



# Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals

## Certification Program

Obtaining Designation as a  
Certified Threat Assessment Professional

June 2019

Questions? Contact the Program Coordinator:  
Erin Fuller at [erin.fuller@catap.ca](mailto:erin.fuller@catap.ca)

### **CATAP Certification Committee**

*Coordinator:* Laura Guy, PhD

*Committee Members (alphabetically):* Mark Beaulieu; Peter Collins, MD; Stephen Hart, PhD; Tracey Marshall; and Trudy Triplett

## **The Meaning and Goals of Certification**

Threat assessment and management (TAM) comprises operational activities related to the assessment and management of risk for violence. This involves most broadly the practice of and research related to violence prevention through development, implementation, and evaluation of assessment and management procedures. TAM may focus on (potential) perpetrators or victims of violence, on system or organizational responses to violence, or on protection of people or events as a situation develops.

TAM is a growing industry that currently has few formal standards of practice or ethical guidelines. At present, certification programs in Canada are available through three law enforcement agencies: Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), Ontario Provincial Police (OPP), and Integrated Threat and Risk Assessment Centre (ITRAC). Moreover, there are no legal restrictions regarding who can offer TAM services, and no professional titles that are legally protected restricting identification of oneself as a threat assessment professional, threat assessment specialist, etc. As such, substantive and procedural elements are necessary to maintain the integrity and quality control of services provided by members of the threat assessment community. Accordingly, the Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (CATAP) has developed a Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (Appendix A); Guidelines for Practice (Appendix B); and Core Competencies (Appendix C) to guide the practice of threat assessment and management for CATAP members operating in all types of settings.

CATAP is the only professional association dedicated to the study and practice of TAM in Canada. CATAP's mission is to foster safer communities and workplaces by promoting best practices among multidisciplinary professionals dedicated to excellence in operational practice, teaching, and research in the field of TAM. As a non-profit entity that provides stakeholders from various professions with information about violence prevention, it is appropriate that CATAP develop and oversee a rigorous, thorough, and verified certification process for individuals who provide violence prevention services. It therefore is CATAP's intent to establish a professional certification framework, and to recommend guidelines for professional certification in Canada.

The goal of the CATAP Certification Program is to enhance public safety by promoting best practice in TAM. To that end, CATAP will: (1) establish and disseminate a national standard that sets out the attitudes, knowledge, and skills essential for the effective practice of TAM and revise that standard as required; and (2) establish and maintain a

process for certifying that professionals demonstrate they are competent and compliant with respect to the national standard.

The CATAP Certification Program is voluntary. It is not mandatory to acquire certification to practice as a threat assessment professional. Lack of certification does not imply a lack of expertise in TAM. The CATAP TAM certification designation is intended to attest that a professional has achieved a high level of expertise in the practice of TAM, including: (a) general skills with respect to delivering services to (potential) victims or perpetrators of violence; and (b) specific skills with respect to TAM.

The CATAP Certification Program has a Certification Committee that comprises board and general members of CATAP approved by the CATAP Board.

## The CATAP TAM Certification Program

### Professional Designation

Successful applicants will be designated as Certified Threat Assessment Professional (Canada), abbreviated as CTAP (C).

### Certification Process

The process includes four sequential stages:

1. **Application:** The applicant submits a completed web-based application and must be deemed to meet minimum requirements for training, professional and practical experience. In addition, the applicant must pass a conduct and ethics review through verification with, at minimum but not necessarily limited to, the referees nominated by the applicant.
2. **Written examination:** The Candidate passes a written examination assessing their breadth of knowledge regarding the theory, legal, practice, and scientific aspects of TAM.
3. **Written reports:** The Candidate submits two de-identified written reports (without supporting / collateral documents) that were completed as part of actual professional duties, which must be deemed to meet required standards of competence for TAM generally and report writing specifically.
4. **Oral examination:** The Candidate passes an oral examination assessing (i) skills demonstrated in written reports submitted in stage 3, including depth of knowledge regarding any specific forms of violence of focus in the written reports and (ii) adherence to standards of practice. As part of the oral examination, the Candidate completes an oral report based on a standardized case file that will be provided on the day of the oral examination.

Below, requirements for each of the four application stages are discussed in more detail.

## 1. Application

The application is intended to ensure that applicants (a) meet requirements for adequate qualified training and experience, and (b) do not have problems with ethical or unlawful behaviour. This requires producing appropriate documentation for a credential review and verification of past behavior from referees. The applicant will submit the [CATAP Certification Application Form](#) online, which gathers the requisite information and supporting documentation (i.e., resume or curriculum vitae). Once the applicant has passed the credential and conduct/ethics review and paid the appropriate fees, they are considered a Candidate in the CATAP Certification program. The application form will be available in French in the near future.

### *a) Qualified Training and Experience*

Applicants are expected to have sufficient background in TAM, as demonstrated by appropriate training and requisite professional and practical experiences, and to be practicing TAM currently. It also is expected that an applicant:

- Has completed education generally relevant to TAM, which may include a certificate, diploma, degree, or other training program
- Has attended or completed training or continuing professional activities specifically relevant to TAM\* (e.g., workshops, online training, conferences); for example:
  - Has completed a formal Threat Assessment Professional understudy program in law enforcement; or
  - Has completed the equivalent of at least 12 full days of TAM training
- Has been and continues to be actively involved in the practice of TAM in the role of trainee, practitioner, supervisor, instructor, or administrator; for example:
  - Has worked, individually or as part of a team, on 25 or more cases; and
  - Has been the lead or primary evaluator on 15 or more cases; and
  - Has authored a written opinion or report on 10 or more cases
- Is a member or affiliate member of CATAP
- Has attained the core competencies as outlined in CATAP materials

\*CATAP may offer or sponsor TAM training activities from time to time. Under no circumstances will applicants be required to attend or complete these training activities to be certified.

## *b) Ethics and Conduct Review*

The applicant has an affirmative duty to acknowledge any allegations of ethical misconduct or unlawful behaviour that have been lodged against them.

CATAP will conduct background checks with nominated referees and others as necessary.

## **2. Written Examination**

The written examination is intended to provide a uniform way to assess the Candidate's breadth of knowledge. Therefore, the examination focuses on a wide range of categories that guide the practice of TAM, such as principles, procedures, and law. The standard does not require a high level of expertise in each of these areas; rather, it requires good familiarity with core principles, issues, and findings.

The examination questions are diverse in format (i.e., multiple choice, fill in the blank, short answer, and long essay) and cover five broad content domains (see Appendix D, CATAP Certification Reading List). The approximate relative weight given to each of the content domains on the examination at present is as follows: Violence (20%), Threat Assessment (20%), Legal, Ethical, and Professional Issues (20%), Basic Procedures (15%), and Tools (25%). Candidates have two hours to complete the written examination. Candidates must obtain a score of 80% on the written examination to continue to the next stage of the certification program. In the event that a Candidate does not pass, they will be allowed to re-write the examination within three months or on the next occasion at which the exam is offered at the annual CATAP conference, whichever is sooner; the fee for the written examination will be charged again. The written examination passing score is valid for 10 years.

## **3. Written Reports**

Candidates who pass the written examination will submit two de-identified written reports authored by the Candidate in actual practice. The reports should reflect the Candidate's own work and opinions and be authored solely by the Candidate. Each report will be evaluated according to structured criteria (see Appendix E). Candidates will be required to obtain a passing grade on both reports to progress to the next step. Should a candidate pass on only one report, they will be invited to submit one new report within three months and will not be required to pay the fee again. Should a candidate not pass the resubmitted report, or fail both reports at the initial attempt, they will be required to begin this step again by submitting two new reports within three months and paying this step's fee again.

#### **4. Oral Examination**

In preparation for the oral examination, the Candidate will be provided case materials three hours in advance of the start of the examination. The oral examination itself will comprise three components:

- 1) The Candidate will present a summary of their findings and opinions regarding the case materials to last no more than 15 minutes. Candidates will be allowed to refer to any written notes made during review of case materials.
- 2) The Candidate will be asked questions regarding their findings and opinions based on the case materials.
- 3) The Candidate will respond to questions pertaining to legal, ethical, research, and practice issues more generally, including issues related to the Candidate's areas of competence (as reflected in the written reports submitted in stage 3).

The Candidate will complete the oral examination with a panel of three examiners selected by the Certification Committee, one of whom will serve as Chair. All panel members will have the CTAP (C) designation. At least one of the panel members will have practice experience in the Candidate's practice setting or discipline (e.g., law enforcement, mental health, etc.). At the time of scheduling the Oral Examination, the Candidate will be provided with a list of potential examiners and be asked to identify any of these persons whose participation on the Oral Examination panel might constitute a conflict of interest. CATAP is not restricted from having an examiner serve on the examination panel for a Candidate if they previously acted in that capacity during the Candidate's previous (i.e., unsuccessful) Oral Examination. Moreover, this would not routinely be construed as a potential conflict of interest. The oral examination is expected to last 90 to 120 minutes. Candidates will be notified of the outcome of the examination within two weeks. Candidates' performance during the oral examination will be evaluated according to structured criteria (see Appendix F).

#### Continuation of Certification Status

Continuation of certification status will be granted every two years, provided the certified professional remains in good standing and submits documentation of completion of 40 hours or more of professional development activities. Such activities may include attendance at TAM conferences, participation in trainings or workshops, review of recent professional literature and research, contributions to the scientific or professional literature (e.g., submission to *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*), and so forth. The CATAP Certification Committee reserves the right to request additional information to ensure compliance. The certified professional is responsible for submitting their Continuation of Certification Status (Appendix G) 30 days prior to the anniversary of certification (or upon request). As noted above, the written examination passing score is valid for 10 years. Candidates with passing scores

older than that must re-take the Written Examination and pass to continue to use the CTAP (C) credential.

#### Timeline for Completion and Fee Schedule

Applicants pay a non-refundable fee at the outset of each stage. Payment is made via the CATAP website. Fees are determined by the CATAP Board and may be revised as needed. Deadlines to apply to complete each stage and the associated fees are presented in the following table. An applicant can make up to 3 attempts to pass each of the steps in the certification process.

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Fee (\$)</b>	<b>Deadline for Applying to Proceed to the Stage</b>
1: Application	250	N/A
2: Written examination	250	Written examinations will be scheduled on an individual basis. At minimum, the exam will be offered annually at the national conference and by arrangement throughout the year as needed. Candidates must be scheduled to write the exam at least one month in advance.
3: Written Reports	400	June 1
4: Oral Examination	400	September 1. Oral examination panels will be convened annually at the national conference venue in the days preceding the conference.
Continuance of Certification Status	100	Every two years following certification designation

#### Suspension or Revocation of Certification Status

Certification may be suspended or revoked if the CATAP Board determines that the certified professional has violated CATAP's Code of Conduct.

#### Appeals Process

Candidates may appeal a decision made by the CATAP Certification Committee by submitting a written request to the CATAP President outlining the reason for the appeal. The appeal must be submitted within 30 days of notification of the decision. Failure to adhere to that timeline may serve as the basis to deny an appeal. The basis of appeal must be that CATAP did not follow its procedures during the examination and that the failure to follow its procedures resulted in an egregious error that was related directly to the decision to fail the Candidate. Disagreements pertaining to the outcome of the examination or examiners' comments are not to be construed as nonadherence to procedures or egregious error.

All appeals are reviewed for potential merit by the CATAP President. The President will deny appeals that are without merit. For appeals with potential merit, the President, within 30 days of receipt of the appeal, will convene a Certification Appeals Committee comprising three credentialed TAM professionals who have experience with the nature of the violence assessed in the Written Reports and with the Oral Examination process and criteria. Once convened, the President will provide the Certification Appeals Committee with the Candidate's Written Samples, written comments made by the Oral Examination panel members, a copy of the recording of the Oral Examination, and the Candidate's appeal letter. The Certification Appeals Committee will review the materials and conclude by consensus whether the appeal is granted.

Candidates whose appeals are granted may be scheduled for re-examination using the same Written Reports by a different Oral Examination Committee at the next available opportunity. The Candidate will not be charged a fee for this examination. Under no circumstances can the Certification Appeals Committee declare a failed Candidate as having passed the Oral Examination.

#### Policy on Representation of Affiliation by Applicants and Candidates

By submitting an application for CATAP TAM certification all applicants and Candidates agree to abide by CATAP's policy regarding representation of affiliation by applicants and Candidates. CATAP does not permit applicants or Candidates to represent their status in relation to CATAP in any manner during the pendency of their application or candidacy. Applicants and candidates are prohibited from identifying themselves as an applicant or a candidate for CATAP TAM certification on a resume/curriculum vitae and in any written or oral statement of qualifications. CATAP does not use, authorize, or recognize the term "Certified Eligible" or similar terms. Applicants and Candidates may not use this term to represent any relationship or status with CATAP and should not describe themselves to any outside person or entity that they have met the minimum requirements as an applicant or candidate for CATAP TAM certification. Failure to abide by these terms may be grounds to terminate an applicant's candidacy.

## Appendix A



# Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals

## Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct

Current as of 12 October 2018

# **Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct**

## **Mission Statement**

The mission of the Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (CATAP) is to foster safer communities and workplaces by promoting best practices and collaboration among multidisciplinary professionals dedicated to excellence in operational practice, education, and research in the field of threat assessment and threat management.

## **Purpose**

The Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (the “Code”) is designed to reinforce and preserve CATAP’s tradition of integrity and credibility within the field of threat assessment. The Association recognizes the diversity of its membership and that many of our members may hold membership in other professional associations. No part of the Code supersedes or substitutes for the professional standards or guidelines expected of our members in their other affiliations.

## **Application**

This Code applies to all CATAP members and any individuals involved in and/or attending CATAP events, activities or business.

## **CATAP Board Members shall:**

- Receive no personal compensation in relation to any CATAP business;
- Notify the CATAP Board of any individual who may have committed an act in contravention of this Code;
- Foster a positive work environment free of discrimination, harassment and abuse;
- Support CATAP in its efforts to advance the profession of threat assessment and threat management;
- Maintain confidentiality with respect to information they acquire from their position on the Board, except when required by law or when authorized by the Board;
- Continue to adhere to confidentiality requirements following exit from the board;
- Conduct themselves professionally; and
- Upon retirement from the Board, promptly return all relevant CATAP material.

## **CATAP Members shall:**

- Conduct themselves professionally when involved in and/or attending CATAP events, activities or business;
- Provide threat assessment and management services that adhere to best standards

- of practice within their bounds of competence;
- Refrain from all forms of misconduct, including discrimination, harassment, abuse, human rights violations and/or illegal activity; and
- Report to a CATAP Board member any member who may have committed an act in contravention of this Code.

**CATAP Sponsored Presenters and Vendors shall:**

- Conduct themselves professionally when involved in and/or attending CATAP events, activities or business;
- Refrain from all forms of misconduct, including discrimination, harassment, abuse, human rights violations and/or illegal activity;
- Treat members and associates of CATAP with professional respect; and
- Report to a CATAP Board member any member who may have committed an act in contravention of this Code.

**CATAP Representation**

- Members must seek the approval from the CATAP President to represent CATAP.
- Failure to receive approval can result in action under this Code against the member (see, e.g., CATAP Media Communications Policy).

**Provision of Threat Assessment and Management Services**

- **Competence**
  - Members of CATAP shall endeavor to practice in a manner that is consistent with the articulations in the CATAP Guidelines for Practice and CATAP Core Competencies documents
  - Members shall engage in continuing professional development and educational activities; and
  - Members shall practice within their bounds of competence.
- **Bases for Opinions**
  - CATAP members will ensure that any professional recommendations or other opinions they provide are appropriately substantiated by evidence and supported by a credible body of professional knowledge in the field of threat assessment.
  - CATAP members will base their opinions and recommendations on multiple sources of data and techniques sufficient to substantiate their findings.
  - CATAP members will administer, adapt, score, interpret, or use assessment techniques, interviews, tests, or instruments in a manner and for purposes that

are appropriate in light of the research on or evidence of the usefulness and proper application of the techniques.

- **Confidentiality**

- CATAP members will comply with any applicable privacy requirements and legislation and discuss the relevant limits of confidentiality at the outset of their professional relationship. (Examples of federal privacy legislation include the *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act* and the *Privacy Act*.)
- CATAP members will not disclose in their writings, lectures, or other public media any personally identifiable or other confidential information concerning their clients, students, research participants, organizational clients, or other recipients of their services that they obtained during the course of their work, unless: (1) they take reasonable steps to disguise the person or organization; (2) the person or organization has consented in writing; or (3) there is legal authorization for doing so.

- **Minimizing Intrusions on Privacy**

- CATAP members will include in written and oral reports and consultations only information germane to the purpose for which the communication is made.

- **Avoiding of False or Fraudulent Statements**

- CATAP members will not knowingly make public statements within any forum that are false or fraudulent concerning their research, practice, experience or other work activities or those of persons or organizations with which they are affiliated.

## **Complaints and Discipline**

- **Administration**

- CATAP has a Complaints Committee (CC) chaired by the CATAP Vice President (VP). The VP appoints positions to the CC. The CC may comprise general CATAP members and CATAP Board Members.
- All complaints received under this Code will be considered strictly confidential and all information obtained, including identifying information about any individuals involved, will not be disclosed unless the disclosure is necessary for CATAP to safeguard members, conduct a thorough

investigation, or take appropriate corrective and/or disciplinary action. The parties to the complaint and any witnesses are expected to maintain confidentiality. Breaches of confidentiality may result in action under this Code.

- Decisions about discipline stemming from complaints will be administered by the Discipline Committee (DC), whose members do not sit on the CC.
- Where an investigation results in corrective and/or disciplinary action against a member, a record of such action will be maintained by CATAP.

- **Informal Resolution**

- Members should take steps to resolve any conflicts in a responsible manner between the parties when possible. Otherwise, members may wish to submit a Formal Complaint, as outlined below.

- **Making a Complaint**

- Complaints regarding a CATAP member or the operation of CATAP must be submitted in writing to the CATAP VP that includes the name and contact information of the complainant and a detailed summary of the complaint. CATAP will not act upon any complaint unless it is received in writing. E-mail is an acceptable form of communication.
- The VP will acknowledge receipt of the complaint via e-mail to the complainant and provide the complainant with a copy of this Code.
- The VP will attempt to resolve the complaint informally to the satisfaction of the involved parties and CATAP, which may include conducting an investigation of the matter, if necessary.
- If a resolution is not possible, or at the discretion of the CC, CATAP will hire an external investigator to investigate the issue and report back to CC. The complainant will be informed of the outcome of the investigation and the investigator's recommendations.

- **Appeal of complaints**

- All requests for appeals of complaint outcomes and discipline decisions should be submitted in writing to the CATAP President. The submission should detail the nature of the appeal.
- The VP will forward all relevant material regarding the complaint to the President.
- The appellant will be asked to provide any additional information or

material that may assist the President in making a decision; this information or material must be delivered in a reasonable manner and timeframe determined by the President.

- The President will advise the appellant via e-mail of CATAP's decision in the matter.

- **Timing**

- All complaints are to be resolved in a reasonable time.
- Should a complaint not be resolved within 6 months of receipt, the complainant will be advised of the reasons for the delay and what steps are being taken to resolve the matter.

- **Discipline**

- Where it is determined that corrective action or disciplinary action is to be taken against a member due to a violation of this Code, the DC will determine what action is warranted. The action may include, but is not limited to, the following:
  - Recommendations for coaching and/or counselling
  - Suspension of CATAP membership
  - Termination of CATAP membership
- The Chair of the DC will advise the complainant (and respondent as necessary) of the outcome of the investigation including any sanctions that have been determined.

- **Criminal Matters**

- Where criminal proceedings are initiated against a respondent based on the allegations in a complaint that falls within the scope of this Code, CATAP, in accordance with the Code, will conduct its own independent investigation, if possible, into the allegations and make its own determination.
- Members shall inform the President in writing of any criminal charges within 30 days of being notified.
- Members must inform the President in writing of any changes in the status of the charges within 30 days of being notified of the change.

- **Reprisal/Retaliation**

- Retaliation/reprisal will not be tolerated. Mistreatment of an individual for: (a)

invoking this Code (on behalf of themselves or another individual); (b) participating or cooperating in an investigation under this Code; or (c) associating with a person who has invoked this Code or participated in these procedures will be treated as a violation of the Code and will be dealt with accordingly. In such a case, the offender may be subject to corrective and/or disciplinary action.

## Appendix B



# **Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals**

## **Guidelines for the Practice of Threat Assessment and Management**

Current as of 12 October 2018

# Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals Guidelines for the Practice of Threat Assessment and Management

## 1. Introduction

Violence risk assessment and management is conducted by diverse professionals working in a wide range of settings whose responsibilities include<sup>1</sup> protecting people's health and safety. Some professionals draw distinctions between *violence risk assessment and management* and *threat assessment and management*. As there is no consensus regarding which (if any) of these distinctions is valid, and as most are of limited practical importance, we use the terms interchangeably in the *Guidelines*.

The purpose of the *Guidelines* is to promote best practices with respect to violence risk assessment and management for the benefit of those directly involved in and affected by such activities, as well as for the benefit of the general public. The *Guidelines* are aspirational in nature and intent. They recommend rather than require specific activities and conduct, and they aim to help professionals exercise good judgment rather than to restrict or replace professional judgement. The *Guidelines* are also general. They are not exhaustive in scope and not applicable to all situations professionals may encounter in their practice. In particular, the *Guidelines* are not applicable to the conduct of administration, research and program evaluation, pedagogical activities, or legal consultation. Finally, the *Guidelines* are intended to supplement rather than supplant other relevant legal, professional, or ethical standards.

## 2. Definitions

- 2.1 *Violence* is a plan, attempt, threat, or act by one or more persons that recklessly or deliberately causes fear of, potential, or actual physical harm or grave psychological harm to one or more other persons without lawful authority. Although the range of conduct that falls within this definition of violence is broad, by its very nature it is likely to violate criminal, civil, human rights, employment, occupational health and safety, or other law.
- 2.2 *Risk* is the effect of uncertainty on the achievement of objectives. The uncertainty stems from incompleteness or imprecision in language, knowledge, or information. The objectives may be strategic, tactical, logistical, or operational in nature. Risk typically is used to characterize negative outcomes that may vary in terms of nature, seriousness, imminence, frequency, duration, or likelihood.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this document, "include" means "include without limitation."

- 2.3 *Violence risk assessment*, also known as *threat assessment*, is the process of gathering information about one or more people to understand their potential for violence.
- 2.4 *Violence risk management*, also known as *threat management*, is the process of developing plans to mitigate people's potential for violence.
- 2.5 *Persons of interest* are people whose violence risk is being assessed or managed.
- 2.6 *Potential victims* are people who may be the target of violence perpetrated by persons of interest.
- 2.7 *Threat assessment professionals* are people who deliver violence risk assessment and management services to persons of interest or potential victims.

### 3. Orienting Guidelines

- 3.1 **Threat assessment professionals strive to respect and achieve the ultimate goal of violence risk assessment and management, which is to prevent violence or minimize the impact of violence on potential victims.** To this end, *inter alia*, they assist in identifying, implementing, and evaluating interventions that are both feasible and likely to be effective in a given case.
- 3.2 **Threat assessment professionals strive to achieve and maintain a high level of competence.** To this end, *inter alia*, they familiarize themselves with the scientific and professional literature regarding the various forms of violence with which they work or are likely to encounter. Such literature includes books, chapters, journal articles, and other documents relevant to the nature of, causes of, risk factors for, and management of various forms of violence.
- 3.3 **Threat assessment professionals strive to be aware of and compliant with the laws, policies, standards, and other documents that guide or are relevant to their work.** To this end, *inter alia*, they familiarize themselves with existing laws, policies, standards, and other documents, as well as any updates or changes to same over time.
- 3.4 **Threat assessment professionals strive to respect the basic legal rights and dignity of all persons involved in or affected their work, including persons of interest and potential victims.** To this end, *inter alia*, they ensure that people are adequately informed of and are given the opportunity to exercise their constitutional, human, and privacy rights, as relevant and appropriate. This

includes that people provide informed consent (i.e., their explicit, knowing, and voluntary agreement) prior to participating in violence risk assessment and management and are accompanied by legal counsel, union representatives, or other personal support people, as relevant and appropriate. It also includes using practices that are appropriate in light of and do not discriminate on the basis of gender, age, mental or physical disability, culture, language, or other important group differences.

**3.5 Threat assessment professionals strive for fairness and impartiality in their work.**

To this end, *inter alia*, they seek to minimize potential bias and maximize transparency and accountability, as relevant and appropriate. Steps to minimize potential bias includes monitoring their own values, perceptions, and reactions; as well as avoiding conflicts of interest or multiple relationships with respect to, or advocacy on behalf of, people involved in or affected by their work. In the face of potential bias, they refuse to undertake work, recuse themselves from work in progress, or seek peer consultation concerning other steps to mitigate potential bias. Steps to maximize transparency and accountability include providing complete, accurate, and prompt information to people involved in or affected by their work, as relevant and appropriate.

**3.6 Threat assessment professionals strive to deliver violence risk assessment and management services that are individualized.**

To this end, *inter alia*, they familiarize themselves with and consider the totality of relevant circumstances in a given case, as relevant and appropriate, regardless of any specific procedures they use. Such circumstances include the behavior, personal characteristics, living conditions, and plans or intentions for the future of both persons of interest and potential victims.

**4. Procedural Guidelines**

**4.1 Threat assessment professionals strive to gather and integrate all the information that is reasonably necessary to do their work.**

To this end, *inter alia*, they identify the information that is reasonably necessary and then attempt to gather it. They gather information from diverse sources, including interviews, observations, official records, and other documents. They use or rely on specialized information-gathering techniques (e.g., open source information searches, covert surveillance), where relevant and appropriate. They attempt to corroborate critical information. They acknowledge in their communications when critical information they relied on was unavailable, incomplete, or outdated.

- 4.1.1 Threat assessment professionals do not avoid gathering or reviewing information in the form of direct interviews with or observations of persons of interest, unless doing so would be inappropriate, unfeasible, or unsafe (e.g., an interview would compromise an ongoing investigation being conducted for another purpose, an interview would jeopardize the safety of potential victims, the assessment is being conducted in a consultative or liaison role).
  - 4.1.2 Threat assessment professionals do not rely on a single source of information in their work, and in particular do not rely on uncorroborated statements made by persons of interest.
  - 4.1.3 Threat assessment professionals do not rely on information that is or is likely to be outdated, unless gathering updated information would be inappropriate, unfeasible, or unsafe.
- 4.2 **Threat assessment professionals strive to be alert for signs that persons of interest or potential victims may have physical or mental health problems and take appropriate action when such signs are apparent.** To this end, *inter alia*, they gather information about potential health problems, document and communicate any signs of potential health problems that come to their attention or undertake or recommend specialized assessment or treatment of health problems, as relevant and appropriate. They take care to respect the dignity of people with health problems, and in particular to avoid infringing on their legal rights. They consider carefully the extent to which health problems may affect the risks posed by persons of interest or the management of those risks.
- 4.2.1 Threat assessment professionals do not assume themselves or encourage others to assume that the mere presence of mental health problems means those problems are relevant to risk.
  - 4.2.2 Threat assessment professionals do not assess or treat physical or mental health problems unless legally qualified to do so and unless they can do so in a way that maintains fairness and impartiality and avoids multiple relationships.
- 4.3 **Threat assessment professionals strive to identify and use evaluative devices or procedures.** To this end, *inter alia*, they acknowledge the limitations of unaided

or unstructured professional judgment, seek education and training about evaluative devices or procedures germane to their work, and use evaluative devices and procedures, where relevant and appropriate. They use evaluative devices and procedures only as recommended by authorities in the field, such as the developers. They acknowledge in their communications the strengths and limitations of any evaluative devices or procedures they used.

4.3.1 Threat assessment professionals do not rely solely on unaided or unstructured professional judgement when evaluative devices or procedures germane to their work exist and could be appropriately used.

4.3.2 Threat assessment professionals do not use evaluative devices or procedures unless adequately trained and experienced in their application, administration, and interpretation.

4.3.3 Threat assessment professionals do not use evaluative devices or procedures unless familiar with the professional literature regarding their reliability (consistency) and validity (accuracy).

4.3.4 Threat assessment professionals do not rely solely on a single evaluative device or procedure in their work.

4.3.5 Threat assessment professionals do not report the findings of evaluative devices or procedures that are quantitative (i.e., algorithmic, statistical, or actuarial) in nature without a complete interpretation or explanation of the quantitative findings.

4.4 **Threat assessment professionals strive to develop comprehensive management plans.** To this end, *inter alia*, they develop plans that identify potentially effective management strategies, tactics, and logistics. They ensure that plans target all important risk factors, but only important risk factors. They recognize the need for and facilitate coordination among the various professionals responsible for risk management, where relevant and appropriate. They acknowledge in their communications the need to evaluate and revise plans.

4.4.1 Threat assessment professionals do not deliver risk management services without adequate training and experience in those specific services.

4.4.2 Threat assessment professionals do not deliver risk management services without involving and collaborating with allied professionals, as relevant and appropriate.

- 4.4.3 Threat assessment professionals do not deliver risk management services without arranging for backup or coverage, as relevant and appropriate.
- 4.5 **Threat assessment professionals strive to communicate with others about their work in a manner that is complete, accurate, and clear.** To this end, *inter alia*, they include in their oral or written communications all the information necessary, but only the information necessary, to describe their actions, findings, or opinions. They use non-technical language when communicating with people who are not threat assessment professionals, as relevant and appropriate. They acknowledge the limitations of their work.
  - 4.5.1 Threat assessment professionals do not misrepresent or distort information included in their communications.
  - 4.5.2 Threat assessment professionals do not ignore or omit potentially relevant information from their communications.
  - 4.5.3 Threat assessment professionals do not use jargon in their communications unless necessary and unless they provide adequate definition or explanation.
  - 4.5.4 Threat assessment professionals do not present their findings or opinions without qualifying them in light of limitations in the information on which they were based.
  - 4.5.5 Threat assessment professionals do not present their findings or opinions without qualifying them in light of the contextual and dynamic nature of risk.

## Appendix C



# **Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals**

## **Core Competencies for the Practice of Threat Assessment and Management**

Current as of 12 October 2018

# Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals Core Competencies for the Practice of Threat Assessment and Management

**\*\*numbers in the left column correspond to sections in the CATAP Guidelines of Practice**

<b>Planning, Organizing and Coordinating</b> – <i>involves proactively planning, establishing priorities and managing threats and risks of violence.</i>	
4.1	Understanding of subject/victim/witness interviews
3.3	Understand chain/continuity of evidence
3.6 4.1	Ability to conduct a background investigation and identify relevant sources of information
4.1	Ability to manage workflow in a dynamic environment
4.1	Ability to identify relevant sources of information including closed and open sources, collateral sources
4.5	Report writing and documentation

<b>Analytical Thinking</b> – <i>includes organizing information in a systematic way and identifying causal relationships to break down complex situations, understand the case and identify root causes.</i>	
<b>Conceptual Thinking</b> – <i>includes the ability to identify patterns or connections between situations that are not obviously related, and to identify key or underlying causes of human behaviour in developing situations.</i>	
4.3	Use of the standard tools and concepts and their application to the appropriate domain of violence
3.6	Identifying key factors in sometimes complex cases and associating case information to analyze the potential threat or risk
4.1	Evaluate and weigh the relevance and credibility/veracity of information
3.2 4.3	Remain current with emerging threat assessment knowledge and practice relevant to their areas of professional practice.
4.1	Rely on multiple sources of collateral data, and when appropriate, an interview with the person of interest

<b>Problem Solving and Judgement</b> – <i>ability to analyze problems systematically, organize information, identify key factors, identify underlying causes and generate solutions</i>	
3.1	Understand TAM goals and objectives
3.2	Understand TAM key practices and principles
3.2	Understand behaviours and motivators of violence
3.2 4.3	Understand the use of standard conceptual frameworks (e.g., PIV, JACA, H/H) and other tools (e.g., actuarials, SPJ guidelines) and their application to the appropriate domain of violence (youth, adult, domestic, stalking)
3.2 4.4	Understand risk enhancing and risk reducing factors including potential risk to victim or the mitigation plan

<b>Integrity</b> – <i>refers to actions that are consistent with what one says are important. It is the ability to act with honesty and be consistent based on the particular moral, value or belief system.</i>	
3.3	Knowledge of the CATAP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct
3.5	Objectivity
3.4	Respect for diversity
3.5	Honesty, openness, and transparency
3.4 4.2	Understanding the concept of privilege, confidentiality, and informed consent
4.3 4.2	Recognition of appropriate use and limitations of assessment technologies
3.3	Recognize the process for reporting violations
3.5	Avoid the use of false or fraudulent statements
4.1 4.2	Administer, adapt, score, interpret, or use assessment techniques, interviews, tests, or instruments in a manner and for the purposes that are appropriate considering the research on or evidence of the usefulness and proper application of the techniques.

<b>Legal Issues</b> – <i>includes understanding the legal framework that threat assessors work within and that all threat assessment is forensic.</i>	
3.3	Comply with applicable privacy requirements and legislation
3.3	Understand other laws relevant to their practice
3.3	Understand information and privacy laws
3.3	Understand the Canadian Criminal Code and criminal justice system as it pertains to their assessments and management plans
3.3	Understanding the criteria for expert evidence
3.3	Understanding the obligations related to duty to warn legislation

<b>Teamwork and Cooperation</b> – <i>ability to work co-operatively both within and outside of the organization.</i>	
<b>Self-Awareness</b> – <i>demonstrates awareness, accurate assessment and control of one’s own emotional state, attitudes, belief system, image and strengths to maintain personal effectiveness and emotional stability even in the face of adversity, provocation stress and/or high workload.</i>	
3.2	Being aware of the extent and parameters of their competence and their professional scope of practice and limit their practice accordingly
4.4	
3.2	When a client’s needs fall outside the CATAP member’s area of competence, the member should inform the client and offer to refer them to another professional who can assist.
4.4	
4.4	Ability to work both independently and as a member of a team
4.5	Information sharing and communication with relevant stakeholders
4.4	Relationship building

## Appendix D



# **Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals**

## **Certification Program Written Examination Reading List**

Current as of January 2019

# CATAP Certification Program Written Examination Reading List

\*\*Current as of January 2019\*\*

The written exam consists of 20 multiple choice, 10 fill-in-the-blank, 6 short answer, and 1 long essay questions. The exam covers five content domains: (1) violence, (2) threat assessment, (3) legal, ethical, and professional issues, (4) basic procedures, and (5) analytical tools. The relative weight given to each of the content domains on the examination at present is as follows: Violence (20%), Threat Assessment (20%), Legal, Ethical, and Professional Issues (20%), Basic Procedures (15%), and Tools (25%). To increase accessibility of the certification program by keeping costs to applicants reasonable, required readings in the form of books or book chapters have been kept to a minimum. There are three categories of readings for each of the six content domains: (1) **core** (required; will form basis of written exam); (2) **breadth** (strongly encouraged; applicants should be expected to be familiar with content); and (3) **supplementary** (encouraged; applicants would be well served to be familiar with content). Some papers are listed in multiple content domains. Please contact the CATAP Certification Program Coordinator, Erin Fuller ([erin.fuller@catap.ca](mailto:erin.fuller@catap.ca)), should you need assistance locating any readings.

Candidates have two hours to complete the written examination. Candidates must obtain a score of 80% on the written examination to continue to the next stage (see details in Program Description document).

## CONTENT DOMAINS

### 1. VIOLENCE

Dahlberg, L. L. & Krug, E. (2002). Violence – A global public health problem. In E. Krug, L. L. Dahlberg, J. A. Mercy, A. B. Zwi, & R. Lozano (Eds.), *World report on violence and health* (pp. 3-21). Geneva: World Health Organization. Retrieved from: [http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2002/9241545615\\_chap1\\_eng.pdf](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2002/9241545615_chap1_eng.pdf)

DeWall, C. N., & Anderson, C. A. (2011). The general aggression model. In P. R. Shaver & M. Mikulincer (Eds.), *Human aggression and violence: Causes, manifestations, and consequences* (pp. 15-33). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

DeWall, C. N., Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2011). The general aggression model: Theoretical extensions to violence. *Psychology of Violence, 1*, 245-258.  
doi:10.1037/a0023842

- Bonta, J. & Andrews, D. A. (2017). From criminology theories to a psychological perspective of criminal conduct. In J. Bonta & D. A. Andrews (Eds.), *The psychology of criminal conduct, 6<sup>th</sup> ed.* (pp. 35-56). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bonta, J. & Andrews, D. A. (2017). The risk-need-responsivity model of offender assessment and treatment. In J. Bonta & D. A. Andrews (Eds.), *The psychology of criminal conduct, 6<sup>th</sup> ed.* (pp. 175-184). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Felson, R. B. (2009). Violence, crime, and violent crime. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 3*(1), 23-39.
- Slotter, E. B., & Finkel, E. J., (2011). I<sup>3</sup> theory: Instigating, impelling, and inhibiting factors in aggression. In P. R. Shaver & M. Mikulincer (Eds.), *Human aggression and violence: Causes, manifestations, and consequences* (pp. 35-52). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Wikström, P. O., & Treiber, K. H. (2009). Violence as situational action. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 3*(1), 75-96.

## **2. THREAT ASSESSMENT**

- American National Standards Institute. (2011). *Workplace violence prevention and intervention*. ASIS/SHRM/WVPI.1-2011.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2017). *Making prevention a reality: Identifying, assessing, and managing the threat of targeted attacks*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from:  
[www.fbi.gov/filerepository/making\\_prevention\\_a\\_reality\\_identifying\\_assessing\\_managing\\_threats\\_of\\_ta.pdf](http://www.fbi.gov/filerepository/making_prevention_a_reality_identifying_assessing_managing_threats_of_ta.pdf)
- Guy, L. S., Douglas, K. S., & Hart, S. D. (2015). Risk assessment and communication. In B. Cutler & P. Zapf (Eds.), *APA handbook of forensic psychology, Vol. 1* (pp. 35-86). Washington: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/14461--003
- Meloy, J. R., Hart, S., D., & Hoffman, J. (2014). Threat assessment and threat management. In J. R. Meloy & J. Hoffman (Eds.), *International handbook of threat assessment* (pp. 3-17). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

American National Standards Institute. (2015). *Risk assessment*. ANSI/ASIS/RIMS RA.1-2015.

O'Toole, M. E., & Smith, S. S. (2014). Fundamentals of threat assessment for beginners. In J. R. Meloy & J. Hoffman (Eds.), *International handbook of threat assessment* (pp. 272-284). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Vossekuil, B., Fein, R. A., & Berglund, J. M. (2015). Threat assessment: Assessing the risk of targeted violence. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, 2, 243-254. doi: 10.1037/tam0000055

Heilbrun, K., Yasuhara, K., & Shah, S. (2010). Violence risk assessment tools: Overview and critical analysis. In K. S. Douglas & R. Otto (Eds.), *Handbook of violence risk assessment* (pp. 1-17). New York, NY: Routledge.

### **3. LEGAL ISSUES**

Grabe, N. W. K-H. (2017). Criminal law. In S. Chen (Ed), *Law students' legal advice manual*, 41<sup>st</sup> ed. (pp. 1.1-1.58). Vancouver, BC: Law Student's Legal Advice Program.

Mahar, W. (2017). Mental health law. In S. Chen (Ed), *Law students' legal advice manual*, 41<sup>st</sup> ed. (pp. 14.1-14.23). Vancouver, BC: Law Student's Legal Advice Program.

Mohandie, K., & Hoffman, J. (2014). Legal issues in threat assessment. In J. R. Meloy & J. Hoffman (Eds.), *International handbook of threat assessment* (pp.67-82). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Scott, B. (2017). Employment law. In S. Chen (Ed), *Law students' legal advice manual*, 41<sup>st</sup> ed. (pp. 9.1-9.58). Vancouver, BC: Law Student's Legal Advice Program.

Storey, J. S., Campbell, V. J., & Hart, S. D. (2013). Expert evidence about violence risk assessment: A study of Canadian legal decisions. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 12, 287-296. doi: 10.1080/14999013.2013.867383

Williams, D. (2017). Human rights. In S. Chen (Ed), *Law students' legal advice manual*, 41<sup>st</sup> ed. (pp. 6.1-6.24). Vancouver, BC: Law Student's Legal Advice Program.

## Confessions

- *R. v. Oickle*, 2000 SCC  
<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2000/2000scc38/2000scc38.html>

## Expert Evidence

- *R. v. Abbey*, 2009 ONCA 624  
<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onca/doc/2009/2009onca624/2009onca624.html>
- *R. v. Mohan*, [1994] 2 SCR 9  
<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1994/1994canlii80/1994canlii80.html>

## Limits of Privilege

- *Smith v Jones*, 1999 SCC  
<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1999/1999canlii674/1999canlii674.html>

Cawood, J., & Corcoran, M. (2009). Organizational influences – Personal and professional. In J. Cawood & M. Corcoran (Eds.), *Violent assessment and intervention: The practitioner's handbook*, (pp. 203-217). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Cawood, J., & Corcoran, M. (2009). The laws of violence risk assessment and intervention. In J. Cawood & M. Corcoran (Eds.), *Violent assessment and intervention: The practitioner's handbook*, (pp. 279-309). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

*Winko v British Columbia (Forensic Psychiatric Institute)*, 1999 SCC

<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1999/1999canlii694/1999canlii694.html>

## **4. ETHICAL AND PROFESSIONAL ISSUES**

CATAP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (2018).

CATAP Core Competencies (2018).

CATAP Guidelines for Practice (2017).

*Ewert v. Canada*, 2018 SCC 30

<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2018/2018scc30/2018scc30.html>

*R. v. Gladue*, [1999] 1 SCR, 679 (SCC)

<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1999/1999canlii679/1999canlii679.html>

R. v. Ipeelee, [2012], SCC 13

<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2012/2012scc13/2012scc13.html>

Hart, S. D. (2016). Culture and violence risk assessment: The case of Ewert v. Canada. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, 3, 76-96. doi: 10.1037/tam0000068

## 5. BASIC PROCEDURES

*Basic procedural issues: interviewing, reviewing critical info, collaterals, reviewing third party info; response distortion*

Guy, L. S., Douglas, K. S., & Hart, S. D. (2015). Risk assessment and communication. In B. Cutler & P. Zapf (Eds.), *APA handbook of forensic psychology*, Vol. 1 (pp. 35-86). Washington: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/14461--003

Van der Meer, B. & Diekhuis, M. (2014). Collecting and assessing information for threat assessment. In J. R. Meloy & J. Hoffman (Eds.), *International handbook of threat assessment* (pp. 54-66). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cawood, J., & Corcoran, M. (2009). Information gathering. In J. Cawood & M. Corcoran (Eds.), *Violent assessment and intervention: The practitioner's handbook*, (pp. 17-62). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Cawood, J., & Corcoran, M. (2009). The informative discussion. In J. Cawood & M. Corcoran (Eds.), *Violent assessment and intervention: The practitioner's handbook*, (pp. 63-101). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Otto, R. K. (2008). Challenges and advances in assessment of response style in forensic examination contexts. In R. Rogers (Ed.) *Clinical assessment of malingering and deception*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (pp. 365-375). New York: Guilford Press.

Rogers, R. (2008). An introduction to response styles. In R. Rogers (Ed.) *Clinical assessment of malingering and deception*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (pp 3-13). New York: Guilford Press.

## 6. BEHAVIORAL THREAT ASSESSMENT ANALYTICAL TOOLS

Calhoun, F. S., & Weston, S. (2016). *Threat assessment and management strategies: Identifying the hunters and howlers* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

- Hart, S. D., Sturmey, P., Logan, C., & McMurrin, M. (2011). Forensic case formulation. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 10*, 118-126.
- Anderson, D., & Hanson, R. K. (2010). Static-99: An actuarial tool to assess risk of sexual and violent recidivism among sexual offenders. In K. S. Douglas & R. Otto (Eds.), *Handbook of violence risk assessment* (pp. 251-267). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Borum, R., Lodewijks, H., Bartel, P. A., & Forth, A. E. (2010). Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY). In K. S. Douglas & R. Otto (Eds.), *Handbook of violence risk assessment* (pp. 63-79). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Calhoun, F., & Weston, S. (2015). Perspectives on threat management. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 2*, 258-267. doi: 10.1037/tam0000056
- Dematteo, D., Edens, J. F., & Hart, A. (2010). The use of measures of psychopathy in violence risk assessment. In K. S. Douglas & R. Otto (Eds.), *Handbook of violence risk assessment* (pp. 19-40). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Douglas, K. S., Hart, S. D., Webster, C. D., Belfrage, H., Guy, L. S., & Wilson, C. M. (2014). Historical-Clinical-Risk Management-20, Version 3 (HCR-20<sup>V3</sup>): Development and Overview. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health Services, 13*, 93-108.
- Hanson, R. K., Thornton, D., Helmus, L., & Babchishin, K. M. (2015). What sexual recidivism rates are associated with Static-99R and Static-2002R scores? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*, 215-282. doi:10.1177/1079063215574710.
- Hart, S. D., & Boer, D. P. (2010). Structured professional judgment guidelines for Sexual Violence Risk Assessment: The Sexual Violence Risk-20 (SVR-20) and Risk for Sexual Violence Protocol (RSVP). In K. S. Douglas & R. Otto (Eds.), *Handbook of violence risk assessment* (pp. 269-294). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kropp, P. R., & Gibas, A. (2010). The Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide (SARA). In K. S. Douglas & R. Otto (Eds.), *Handbook of violence risk assessment* (pp. 227-250). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Meloy, J. R., & Gill, P. (2016). The lone-actor terrorist and the TRAP-18. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 3*(1), 37. doi: 10.1037/tam0000061

Rice, M. E., Harris, G. T., & Hilton, N. Z. (2010). The Violence Risk Appraisal Guide and Sex Offender Risk Appraisal Guide for Violence Risk Assessment and the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment and Domestic Violence Risk Appraisal Guide for Wife Assault Risk Assessment. In K. S. Douglas & R. Otto (Eds.), *Handbook of violence risk assessment* (pp. 99-119). New York, NY: Routledge.

Rice, M. E., Harris, G. T., & Lang, C. (2013). Validation of revision to the VRAG and SORAG: The Violence Risk Appraisal Guide – Revised (VRAG-R). *Psychological Assessment*, 25(3), 951-965. doi: 10.1037/a0032878

## Appendix E



# **Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals**

## **Certification Program Guidelines for Submitting Written Reports and Evaluation Criteria**

Current as of 12 October 2018

# **Guidelines for Submitting Written Reports and Evaluation Criteria**

## *Purpose of Reports*

Submission of written reports assists the CATAP Certification Committee in its goal of ensuring Candidates possess a high level of professional competence in the practice of TAM. Following successful completion of the first two steps in the certification program (i.e., application and written examination), Candidates will submit two de-identified written reports that were completed independently as part of actual professional duties. To advance to the final step in the certification program (i.e., oral examination), Candidates' written reports must be deemed to meet required standards of competence for TAM generally and report writing specifically. The criteria for evaluating the reports are presented below. The written reports also will be discussed during the oral examination: most commonly, with respect to questions about the type of violence of focus in the reports and procedures followed to assess risk in the particular case (Candidates will not be expected to recall by memory specific details of the cases during the oral examination).

## *Selecting Reports*

Although the CATAP Certification Committee recognizes that risk for multiple forms of violence may occur concurrently for a given person of interest, each written report should focus primarily on distinct types of violence or referral questions. For example, one report could focus on risk for general violence and the other report could focus on risk for domestic violence. When possible, at least one of the two reports should focus on risk for general violence. Both reports should have been written not more than one year prior to having been accepted as a Candidate in the CATAP Certification Program. Written reports should involve cases that are not currently active or in which the legal issue has been settled (i.e., cases have been resolved to the best of the Candidate's knowledge and the Candidate does not reasonably anticipate further involvement). Candidates should seek consultation from the CATAP Certification Program Coordinator should clarification regarding selection of Written Reports be needed.

## *Preparing Reports*

Each of the two Written Reports should include the following five distinct components:

1. Title Page: The Candidate's name and a title of the report that reflects the nature of the case should be listed.
2. Introduction: The Candidate should provide information to orient the Certification Committee to issues that will facilitate their understanding of the case and any contextual parameters that guided the assessment. The Introduction should not

exceed three pages, double-spaced. Candidates may choose to provide information to explain the nature of the setting in which they work, any unique policies or jurisdictional procedures that applied, or any unique ethical issues raised by the case.

3. Statement of Contribution: The CATAP Certification Committee recognizes that many professionals work in teams to complete cases. For the purpose of being evaluated in the certification program, Candidates must be sole authors of the version of the Written Reports submitted and should not have received feedback on it before submitting them (of course there is nothing prohibiting coworkers or supervisors from contributing to subsequent versions or the final version of the report that ultimately is submitted to the real-world client). Candidates should indicate whether they conducted the assessment completely independently or were assisted in any way. If they were assisted in any manner, the specific nature of their contribution should be described.
4. Statement of Sanitization. Candidates should describe the steps they took to conceal the identity of people or places in the Written Report. It is critical that the identity of all parties involved in the case are obscured, even if the material has become part of the public record. Reports can be sanitized, or de-identified, either by redacting information or assigning fictitious identities to key information, including: dates; case numbers; names of parties, triers of fact, attorneys, witnesses, and other professionals; and any other possible identifying information (e.g., schools, workplaces, treatment settings, etc.). If identifying information is obscured by blacking or whiting out, the Candidate must be sure that the redacted information cannot be read (photocopying the document after information has been obscured and then scanning the photocopy likely is required). Failure to appropriately sanitize Written Reports may result in the rejection of the report and termination of Candidacy.
5. De-identified Written Report. A de-identified copy of the entirety of the report should be submitted. To avoid obstacles related to privacy issues, reports should be submitted without copies of the supporting files or collateral documents relied on to complete the threat assessment.

Both of the Written Reports should be formatted as follows: typed, double-spaced, 12- point font, and one-inch margins on all sides. All pages should be numbered, beginning with the title page and ending with the last page of the de-identified Written Report. Each Written Report should be saved as a separate PDF file. The file should be named using the following template: "CANDIDATE SURNAME, Written Report 1 (or 2), TODAY'S DATE"

### *Evaluating Reports*

Each Written Report will be evaluated independently by two members of the Examination Subcommittee. The structured criteria in three domains detailed below will be considered. The two examiners will make a consensus decision of Pass or Fail for each Written Report. To proceed to the final stage of Candidacy (i.e., oral examination), the Candidate must obtain a Pass for two Written Reports.

1. Technical writing (2 points)
  - Grammar, spelling, clarity of written language, jargon-free or jargon defined.
2. Organization, description of procedures, and data issues (3 points)
  - Report organized coherently, with clearly labeled sections; purpose of assessment/report or referral question stated clearly; statement included about warning or notifications about limitations on confidentiality given to parties; clear description of procedures followed; sections on data and opinions presented separately (i.e., observations and inferences are separated); when possible, multiple sources of data considered; is the justification for any absence of sources or types of data typically or preferably relied upon for the type of assessment under consideration clarified; are data restricted to those that are relevant or appropriate.
3. Analysis and opinions (5 points)
  - Analytic approach used is appropriate; appropriate use of tools, as relevant; opinions about risks posed and management recommendations offered are supported by data; connection between data and opinions made clear; alternate hypotheses considered and discussed, as appropriate; clear statement(s) describing level of concern regarding risk(s) posed; risk management recommendations articulated clearly; limitations noted, as appropriate.

## Appendix F



# **Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals**

## **Certification Program Oral Examination Procedures and Evaluation Criteria**

Current as of 12 October 2018

## **Oral Examination Procedures and Evaluation Criteria**

The Oral Examination is designed to determine the Candidate's quality of practice and knowledge in threat assessment and management in areas exemplified by the Written Reports; to assess the Candidate's understanding and application of the current versions of CATAP's ethical standards and professional practice guidelines; to determine whether a Candidate possesses a high level of professional competence and maturity; and to ascertain whether the Candidate can articulate a reasoned rationale for his or her threat assessment and management work. Successful Candidates will demonstrate the requisite qualities presented in the CATAP Core Competencies.

The oral examination itself comprises three components: (1) The Candidate completes an oral report based on a standardized case file provided to the Candidate three hours in advance of the start of the examination. The Candidate presents a summary of his or her findings and opinions regarding the case materials to last no more than 15 minutes. Candidates will be allowed to refer to any written notes made during review of case materials. (2) The Candidate is asked questions regarding his or her findings and opinions based on the case materials. (3) The Candidate responds to questions pertaining to legal, ethical, research, and practice issues more generally, including issues to assess depth of knowledge related to the Candidate's areas of competence as reflected in the Written Reports submitted in stage 3.

The Candidate will complete the oral examination with a panel of three examiners selected by the Certification Committee, one of whom will serve as Chair. All panel members will have the CTAP (C) designation. At least one of the panel members will have practice experience in the Candidate's practice setting or discipline (e.g., law enforcement, mental health, etc.). At the time of scheduling the Oral Examination, the Candidate will be provided with a list of potential examiners and asked to identify any of these persons whose participation on the Oral Examination panel might constitute a conflict of interest. CATAP is not restricted from having an examiner serve on the examination panel for a Candidate if she or he previously acted in that capacity during the Candidate's previous (i.e., unsuccessful) Oral Examination. Moreover, this would not routinely be construed as a potential conflict of interest. The Oral Examination is expected to last 90 to 120 minutes. The Oral Examination is recorded solely to facilitate resolution of appeals by failed Candidates. Candidates are not authorized to obtain examination recordings for any purpose.

As soon as the Candidate leaves the Oral Examination room, the Oral Examination Panel evaluates the Candidate related to ethical standards, quality of practice, and knowledge of TAM areas. The Oral Examination Panel reaches a consensus decision of Pass or Fail. Candidates will be notified of the outcome of the examination within two weeks.

## Appendix G



# **Canadian Association of Threat Assessment Professionals**

## **Certification Program Continuation of Certification Status**

Current as of 12 October 2018

## **Continuation of Certification Status**

Continuation of certification status will be granted every two years, provided the certified professional remains in good standing and submits documentation of completion of 40 hours or more of professional development activities. Such activities may include attendance at TAM conferences, participation in trainings or workshops, review of recent professional literature and research, contributions to the scientific or professional literature (e.g., submission to *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*), and so forth.

The CATAP Certification Committee reserves the right to request additional information to ensure compliance. The certified professional is responsible for submitting the web-based Continuation of Certification Status (to be accessible following progression to candidacy status)) 30 days prior to the anniversary of certification, or upon request. As noted above, the written examination passing score is valid for 10 years. Candidates with passing scores older than that must re-take the Written Examination and pass to continue to use the CTAP (C) credential.