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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

Tool type: assessment

# of versions 1

Software by Allvest Information Services, Inc.

Assessment

Yes 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 minutes + interview + file

Scales:

6 Sections to the YLS. Section 1: Assessment of Risk/Needs has 42 items 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)


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 - 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,

☑ 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.

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

**Studied in JJ settings?** Yes

**Age range from manual:** Youths aged 12 to 17

**Age range studied:** 12 to 17

**Valid studies for gender or minorities:** 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 differences by gender in the predictive validity (see below). No sig diff 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 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?** Unsure if it can be used for reassessment.

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

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

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

**Reliability info:**
- 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) ICIs ranged .71 to .85, except Peer Relations = .61 (didn't include offense history scale) between MH professionals and POs on 29 cases.
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)

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 .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=.35m 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:


General Characteristics of Tool— Interrater Check

Juvenile Inventory for Functioning


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

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target setting/pop:</th>
<th>Juvenile Justice, Child Welfare, Educational settings and Public Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studied in JJ settings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range from manual:</td>
<td>7-17 years of age - age is listed in the instructions on the JIFF form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range studied:</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>The JIFF can be repeatedly administered, and thus could be used to assess change over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scales:

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

#### Used for reassessments?

Yes

#### 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.

#### Key citations:


#### Results of a FA reported?:

No

#### Concurrent validity:


#### Validity studies:

Predictive validity:


#### Norm sample:

None

#### Actual setting(s) researched:

Two juvenile justice sites but none of the data has been published

#### Target setting/pop:

Juvenile Justice, Child Welfare, Educational settings and Public Health

#### Valid. studies for gender or minorities:

None

#### 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

At least 1 study demon. interrater reliability? No

#### Other info RE purpose or format of tool?:

At least 1 study demon. predictive validity? No

At least 1 study demon. interrater reliability? No

#### Results of a FA reported?:

No
## Screening and Assessment Tools Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of tool/ instrument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors/ Developers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool screening:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of tool:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a risk assessment tool?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes on tool type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of versions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on versions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a cost per case?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, cost:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Notes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost for software?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, cost:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost for technical support?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on technical support cost:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where to obtain the tool:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have a copy of the test manual?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have the instrument coding sheet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the tool:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X minutes/X hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Respondent type:

- Youth
- Parents (check parents only if they MUST be interviewed)
- Other collateral specify--
- Other specify--

### Mode of Administration:

- Computer
- Paper-and-pencil
- Interview
- Interview + collateral

### Norm sample:

Online 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target setting/ population:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual settings researched:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range from manual:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range studied:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments on validation studies for gender or minorities:

Describe how the test is organized/ formatted. List each domain/scale/ subscale and the number of items in each.

### Information on scales/domains:

Describe what scores are produced. Subscale scored? Total test score? Item scores only? Settings on domains?

### Description of scoring method:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer scored?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a report generated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on report generated:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Used for reassessments?

Memo on RE reassessments:

### Examiner qualifications:

- Degree required: specify--
- License required: specify--

### Do examiners need training on the tool before they use it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the tool include any test items that address...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the tool include scales/subscales that address...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on the purpose or format of the tool:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Psychometric properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there at least 1 study demonstrating predictive validity from an independent party?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-rater reliability:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information on reliability:

- e.g., internal consistency of scales/subscales, inter-rater reliability, test-retest reliability

### Predictive validity:

- e.g., ROC curves, results of survival or regression analysis, correlation with future outcomes

### Concurrent validity:

- e.g., correlations with other tools, diagnostic agreement

### Are the results of a factor analysis reported?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes on factor analysis:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key citations:

APA format

### Relevance to MHC:

Notes on relevance to MHC:

### Date Information last updated:

Date updated: mm/dd/yyyy

Save record