Name of Tool	AssetPlus
Category	Youth Assessment: General Risk (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Baker and Youth Justice Board
Year	2014

Description

- AssetPlus is a structured assessment tool for use with young individuals who come into contact with the criminal justice system. It is designed to contribute to assessment and intervention planning for youths in both custodial and community settings. It has superseded the 'Asset' instrument.
- The instrument examines the young person's offence history and identifies a multitude of factors or circumstances which may have contributed to the behaviour. This includes questions about the inappropriate use of technology, health questions like whether the young person could be pregnant and a prompt about offence paralleling behaviours. It will also highlight any particular needs or difficulties for intervention as well as changes in risk and need over time.
- Designed to be used by Youth Offending Teams (YOT) in England and Wales. 'Youth Offending Team' (YOT) transfer questions are included in AssetPlus to support case transfers between teams.
- The instrument has scope to record whether a young person is susceptible to being manipulated or exploited.

Age Appropriateness

10-18

Assessor Qualifications

Assessors are required to complete a detailed induction programme on AssetPlus. Refresher training every three to six months is highly likely, particularly in the areas of Risk of Serious Harm, Safety and Wellbeing and identifying desistance factors.

Tool Development

- The AssetPlus builds upon the original Asset instrument. It uses the YOGRS as a static predictor to provide an indication of likely re-offending. This should help promote greater alignment with the National Probation Service's assessment framework (Baker, 2014).
- "The AssetPlus framework will provide a single assessment and plan for a young person, which will be dynamic and iterative in nature, making it easier to update assessments on an ongoing basis and therefore always presenting the latest information" (Baker, 2014).
- Factors included can contribute towards measuring progress or deterioration in relation to the individual's level of risk. This includes a measurement of whether a young person is susceptible to exploitation or manipulation.

• Empirical research on the AssetPlus is pending. Currently, there has just been research on the Asset instrument (Baker et al., 2003; Baker et al., 2005; Burman et al., 2007).

General Notes

• Asset has been used in a number of local authorities since 2001. In Scotland, the processing of police charges through the Children's Hearing System means that only the dynamic component of the Asset tool is used in everyday practice. To clarify, it is not possible to use the static component of the instrument, whereby involvement in previous offending is scored in relation to convictions, something which tends to be negated by the involvement of the Children's Hearing System in Scotland. To negate this, changes were made to the terminology in the 'Asset' when used in Scotland (Fearn 2014).

• The instrument can aid assessors in identifying risk and responsivity factors specific to the individual (e.g. 'motivation to change'). Some of the factors included in the assessment can act as targets for change. The AssetPlus can also help assessors identify protective factors and strengths.

• Participation of the young person in identifying and responding to their behaviours is part of the structure of the instrument.

Name of Tool	Early Assessment Risk List for Girls (EARL-21G)
Category	Youth Assessment: General Risk (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Levene and Colleagues
Year	2001

Description

• The EARL-21G is a 21 item structured clinical risk assessment tool to be used with females aged 6-12 years. It is designed to assess the risk level of future anti-social behaviour in order to inform treatment planning.
• It is similar to the boys' equivalent EARL-20B, with the inclusion of some gender-responsive items such as caregiver-daughter interaction.
• There are three sections within the tool: 1) family, looking at familial support and stressors; 2) child, looking at risk factors associated with the individual; 3) responsivity in terms of the ability and willingness of the individual and their family members to engage in interventions (Augimeri et al., 2001; 2019).
• Items are rated on a 3-point scale from 2 for presence, 1 for some but not complete and 0 for the lack of presence. There is also a clinical risk column for the assessor to red flag any factors that are particularly concerning (Augimeri et al., 2010a).

Age Appropriateness

For girls ages 12 and under.

Assessor Qualifications

EARL-21G should be used by clinicians and other professionals with experience of working with high-risk children.

Tool Development

• Developed from adult assessment tools and juvenile offending screening assessments (Augimeri et al., 2005).
• The goal of the EARL-21G is to help clinicians determine effective clinical risk management plan that may negate risk and prevent high-risk children entering the juvenile or adult justice systems (Augimeri et al., 2010).
• Girls had significantly higher composite scores than boys on the 19 common items shared in both the EARL-20B and EARL-21G assessments particularly on the 'Family' and 'Child' items (Augimeri et al., 2010).
• de Ruiter and Augimeri (2012) - the EARL-21G achieved moderate to strong predictive accuracy in relation to teacher-reported delinquency and the composite scores (AUC=.68) and final risk judgement (AUC = .71). No significant association was found, however, between EARL-21G scores and recidivism in official police records.

- Koegl (2011) - the composite score for the EARL-21G attained moderate accuracy in predicting any offence (AUC = .65).
- Augimeri et al (2010a) - using cox regression analysis, to analyse the relationship between variables, it was found that scores on the 'Antisocial Values and Conduct' item were significantly related to an increased probability to engage in future criminal offences. This was more so than the composite scores containing a combined score of multiple variables
- Yuile (2007) - the EARL-21G attained low to high kappa values ranging from .34 to .88 with an averaged item-level agreement on individual items of .55. Reliability scores for four of the items were low (i.e. .36 to .40).
- Levene et al. (2001) - moderate to high ICC values obtained for the EARL-21G composite scores (ICC = .67 [single measure] and .86 [average measure]).
- Augimeri et al. (2010b) found that only the item 'Antisocial Values and Conduct' predicted criminal outcomes for a sample of 380 girls.
- Koegl et al. (under review) found that overall, manifesting antisocial behaviour was the strongest predictor for future criminal convictions (OR = 6.00), and poor coping Ability (C12) was associated with more than a fourfold increase in the odds of committing an offence.

General Notes

- No validation evidence for UK samples at present.
- The majority of the current validation literature has been conducted by the authors of the EARL-21G.
- Fewer studies examining the predictive accuracy of the final judgement ratings.
- Other studies have used factor analysis methodology to validate the underlying constructs relating to the tool (e.g. confirmatory factor analysis used to test data based on existing theory or analytic research).
- The EARL-21G was used in the 'Interventions for Vulnerable Youth' Project funded by the Scottish Government.
- The EARL-21G had been used in Edinburgh and is currently used in Glasgow as part of the SNAP® (Stop Now And Plan)pilot programme, a multi-modal, gender-specific, evidence-based intervention for young children aged 6-11 with conduct problems and their families Augimeri et al., 2017; 2018). A presentation by Augimeri, Walsh and Donato (2016) explored the criminal outcomes for participants of SNAP®. The first wave informed the cost benefit analysis of SNAP® and the second wave informed the trajectory of SNAP® children and the predictive validity of the EARL tools.
- The tool has been translated into translated into six languages other than English (Swedish, Finnish, Norwegian, French, Dutch, and Japanese) and is used in various countries to assess the risk of future antisocial behaviours in young children.
- The EARL Pre-Checklist (EARL-PC: Augimeri et al., 2010a) has been recently developed as an abbreviated version of the full EARL assessments (see the EARL-20B entry in the Responsivity category for more information).

Name of Tool	Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory 2.0 Screening Version (YLS/CMI-SV 2.0)
Category	Youth Assessment: General Risk (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Hoge and Andrews
Year	2009

Description

• The screening version of the YLS/CMI may be used as a preliminary assessment for identifying young people at risk of general recidivism.

• As an abbreviated version of the YLS/CMI, the YLS/CMI-SV consists of 8 items pertaining to the risk/need domains of the tool: history of conduct disorder, current school or employment problems, some criminal friends, alcohol/drug problems, leisure/recreation, personality/behaviour, family circumstances/parenting and attitudes/orientation. Items are scored as 1 for the presence of a risk factor and 0 for the absence of it (Chu et al., 2014; Cuervo and Villanueva, 2017).

Age Appropriateness

12-18 years

Assessor Qualifications

Assessors should possess training and experience in youth assessment.

Tool Development

• The YLS/CMI consists of 42 items relating to the 'Central Eight' risk and need domains. These are the social circumstances and personality items considered to be reflective of recidivism (Andrews, Bonta and Wormith, 2004). The YLS/CMI-SV is an abbreviated version of this tool, corresponding to the eight risk/needs domains of the YLS/CMI (Hoge & Andrews, 2009).

• There have been a handful of international studies examining the reliability and predictive power of the YLS/CMI-SV.

• A study applying the YLS/CMI-SV and the YLS/CMI tools to Singaporean youths gave a fair inter-rater reliability rating of .51 for the YLS/CMI-SV compared to a good one of .63 for the YLS/CMI. The authors note that this may be a result of the small sample size for testing inter-rater reliability (Chu et al., 2014).

• The AUCs generated from the YLS/CMI-SV when applied to 3264 youth in Singapore were .64, .63 and .61 for predicting general, non-violent and violent recidivism respectively (Chu et al., 2014).

• Cuervo and Villanueva's (2017) study examining the 'reduced version' of the YLS/CMI on a sample of Spanish youths found that the AUC score for predicting general recidivism was .775.

General Notes

- For young person is assessed as being at moderate or high risk of recidivism using the YLS/CMI-SV, a fuller assessment using the YLS/CMI would be warranted (Chu et al., 2014).
- The YLS/CMI has been adopted as the primary risk assessment measure for youth in Singapore. Several justice agencies are contemplating whether to also use the YLS/CMI-SV to screen for risk of general recidivism (Chu et al., 2014).