Name of Tool	Dynamic Risk Assessment of Offender Re-Entry (DRAOR)
Category	Violence Risk (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Serin and Mailloux
Year	2009

Description

• The DRAOR contains dynamic stable, acute and protective factors that assist staff in identifying and responding to change in the risk of reoffending and desistance from crime.

• The DRAOR is scored using information obtained from interviews with the individuals, their families and partners, reports from treatment providers and other applicable persons such as the police (Yesberg, Scalan and Polaschek, 2014).

The total score for the DRAOR is calculated by adding the stable and acute scores and then subtracting the protective total (Yesberg and Polaschek, 2014).

• The basis for this instrument is the 'risk-needs-responsivity' model, which categorises interventions based on risk and changing needs (Yesberg et al., 2015).

Age Appropriateness

No age range specified

Assessor Qualifications

Designed for use within the probation service. No assessor qualifications specified.

Tool Development

• The DRAOR was firstly developed for probation staff in Canada to be able to manage the management of those in the community. Serin and colleagues extrapolated items from previous research on violent and sexual offending (Serin, Lloyd and Hanby, 2010).

• Polaschek and Yesberg (2018) looked at completers of an intensive prison-based treatment programme. Based on DRAOR scores, completers entered the community with higher protective and lower stable and acute dynamic factors and also showed less variability on acute risk factors.

• R. Serin (personal communication, October 2010) - initial validation research in New Zealand involved 283 individuals who offended and 35 probation officers. The researchers found that the DRAOR attained moderate to high accuracy in predicting recidivism: 'Stable' subscale scores in predicting any new offence (AUC = .75), 'Acute' subscale (AUC= .76). It was also found that repeating the DRAOR assessments resulted in better prediction. The first set of Stable scores attained an AUC value of .70 which increased to .79 by the fourth iteration. The tool was further refined and thereafter adopted as a national standard for probation in New Zealand (Serin, Lloyd and Hanby, 2010).

• Tamatea and Wilson (2009) found positive correlations between the Stable and Acute subscales and the risk of recidivism. The Protective subscale was negatively correlated to recidivism.

- Serin (personal communication, December 2012) - a 3-month follow-up pilot study conducted in Iowa, utilised a total of 926 DRAOR assessments obtained from individuals within probation and parole settings. Data was extracted at two time intervals, with a mean of 65.6 days between assessments. Small to moderate correlations was observed between the composite and subscale scores at time 1 and the outcome - which was defined as any violation of return to prison (Total score = .28; Acute score = .23; Stable -.25; Protective score = -.28).Similar trends in correlation were observed at time 2. Furthermore, the DRAOR attained moderate AUC values in predicting recidivism (Total score = .66, Stable = .60, Acute = .65, Protective = .67) compared to the LSI-R (.56).
- A doctoral thesis by Hanby (2013) found that the DRAOR has promise as a valid tool for risk assessment and management, with reconvictions being accurately predicted from monthly average Stable Risk for 12 months and the Protective Factors were predictive for 4 months.
- A sample of 287 high-risk males discovered that the DRAOR total score significantly predicted reconviction. Further, the score of stable items was found to independently predict reconvictions and imprisonment, indicating that this is the most important element to the tool in predicting outcomes (Yesberg and Poalschek, 2014).
- Research by Yesberg and colleagues (2015) on a mixed-sex sample found that the DRAOR predicted recidivism for the females but not the males.
- As part of Masters dissertation research, Chadwick (2014) sought to validate the DRAOR. Predictive accuracy was evaluated using ROC analysis. Findings indicated the stable domain and total scores produced the largest effects (AUCs of .61 to .62). It is concluded that case managers would benefit from utilising the DRAOR in the everyday supervision of individuals who have offended.
- A Masters dissertation administered the DRAOR to 85 individuals convicted of sexual offences released from prison to test its ability to predict sexual, violent and general recidivism. It was found that the domain scores significantly correlated with all recidivism, bar sexual offending (Averill, 2016).
- Using a sample 112 males convicted of IPV offences, a Masters dissertation looked at whether the DRAOR predicted repeat offending. While the DRAOR did not predict IPV recidivism in this sample, it appeared to be useful for informing case management decisions. IN terms of violence generally, the DRAOR's Total and Stable scores were significantly positive associated with offending (AUC=.65); whilst the Protective scores were negatively associated with violence (AUC=.35) (Perley-Robertson, 2019).

General Notes

- Authors advise that the assessment should be completed on a monthly basis.
- Further validation is being undertaken in Australia, Canada and the United States (Serin, Lloyd and Hanby, 2010).
- Positive reports of the application of DRAOR from Department of Corrections New Zealand – 2013.