

# Ohio Risk Assessment Direct Observation Tool

## Performance Measurement Guide

Knowledge	Skills	Ability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORAS Assessment Tool</li> <li>• Interview Techniques</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proficiency in completing an ORAS</li> <li>• Gathering information during an interview</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completing an ORAS accurately</li> <li>• Conversational and effective interview style that demonstrates knowledge of ORAS.</li> </ul>

Performance Measure	Measurement Description
Interviewer clearly explained the purpose of the interview.	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The interviewer briefly informed offender of the assessment process.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer explained the assessment in terms understandable to the offender, inquired if the offender had questions, and responded to questions prior to starting the interview. Interviewer also explained how the assessment results will be used to benefit the offender in the future and the next steps following the interview.</p>
Interviewer avoided jumping to conclusions	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> On 1-2 occasions, the interviewer interrupted the offender and made judgmental statements before the offender was finished responding.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer did not interrupt and waited for the offender to finish before responding. The interviewer asked for clarification when the offender provided vague/ unclear information and avoided making judgmental statements.</p>
Avoided barriers to listening	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The interviewer minimized noise and distractions (phones, finger/pencil tapping, no multi-tasking during interview). The interviewer assured there were no physical barriers to conducting the interview (unable to see or hear the offender clearly).</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer ensured privacy during the interview and minimized noises, distractions, and physical barriers. The interviewer appeared curious about the offender and clearly directed their attention to the offender. The dialogue was natural and the interviewer displayed non-verbal signs of active listening (eye contact, affirmation nods and noises).</p>
Evidence of collateral information being used	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The interviewer referenced at least half of the collateral information available during the interview. The interviewer missed 1-2 opportunities to affirm or challenge the offender with the available collateral information.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer referenced all collateral information available. The interviewer missed no opportunities to affirm or challenged the offender with the available collateral information.</p>
Interviewer used open ended questions effectively	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The interviewer asked more open ended questions than close ended questions.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The use of open ended questions was natural in the flow of conversation and the interviewer was able to elicit the offender's perceptions of his/her problems, motivation, and plans.</p>

<p>Interviewer used reflective statements to summarize answers</p>	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The interviewer missed 1-2 opportunities to use reflective statements to deal with resistance and/or keep the conversation going.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer has a natural reflective style and on multiple occasions used reflective statements to help the offender see the issue more clearly.</p>
<p>Avoided biased or leading questions</p>	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The interviewer did not show emotional responses during the interview. Questions did not assume a personal belief or value or assumed outcome.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer did not show emotional responses during the interview. Questions did not assume a personal belief or value or assumed outcome. Answers were not debated with the offender. The interviewer provided neutral explanations/clarifications when the offender had questions about how to understand a question.</p>
<p>Follow up questions were used</p>	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The Interviewer used follow up questions. The interviewer used some jargon, acronyms, or language that was difficult for the offender to understand. There were 1-2 opportunities missed to ask the offender a needed follow up question.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer used follow up questions throughout the interview. The interviewer avoided jargon and used language that the offender could understand. There were no missed opportunities to ask a needed follow up question.</p>
<p>Interviewer avoided using roadblocks in motivation</p>	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The Interviewer did not order, warn/threaten, argue, judge/blame, or shame/ridicule the offender. On 1-2 occasions the interviewer gave advice/solutions, and/or lectured the offender.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The Interviewer did not order, warn/threaten, give advice/solutions, argue/lecture, judge/blame, or shame/ridicule the offender. The interviewer did not use the “big hammer”.</p>
<p>Interview guide was used</p>	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The interviewer read all questions on the interview guide and used the guide for at least ¾ of the interview.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer has customized his/her interview guide. The interviewer skipped appropriate questions when the offender has provided the information in a previous question. The interviewer used the interview guide throughout the entire interview.</p>
<p>Interviewer used appropriate note taking during the interview which did not hinder the conversation</p>	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The Interviewer paused 1-2 times to finish writing notes and/or the interviewer lost their place in the interview while taking notes. The interviewer notes contained the offender’s name and the date of the interview. The notes were placed in the offender’s file. The content of the notes were vague and made scoring domains difficult.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer was able to balance taking notes while being engaged in the conversation. Taking notes did not interfere with the flow of the interview/conversation. The interviewer notes contained the offender’s name and the date of the interview. The notes were placed in the offender’s file. Notes contained adequate detail to score domains.</p>
<p>Interviewer obtained information to score each domain</p>	<p><b>Meets Requirements (2):</b> The interviewer asked questions specific to each domain area and gathered information regarding the offender’s attitudes, behaviors, and skills. All domains were scored and there were no more than 1 unanswered question in any domain.</p> <p><b>Exceeds Requirements (3):</b> The interviewer asked questions specific to each domain and gathered detailed information on the offender’s attitudes, behaviors, and skills. The Interview was able to score all domains and no questions were left blank.</p>