

# Forensic Mental Health Assessment

A C A S E B O O K

SECOND EDITION

EDITED BY

KIRK HEILBRUN

DAVID DEMATTEO

STEPHANIE BROOKS HOLLIDAY

CASEY LADUKE

OXFORD

SECOND EDITION

---

FORENSIC MENTAL  
HEALTH ASSESSMENT

*A Casebook*

EDITED BY

KIRK HEILBRUN, DAVID DeMATTEO,  
STEPHANIE BROOKS HOLLIDAY,  
AND CASEY LADUKE

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide.

Oxford New York  
Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi  
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi  
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in  
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece  
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore  
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by  
Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

© Oxford University Press 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data  
Forensic mental health assessment : a casebook. — Second edition / edited by Kirk Heilbrun,  
David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-19-994155-1

1. Forensic psychology—Case studies. 2. Mentally ill offenders—Case studies.
3. Forensic psychiatry—Case studies. I. Heilbrun, Kirk, editor of compilation. II. DeMatteo, David, 1972—  
editor of compilation. III. Holliday, Stephanie Brooks, editor of compilation.
- IV. LaDuke, Casey, editor of compilation.

RA1148.F553 2014

614'.15—dc23

2014001777

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2  
Printed in the United States of America  
on acid-free paper

The views expressed in this book are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the US Government.

# FORENSIC MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT

*To Don Bersoff—colleague, mentor, and friend—a giant in American law-psychology*

*Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo*

*To my family, Linda, Justin, Lauren, and Jimmy; and husband, Mike, for all*

*their support*

*Stephanie Brooks Holliday*

*To LWC, who is remembered every day*

*Casey LaDuke*

## PREFACE

The second edition of any book is always a balancing act. We wanted to make sure that the field and the literature had advanced sufficiently from the 2002 original to justify a revision. On the other hand, we did not want to wait so long that the original framework and content were no longer relevant. When our Oxford editor, Sarah Harrington, raised the possibility of a second edition about two years ago, it seemed like time to consider it. The original set of forensic mental health assessment (FMHA) principles had been expanded but was still largely intact. There had been significant advances in some areas (e.g., risk and threat assessment; appraisal of response style), although relatively little change in others (e.g., evaluation of mental state at the time of the offense). The empirical literature in many relevant areas was robust, featuring important changes that included additional specialized measures developed to strengthen these evaluations. Updates in ethical guidelines and practice standards were available, and Oxford had published a 19-volume series, "Best Practices in Forensic Mental Health Assessment," premised on the idea that best practices could now be identified. So the time seemed right.

There are a number of individuals who deserve particular thanks for their contributions to this second edition. We are very grateful to every professional who agreed to provide a report (sometimes two) in their respective areas of specialization. (In lieu of a report, Stan Brodsky provided commentary on an existing report that is sure to be of interest to those considering how such a report has implications for expert testimony.) Some also contributed

a "teaching point"—a short answer to a very specific question involving the principle, the report, or some issue associated with either. Thanks to all of you for your excellent forensic case reports, which we hope will serve for the field as a model of how such reports should be written. Thanks as well for your timeliness, your dedication, and for the example you set for the entire field.

Our Oxford University Press editor Sarah Harrington has been a genuine pleasure to work with on this and other projects. Andrea Zekus, assistant editor at Oxford, did an outstanding job in the latter stages of this project as well. Randy Otto's suggestion about allowing contributors to interject comments on their work resulted in an interesting additional feature for some of these reports. We are very appreciative to each of you.

Kirk is grateful to his wife, Patty Griffin, and daughter, Anna Heilbrun and her fiancé, Christopher Catizone, for their love and support—as well as to his and Patty's large, extended families for all that they do. Dave thanks his wife, Christina, for her support and patience, his children, Emma and Jake, for providing much-needed perspective, and his parents, Nicky and Julie, for their continuing support. Stephanie would like to sincerely thank her parents, Justin and Linda, as well as her sister, Lauren, and brother, Jimmy, for their unconditional support and confidence in her. She is also extremely grateful for the unwavering encouragement of her husband, Mike. Casey thanks his parents, David and Laurie, and his sister, Lauren, for their sacrifices and support. He also thanks his grandparents, Lauren and Ann

Choate, whose consideration and care are the examples to which he aspires. Both Stephanie and Casey are also grateful to Kirk and Dave for their support and guidance.

Kirk Heilbrun  
Dave DeMatteo  
Casey LaDuke  
Philadelphia, PA

Stephanie Brooks Holliday  
Washington, D.C.

August, 2013

## ABOUT THE EDITORS

**Kirk Heilbrun, PhD**, is a professor in the Department of Psychology, Drexel University, and co-director of the Pennsylvania Mental Health and Justice Center of Excellence. He received his doctorate in clinical psychology in 1980 from the University of Texas at Austin, and completed postdoctoral fellowship training from 1981–1982 in psychology and criminal justice at Florida State University. His current research focuses on juvenile and adult offenders, legal decision-making, forensic evaluation associated with such decision-making, and diversion. He is the author of a number of articles on forensic assessment, violence risk assessment and risk communication, and the treatment of mentally disordered offenders, and has published eight books in this area. His practice interests also center around forensic assessment, and he directs a clinic within the Drexel Department of Psychology in this area. He is board-certified in clinical psychology and in forensic psychology by the American Board of Professional Psychology, and has previously served as president of both the American Psychology-Law Society/APA Division 41, and the American Board of Forensic Psychology. He received the 2004 Distinguished Contributions to Forensic Psychology award and the 2008 Beth Clark Distinguished Service Contribution Award from the American Academy of Forensic Psychology.

**David DeMatteo, JD, PhD**, is an associate professor of psychology and law at Drexel University, where he is director of the JD/PhD program in law and psychology. He received his JD in 2001 from Villanova Law School and his PhD in clinical psychology in 2002 from MCP Hahnemann University. His research interests

include psychopathy, forensic mental health assessment, drug policy, and diversion, and he has published numerous articles and book chapters and several books in these and related areas. His research has been funded by several state and national agencies. He is licensed as a psychologist in Pennsylvania, where he provides forensic assessment and consultation services. He was chair of the American Psychological Association's Committee on Legal Issues in 2011, and he is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association.

**Stephanie Brooks Holliday, PhD**, is currently a postdoctoral fellow with the War Related Illness and Injury Study Center (WRIISC) at the Washington, D.C., VA Medical Center. She completed her predoctoral internship at the Washington, D.C., VA Medical Center, and received her doctorate in clinical psychology in 2013 from Drexel University. Her current research interests are focused on adult offenders, risk assessment, interventions for risk reduction, justice-involved veterans, and neuropsychological functioning in veteran populations. Her practice interests are focused on forensic assessment and neuropsychological assessment. In addition to membership in the American Psychology-Law Society/APA Division 41 and the Criminal Justice Section of APA Division 18 (Psychologists in Public Service), she has served as a member-at-large for the Graduate Student Committee of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI).

**Casey LaDuke, MS**, is currently a doctoral candidate in the Department of Psychology at Drexel University, with concentrations in forensic psychology and clinical neuropsychology. He



received his BA in psychology from the University of Rochester in 2009, and completed his MS in psychology at Drexel University in 2011. His current interests include forensic mental health assessment (particularly violence risk assessment), psychopathy, the diversion of individuals with serious mental illness from the justice system, and the application of clinical neuropsychology in the forensic context. While at Drexel he has worked

with the Philadelphia Department of Behavioral Health and the Pennsylvania Mental Health and Justice Center of Excellence, and has completed clinical practica within neuropsychological, forensic, and correctional settings. He is an elected member of the student section committee of the American Psychology-Law Society (APA Div. 41), where he will be serving as chair-elect (2013–2014) and chair (2014–2015).

## CONTRIBUTORS

**Chad Brinkley, PhD, ABPP**, is a clinical psychologist at the United States Medical Center for Federal Prisoners in Springfield, Missouri. He provides inpatient treatment for inmates with severe mental illness and civil commitment cases. He is board-certified in forensic psychology and does a variety of forensic work, including risk assessments, competency evaluations, mental state at the time of the offense evaluations, and competency restoration treatment.

**Stanley L. Brodsky, PhD**, is a professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Alabama. He coordinates the psychology-law PhD concentration in clinical psychology and he directs the Witness Research Lab at the university. His areas of specialization are expert witness testimony, forensic assessment, and psychotherapy with involuntary clients.

**Ashley Kirk Burgett, PhD**, is currently a staff psychologist at the Federal Medical Center in Lexington, Kentucky. Her interests include the evaluation and treatment of the mentally ill in a psycholegal context.

**Mary Alice Conroy, PhD**, is a professor and director of clinical training for the Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program at Sam Houston State University. She is a diplomate in forensic psychology, past president of the American Academy of Forensic Psychology, and maintains an active practice conducting both adult and juvenile evaluations for the criminal courts.

**Dewey G. Cornell, PhD**, is a forensic clinical psychologist who holds the Bunker Chair in the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia. His work is concerned with school

climate and safety, youth violence prevention, and threat assessment.

**Mark D. Cunningham, PhD, ABPP**, is a board-certified clinical and forensic psychologist whose practice in capital sentencing is national in scope. His professional contributions and scholarship have been recognized with the 2012 National Register of Health Service Psychologists A. M. Wellner, PhD Distinguished Career Award and the 2006 American Psychological Association Award for Distinguished Contributions to Research in Public Policy.

**Eric Y. Drogin, JD, PhD, ABPP**, is a forensic psychologist and attorney currently serving on the faculty of the Harvard Medical School, in the Program in Psychiatry and Law, and with the Forensic Psychiatry Service, Department of Psychiatry, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. He also teaches on the faculty of the Harvard Longwood Psychiatry Residency Training Program. Dr. Drogin's forensic practice focuses on expert witness testimony and trial consultation in criminal and civil matters.

**Joel A. Dvoskin, PhD, ABPP (Forensic)**, is a clinical and forensic psychologist in Tucson, Arizona, affiliated with the University of Arizona College of Medicine and the Threat Assessment Group. He provides expert testimony, consultation, training, and mediation services to criminal justice and mental health agencies, and workplace and campus violence prevention programs to corporations, colleges, and universities.

**Eric B. Elbogen, PhD**, is an associate professor in the forensic psychiatry program at the

University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill School of Medicine and clinical psychologist at the Durham Veterans Affairs Medical Center. His clinical work and empirical research at the intersection of psychiatry and law concern military veterans, violence risk assessment, and criminal justice involvement.

**Jacey Erickson, Esq.** is a criminal defense attorney and a doctoral student in clinical psychology (forensic concentration) at Drexel University. Her research interests include risk assessment, female offenders, and offender re-entry.

**William (Bill) Foote, PhD, ABPP**, is a forensic psychologist in private practice in Albuquerque, New Mexico, since 1979. He is a past president of the American Psychology-Law Society, and the American Board of Forensic Psychology.

**Richard Frederick, PhD**, is in private practice in Springfield, Missouri. He conducts a wide range of forensic psychological evaluations and consults to others on assessment issues in forensic settings.

**I. Bruce Frumkin, PhD, ABPP**, is board-certified forensic psychologist and Director of Forensic and Clinical Psychology Associates, P.A., with offices in Miami and Chicago. He has conducted approximately 700 “competency to waive *Miranda* rights” and “alleged false/coerced confession” evaluations throughout the country, has published research in the areas of *Miranda* waiver and interrogative suggestibility, and has presented extensively to both lawyer and psychology groups.

**Alan M. Goldstein, PhD**, board-certified in forensic psychology—ABPP, is Professor Emeritus at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice and is in independent practice in White Plains, New York. He specializes in cases involving false confessions, *Miranda* waivers, fitness for trial, insanity and related defenses; and sentencing, including capital and post-conviction relief cases, and has published in these areas as well.

**Jonathan W. Gould, PhD**, is a forensic psychologist in private practice specializing in consulting with attorneys on child custody and related family law issues. He has written extensively on application of forensic methods and procedures to child custody assessment, alienation dynamics, domestic violence, role boundary and related ethical issues, and relocation assessment.

**Stephen D. Hart, PhD**, is a founding Director of ProActive ReSolutions Inc., where he heads

the Threat Assessment Stream. He is a professor of psychology and a member of the Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute at Simon Fraser University in Canada, and is also a visiting professor in the faculty of psychology at the University of Bergen in Norway. His work focuses on clinical-forensic assessment in criminal, civil, and workplace settings, and especially on the assessment of violence risk and psychopathic personality disorder.

**Samuel Hawes, PhD**, is a National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) postdoctoral Fellow at Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. His work focuses on the etiology and development of callous-unemotional (CU) features and anti-social behaviors as well as their relationship with maladaptive outcomes such as violence and aggression.

**Kathleen Kemp, PhD**, is a staff psychologist with Rhode Island Hospital's Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Bradley/Hasbro Children's Research Center. She specializes in forensic mental health evaluations with adolescents in the juvenile justice system. Her clinical research focuses on developmental factors impacting youths' mental health, substance use, and juvenile justice trajectories, as well as the translation of evidence-based practice to the juvenile justice population.

**H. D. Kirkpatrick, PhD**, is a licensed psychologist in private practice in Charlotte, North Carolina. He holds a diploma in forensic psychology from the American Board of Professional Psychology. He is the author of two fictional psychological thrillers.

**Kathryn Kuehnle, PhD**, is an assistant professor in the Department of Mental Health Law and Policy at the University of South Florida and maintains a private forensic practice specializing in child custody evaluations, consultation, and expert witness testimony, with particular sub-specializations in allegations of child sexual abuse, adult sexual assault, and intimate-partner violence. She is the author of four books and author or co-author of 18 book chapters pertaining to issues of child sexual abuse and child custody.

**Terrance J. Kukor, PhD**, is the director of forensic services at Netcare Access in Columbus, Ohio. He is an adjunct faculty member in the

Department of Psychology at Drexel and Miami (Ohio) Universities, and in the Department of Psychiatry at the Ohio State University. His professional interests involve criminal forensic evaluation of adults and juveniles, suicide and violence risk assessment, and forensic animal-maltreatment evaluations.

**Craig R. Lareau, JD, PhD, ABPP**, is the director of forensic training for the Postdoctoral Fellowship Program at Patton State Hospital in southern California. He is an attorney and a diplomate in forensic psychology, is past president of the California Psychological Association, and is a workshop leader for the American Academy of Forensic Psychology. He maintains an active private practice conducting evaluations of adult defendants for the criminal courts and evaluations of plaintiffs in personal injury and disability matters.

**Paul Montalbano, PhD, ABPP (Forensic)**, is a board-certified forensic psychologist and deputy chief of the forensic psychology postdoctoral fellowship at Walter Reed National Military Center. He provides expert forensic consultation, testimony, and training and is in independent practice in Washington, D.C.

**Douglas Mossman, MD**, is a professor of clinical psychiatry and the program director for the Forensic Psychiatry Fellowship at the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine. He has authored more than 150 publications on legal and ethical issues, medical decision-making, violence prediction, statistics, and psychiatric treatment. He received the American Psychiatric Association's 2008 Manfred S. Guttmacher Award for outstanding contributions to the literature on forensic psychiatry. His recent scholarly projects investigate predictions of violence, malingering measures, civil commitment, and novel mathematical approaches to assessing test accuracy.

**David F. Mrad, PhD, ABPP**, is board-certified in forensic psychology. After working for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, he is now the director of clinical training at Forest Institute in Springfield, Missouri. His clinical practice involves criminal forensic evaluations and violence risk assessments.

**Daniel Murrie, PhD**, is the director of psychology at the Institute of Law, Psychiatry, and Public Policy, and an associate professor in the

Department of Psychiatry and Neurobehavioral Sciences in the University of Virginia Medical School. As a clinician, he performs a variety of forensic evaluations. As a researcher, his work addresses reliability and quality control in forensic mental health evaluations.

**J. Gregory Olley, PhD**, is a psychologist specializing in developmental disabilities in the Carolina Institute for Developmental Disabilities and Clinical Professor in the Department of Allied Health Sciences at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His interests include community services for individuals with developmental disabilities and people with intellectual disabilities in the criminal justice system.

**Randy K. Otto, PhD, ABPP (Clinical Psychology and Forensic Psychology)**, is a faculty member at the University of South Florida and adjunct professor at Stetson University College of Law. He also maintains a practice limited to forensic psychological evaluation.

**Ira K. Packer, PhD, ABPP (Forensic)**, is a clinical professor of psychiatry at the University of Massachusetts Medical School, where he directs the Forensic Psychology Postdoctoral Fellowship. His publications include *Evaluation of Criminal Responsibility* (Oxford University Press, 2009) and *Specialty Competencies in Forensic Psychology* (Oxford University Press, 2011, with Thomas Grisso).

**Lindsey Peterson, MS**, is a JD/PhD student in the law and psychology program at Drexel University. She received her master's degree in clinical psychology from Drexel University. Her interests include forensic assessment, false confessions, serious mental illness, and the intersection between law and psychology.

**Lisa Drago Piechowski, PhD, ABPP**, is a board-certified forensic psychologist specializing in civil litigation. She is an associate professor of clinical psychology at the American School of Professional Psychology in Washington, D.C., and maintains a private practice in Chevy Chase, Maryland. She is the author of *Evaluation of Workplace Disability* in the "Best Practices in Forensic Mental Health Assessment" series.

**Phillip J. Resnick, MD**, is a professor of psychiatry at Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine and director of forensic psychiatry at University Hospital's Case Medical Center.

**Richard Rogers, PhD, ABPP**, a Regents Professor at the University of North Texas, has authored several forensic assessment measures widely used in forensic practice. They include the Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms-2 (SIRS-2), the Evaluation of Competency to Stand Trial—Revised (ECST-R), and the Standardized Assessment of *Miranda* Abilities (SAMA). Dr. Rogers is only the third psychologist in APA history to receive Distinguished Professional Contribution awards in both Applied Research (2008) and Public Policy (2011).

**Karen L. Salekin, PhD**, is a clinical forensic psychologist and an associate professor at the University of Alabama. Dr. Salekin's research interests fall in the broad areas of intellectual disability and the legal system.

**Jay P. Singh, PhD**, Associate Professor (II) at Molde University College in Norway. His primary research interests include violence risk assessment, forensic epidemiology, and statistical methodology.

**Heidi Strohmaier, MS**, is a doctoral student in clinical psychology (forensic concentration) at Drexel University. She completed her undergraduate training at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and then earned her master's degree in psychology from Drexel University. Her research interests include psychopathy, diversion, and reentry.

**Kelly A. Watt, PhD**, works as a threat assessment specialist at ProActive ReSolutions, Inc., and is a member of the Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute at Simon Fraser University in Canada. Her work focuses on conducting assessments, providing training, and developing strategies for workplaces related to preventing, assessing, and managing workplace violence.

**Robert M. Wettstein, MD**, is a clinical and forensic psychiatrist, and clinical professor of psychiatry at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine. He is a past president of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law.

**Amy L. Wevodau** is a doctoral candidate in clinical psychology at Sam Houston State University. Her research interests include legal decision-making in laypersons, victim impact statements, and forensic assessment issues. Her clinical interests include forensic assessment and risk mitigation. Amy is currently completing her predoctoral work at the University of Massachusetts Medical School/Worcester Recovery Center and Hospital in Worcester, Massachusetts.

**Philip H. Witt, PhD, ABPP**, is a forensic psychologist in full-time private practice through Associates in Psychological Services, P.A. in Somerville, New Jersey. He specializes broadly in risk assessment and more specifically in sex offender evaluation. He is the coauthor of *Evaluation of Sexually Violent Predators* (Oxford, 2008).

**Patricia A. Zapf, PhD**, is a professor in the Department of Psychology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, the City University of New York. She has conducted over 2,500 forensic evaluations in both the United States and Canada and has published eight books and over 85 articles and chapters on forensic mental health assessment. Professor Zapf travels throughout the United States and internationally to train legal and mental health professionals on best practices in forensic evaluation.

# FORENSIC MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT

# CONTENTS

Preface	xv	
About the Editors	xvii	
Contributors	xix	
1. Introduction and Overview	1	
2. <i>Miranda</i> Waiver Capacity	10	
CASE ONE		
Principle: Use nomothetic evidence in assessing clinical condition, functional abilities, and causal connection (Principle 28)	10	
<i>Case contributed by I. Bruce Frumkin</i>		
Teaching Point: What is the value of specialized forensic assessment instruments in forensic mental health assessment?	17	
<i>Contributed by I. Bruce Frumkin</i>		
CASE TWO		
Principle: Use case-specific (idiographic) evidence in assessing clinical condition, functional abilities, and causal connection (Principle 27)	18	
<i>Case contributed by Alan M. Goldstein</i>		
Teaching Point: What are the limits of specialized Forensic Assessment Instruments?	31	
<i>Contributed by Alan M. Goldstein</i>		
3. Competence to Stand Trial	33	
CASE ONE		
Principle: Use testing when indicated in assessing response style (Principle 26)	33	
<i>Case contributed by Richard Rogers</i>		
Teaching Point: Integrating different sources of response style data	43	
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		
CASE TWO		
Principle: Select the most appropriate model to guide in data gathering, interpretation, and communication (Principle 16)	43	
<i>Case contributed by Patricia A. Zapf</i>		
Teaching Point: How can you use a model to structure the way you write the report?	48	
<i>Contributed by Patricia A. Zapf</i>		
CASE THREE		
Principle: Attribute information to sources (Principle 32)	49	
<i>Case contributed by Samuel Hawes and Mary Alice Conroy</i>		
Teaching Point: Separating and integrating data from different sources through source attribution in analyzing, reasoning about, and communicating FMHA results	56	
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		
4. Criminal Responsibility	57	
CASE ONE		
Principle: Be familiar with the relevant legal, ethical, scientific, and practice literatures pertaining to FMHA (Principle 3)	57	
<i>Case contributed by Robert M. Wettstein</i>		
Teaching Point: Sources of particularly relevant information from the literature	66	
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		
CASE TWO		
Principle: Attribute information to sources (Principle 32)	66	
<i>Case contributed by Kathleen Kemp and Daniel Murrie</i>		

Teaching Point: Line-by-line versus paragraph-level attribution	77	Review the available background information and actively seek important missing elements (Principle 17)	121
<i>Contributed by Daniel Murrie</i>		<i>Case contributed by Kirk Heilbrun and Jacey Erickson</i>	
CASE THREE		Teaching Point: How much is enough? Diminishing returns from information sources	135
Principle: Decline the referral when evaluator impartiality is unlikely (Principle 10)	78	<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>	
<i>Case contributed by Ira K. Packer</i>		CASE TWO	
Teaching Point: Remaining impartial in high visibility cases	86	Principle: Obtain relevant historical information (Principle 19)	136
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		<i>Case contributed by Mark D. Cunningham</i>	
5. Sexual Offending Risk Evaluation	87	Teaching Point: Evaluating the accuracy of different sources of third party information	144
CASE ONE		<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>	
Principle: Provide appropriate notification of purpose and obtain appropriate authorization before beginning (Principle 23)	87	8. Capital Sentencing, <i>Atkins</i> -Type Evaluations	146
<i>Case contributed by Philip H. Witt</i>		CASE ONE	
Teaching Point: Obtaining informed consent in Sexually Violent Predator cases	95	Principle: Accept referrals only within area of expertise (Principle 9)	146
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		<i>Case contributed by J. Gregory Olley</i>	
6. Federal Sentencing	97	Teaching Point: Gauging the training and experience in forensic and mental health areas needed for this kind of evaluation	163
CASE ONE		<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>	
Principle: Describe findings so that they need change little under cross-examination (Principle 31)	97	CASE TWO	
<i>Case contributed by Kirk Heilbrun and Stephanie Brooks Holliday</i>		Principle: Use relevance and reliability (validity) as guides for seeking information and selecting data sources (Principle 18)	164
Teaching Point: Communicating findings to accurately reflect their strength and the evaluator's confidence in them	109	<i>Case contributed by Karen L. Salekin</i>	
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		Teaching Point: Selecting tools for use in FMHA	200
CASE TWO		<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>	
Principle: Use scientific reasoning in assessing the causal connection between clinical condition and functional abilities (Principle 29)	109	9. Competence for Execution	201
<i>Case contributed by David DeMatteo</i>		CASE ONE	
Teaching Point: Risk-need assessment in sentencing	119	Principle: Identify relevant forensic issues (Principle 8)	201
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		<i>Case contributed by Patricia A. Zapf</i>	
7. Capital Sentencing	121	Teaching Point: Identify assessment targets when legal standards are broad or non-specific	207
CASE ONE		<i>Contributed by Patricia A. Zapf</i>	
Principle: Use multiple sources of information for each area being assessed.			



10. Competence to Consent to Treatment	209	Teaching Point: Declining the case when impartiality would be too difficult	250
CASE ONE		<i>Contributed by Alan M. Goldstein</i>	
Principle: Use third party information in assessing response style (Principle 25)	209	13. Civil Commitment	252
Principle: Use plain language; avoid technical jargon (Principle 33)	210	CASE ONE	
<i>Case contributed by David DeMatteo</i>		Principle: Use relevance and reliability (validity) as guides for seeking information and selecting data sources (Principle 18)	252
Teaching Point: Balancing results from interview, testing, and third party sources as they relate to response style	216	<i>Case contributed by Tadeus Edward Kowalski and Douglas Mossman</i>	
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		Teaching Point: The strengths and weaknesses of classification systems	256
Teaching Point: Communicating complex scientific material to legal professionals and lay audiences	217	<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>	
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		14. Harassment and Discrimination	258
11. Testamentary Capacity	218	CASE ONE	
CASE ONE		Principle: Do not become adversarial, but present and defend your opinions effectively (Principle 7)	258
Principle: Determine whether the individual understands the purpose of the evaluation and associated limits on confidentiality (Principle 24)	218	Principle: Write report in sections, according to model and procedures (Principle 34)	259
<i>Case contributed by Eric Y. Drogin</i>		<i>Case contributed by Bill Foote</i>	
Teaching Point: Advantages of written versus spoken notification in determining whether the notification is understood	223	Teaching Point: Communicating firmly but fairly	270
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>	
12. Personal Injury	225	Teaching Point: The value of sequential communication of FMHA results	270
CASE ONE		<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>	
Principle: Carefully consider whether to answer the ultimate legal question. If answered, it should be in the context of a thorough evaluation clearly describing data and reasoning, and with the clear recognition that this question is in the domain of the legal decision maker (Principle 30)	225	15. Workplace Disability	271
<i>Case contributed by Bill Foote</i>		CASE ONE	
Teaching Point: Answering the ultimate legal question directly	237	Principle: Assess legally relevant behavior (Principle 21)	271
<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>		<i>Case contributed by Lisa Drago Piechowski</i>	
CASE TWO		Teaching Point: The relationship between symptoms and disability in capacity to work	281
Principle: Decline the referral when evaluator impartiality is unlikely (Principle 10)	238	<i>Contributed by Kirk Heilbrun, David DeMatteo, Stephanie Brooks Holliday, and Casey LaDuke</i>	
<i>Case contributed by Alan M. Goldstein</i>		CASE TWO	
		Principle: Assess clinical characteristics in relevant, reliable, and valid ways (Principle 20)	281
		<i>Case contributed by Robert L. Sadoff</i>	