provide.net

Have a copy of manual? No

Have a copy of coding sheet? Yes

purpose: Brief self-administered interview which can be used to: 1) screen for mental health problems, 2) assist in determining the youth's day-to-day functioning across domains of functioning, 3) design a service plan that addresses each of the domains in need of attention, and 4) assess outcome over time. There are two versions of the JIFF: youth & caregiver version

admin. time: 20 minutes

scales: JIFF subscales include: school, home, friends, neighborhood, feelings, self-harm potential, substance use, irrational thought, family environment, and health

scoring: The software generates a report that identifies responses indicating problematic functioning. The software also associates these identified problems with suggested goals, permitting the professional design a "service plan." The service plan consists of the goals, and the services recommended to accomplish each goal and a priority ranking. The service plan includes a graph of the number of problem behaviors reported in each of the 10 domains. To permit users to tailor the service plans to their local community, the software has an administrator's module that allows users to enter response options into drop down menus (e.g., list of local services). Scoring method: quantitative scores, including a total score, subscale scores and severity scores.

Respondent type: youth parents file info Other collateral (specify)-- Caregiver

Other source (specify)--

Mode of Admin: computer self report paper-and-pencil self report interview interview + collateral info

degree required? No

specify--

license required? No

specify--

do examiners need training on the tool? No

who can admin tool? It is designed to minimize the demands on the professional, and can be administered by a paraprofessional

Relevant to MfC? Yes

MfC memo: PA Probation considered using this tool but decided against it because of the cost of administration and tech support.

Psychometric Info--Interrater Check

Juvenile Inventory for Functioning

JIFF

Norm sample: None

Target setting/pop: Juvenile Justice, Child Welfare, Educational settings and Public Health

Acutal setting(s) researched: Two juvenile justice sites but none of the data has been published

Studied in JJ settings? Age range from manual: 7-17 years of age - age is listed in the instructions on the JIFF form

Valid. studies for gender or minorities: None

Scales: JIFF subscales include: school, home, friends, neighborhood, feelings, self-harm potential, substance use, irrational thought, family environment, and health

Used for reassessments? Yes Notes: The JIFF can be repeatedly administered, and thus could be used to assess change over time.

Items address: violence MH substance use behavioral d/o suicide family strengths/protect. factors other factor - Health

Sub/scales address: violence MH substance use behavioral d/o suicide family strengths/protect. factors other factor - Health

Other info RE purpose or format of tool?:

At least 1 study demon. predictive validity? No

Reliability info: Thus far, pilot data has been collected at two juvenile justice sites – one in Detroit and the other in Brown County (Green Bay), Wisconsin, using the written JIFF form. This pilot data has been analyzed and presented at four different national conferences. With the computerized version of the software now available, more formal psychometric studies can be readily accomplished and are in progress, including test-retest, internal consistency, concurrent validity and predictive validity.

At least 1 study demon. interrater reliability? No

Concurrent validity:

Validity studies:

Predictive validity:

Results of a FA reported?: No

Key citations: Hodges, K. (2003). Juvenile Inventory For Functioning. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University
Hodges, K. (2004b). Handbook for the Juvenile Inventory For Functioning. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University

Buckeye, L., Hodges, K., Hull, B., Hussey, D., Mitchell, C., Rosas, S., Smith, C., & Timmons-Mitchell, J. (2006). Preventing penetration of truant youth into the juvenile justice system via community-based screening procedures. Symposium o Promoting Resiliency in Families: Innovative Program in Schools, Courts, Child Welfare, and Mental Health. Presented at Research and Training Center for Children's Mental Health, Tampa, FL.

Screening and Assessment Tools Database

<small>subid</small>	Name of tool/ instrument:	Authors\ Developers:	
	Tool acronym:	Type of tool:	Is this an risk assessment tool?
Notes RE tool type:			
Number of versions:		Comments RE versions:	
Availability:	Is there a cost per case?	If yes, cost:	Purchase Notes:
Cost for software?	Per case?	Cost for technical support?	Comments RE technical support cost:
Where to obtain the tool:			
Do we have a copy of the test manual?		Do we have the instrument coding sheet?	
Purpose of the tool:			Administration time: X minutes/X hours
Respondent type: <input type="checkbox"/> Youth <input type="checkbox"/> Parents <i>(check parents only if they MUST be interviewed)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> File information <i>Check all that apply</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Other collateral <i>specify--</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>specify--</i>			
Mode of Administration: <i>Check all that apply</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Computer <input type="checkbox"/> Paper-and-pencil <input type="checkbox"/> Interview <input type="checkbox"/> Interview+collateral			
Norm sample:		<i>Define norm sample. Make sure to include sample size, whether girls were included, what settings youths were gathered from, ethnicity and race. If none, enter 'no norm sample'.</i>	
Target setting/ population:		Actual settings researched: <input type="checkbox"/> Has the tool been studied in juvenile justice settings?	
Age range from manual:		Age range studied:	
Comments RE validation studies for gender or minorities:			
Information on scales/domains:		<i>Describe how the test is organized/formatted. List each domain/scale/subscale and the number of items in each.</i>	
Description of scoring method:		<i>What scores are produced? Subscale scores? Total test score? Item scores only? Ratings on domains?</i>	
Computer scored?	Is a report generated?	Comments RE report generated:	
Used for reassessments?		Memo RE reassessments:	
Examiner qualifications: degree required? <input type="checkbox"/> specify-- license required? <input type="checkbox"/> specify--		List professions that can administer the tool: <i>(e.g., psychologist, probation officers, institutional staff)</i>	
Do examiners need training on the tool before they use it?			
Does the tool include any test items that address... <input type="checkbox"/> violence/aggression <input type="checkbox"/> substance use/abuse <input type="checkbox"/> suicidality <input type="checkbox"/> strengths/protective factors <input type="checkbox"/> mental health <input type="checkbox"/> behavior problems <input type="checkbox"/> parenting/family/home <input type="checkbox"/> other <i>specify--</i>			
Does the tool include scales/subscales that address... <input type="checkbox"/> violence/aggression <input type="checkbox"/> substance use/abuse <input type="checkbox"/> suicidality <input type="checkbox"/> strengths/protective factors <input type="checkbox"/> mental health <input type="checkbox"/> behavior problems <input type="checkbox"/> parenting/family/home <input type="checkbox"/> other <i>specify--</i>			
Comments RE the purpose or format of the tool:			
Psychometric properties:			
Is there at least 1 study demonstrating predictive validity from an independent party?		...inter-rater reliability...?	
Information on reliability:		<i>e.g., internal consistency of scales/subscales, inter-rater reliability, test-retest reliability</i>	
Predictive validity:		<i>e.g., ROC curves, results of survival or regression analysis, correlation with future outcomes</i>	
Concurrent validity:		<i>e.g., correlations with other tools, diagnostic agreement</i>	
Are the results of a factor analysis reported?		Notes RE factor analysis:	
Key citations:			<i>APA format</i>
Relevance to MfC:	Notes RE relevance to MfC:		
Date information last updated: mm/dd/yyyy			

Save record