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LSI-R Initial Assessment by Jurisdiction
Fiscal Year 2006

n=4,291
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Trend: Between the respective years of 2004 and 2006, the percentage of Administrative and Low-Risk Offenders with initial LSI-Rs has increased from 43.4% to 50.6%, while the percentage of Surveillance and High-Risk Offenders had decreased from 33.8% to 30.9%.

Implication: The divergence between high-risk and low-risk offenders reveals a larger proportion of incoming offenders with lower criminogenic risk patterns, and conversely, a smaller proportion of offenders with higher risk patterns.
Trend: Probation and Parole Officers are reassessing their offenders at an increasing rate, with the exception of the 2nd Quarter of 2006.

Implication: The increasing number of LSI-R reassessments administered reflects a greater capacity to monitor offender risk change over time.
Average Time in Months Between LSI-R and ASUS Assessments by Quarterly Year Cohort Groups

**Trend:** There is a steady decline in the average time between LSI-R and ASUS assessments.

**Implication:** Shorter monthly intervals between LSI-R and ASUS assessments may enhance the officers’ risk-monitoring and case management efforts.
Trend: As LSI-R risk levels increase, there is a significant negative change in risk scores and a significant positive change in protective scores.

Implication: The above trend implies greater service-matching and case-management efforts with higher-risk offenders.
Average Change in LSI-R Risk Scores By the Number of Repeat Reassessments Administered

Trend: There is a significant decline in LSI-R risk scores as the number of multiple reassessments increase. This represents a significant reduction in criminogenic risk.

Implication: Offenders that receive multiple reassessments implies increased case management and offender monitoring efforts.