If this opinion indicates that it is "FOR PUBLICATION," it is subject to revision until final publication in the Michigan Appeals Reports.

STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, Plaintiff-Appellee,	UNPUBLISHED November 19, 2026 11:30 AM
v	No. 377590 Ottawa Circuit Court
STEPHANIE RAE YACKISH, Defendant-Appellant.	LC No. 2025-047214-FH

Before: O'BRIEN, P.J., and CAMERON and MALDONADO, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Defendant appeals by right her jury-trial conviction for possession of methamphetamine, MCL 333.7403(2)(b)(*i*). Defendant was sentenced, as a second-offense habitual offender, MCL 769.10, to serve 210 days' incarceration. We affirm.

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

This case arises from defendant's arrest for an outstanding warrant. Defendant approached an Ottawa County Sheriff's Office deputy in the parking lot to report a domestic-violence assault. During the investigation, the deputy learned that defendant had an outstanding warrant for unpaid child support, so he arrested and transported her to the county jail, where a deputy discovered a small glass vial of powder in her bra during a routine pat-down. The substance tested positive for methamphetamine. A jury found defendant guilty as charged.

At sentencing, defendant challenged the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) assessment included in her presentencing investigation report (PSIR). Specifically, she argued that the assessment inaccurately characterized her "criminal personality" as "probable." The trial court declined defendant's request. This appeal followed.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

We review a trial court's response to a claim of inaccuracies in a defendant's PSIR for an abuse of discretion. *People v Uphaus (On Remand)*, 278 Mich App 174, 181; 748 NW2d 899

(2008). "A trial court abuses its discretion when it selects an outcome outside the range of reasonable and principled outcomes." *Id*.

III. ANALYSIS

Defendant argues that the trial court abused its discretion when it declined to strike the COMPAS assessment score from her PSIR because her the assessment mischaracterizes her criminal history, mental health, substance abuse issues, and poor choice of companions as indicative of "probable" criminal personality. We disagree.

Trial courts may rely on the information concerning a defendant's character and circumstances included in the PSIR to fashion a sentence that is "tailored not only to the offense, but also to the offender." *People v Miles*, 454 Mich 90, 97; 559 NW2d 299 (1997). After sentencing, the Michigan Department of Corrections uses the information to make "critical decisions concerning a defendant's status[,]" *People v Waclawski*, 286 Mich App 634, 689; 780 NW2d 321 (2009), including those relating to security and parole, *People v McAllister*, 241 Mich App 466, 477 n 3; 616 NW2d 203 (2000). Therefore, the PSIR should accurately reflect the court's resolution of the disputed information. *Uphaus*, 278 Mich App at 182.

Information in a PSIR is presumptively accurate "unless the defendant effectively challenges the accuracy of the factual information." *People v Grant*, 455 Mich 221, 233-234; 565 NW2d 389 (1997). A defendant may challenge information that asserts disputed facts, as opposed to merely expressing a subjective characterization or opinion. See *People v Maben*, 313 Mich App 545, 554-555; 884 NW2d 314 (2015).

The COMPAS is a "comprehensive risk and needs assessment system, which takes into account both static information (such as the prisoner's past criminal offenses) and dynamic data (such as the prisoner's evolving attitudes and mental condition)." *In re Elias*, 294 Mich App 507, 520; 811 NW2d 541 (2011). Relevant here, it assesses "the main dimensions identified as components of the criminal personality" by assessing certain characteristics, including "impulsivity, no guilt, selfishness/narcissism, a tendency to dominate others, risk-taking, and a violent temper or aggression."[1]

> In conducting a COMPAS risk assessment, a case manager considers various characteristics of the offender and the offense and inputs scores into the COMPAS computer software program. The software generates a score ranking the offender's statistical likelihood of violence, recidivism, success on parole, and other factors. The COMPAS program incorporates information gleaned from the offender's prior criminal history, drug involvement, early indicators of juvenile delinquent problems, and criminal associations to assess a general recidivism risk. The prisoner's history of violent or assaultive crimes, prior use of weapons, past

[1] Michigan Department of Corrections, *Field Operations Administration: Administration and Use of COMPAS in the Presentence Investigation Report,* issued March 2017, p 62 <https://www.michbar.org/file/news/releases/archives17/COMPAS-at-PSI-Manual-2-27-17-Combined.pdf> (accessed November 16, 2026).

> parole experience, and other similar factors contribute to the prisoner's violent recidivism risk. COMPAS also assesses more benign factors such as the level of the prisoner's family support and the prisoner's ability to gain employment, manage his or her finances, and find suitable housing once paroled. [*Id*. (quotation marks and citations omitted).]

Here, defendant's COMPAS scores resulted from the application of the software to information concerning her history and circumstances. To successfully challenge the validity of her COMPAS *score*, defendant had to identify an inaccuracy in the underlying information or otherwise demonstrate that the challenged assessment was improperly derived from that information. She did neither. Defendant does not challenge the accuracy of any of the factual information used to generate her COMPAS assessment. Instead, she challenges the characterization of her criminal personality as "probable," claiming that her criminal record is better described as "a poor choice of companions due to her mental health and substance abuse struggles, not a generally violent personality." But the PSIR's use of the term "probable" is not an arbitrary or subjective way to describe defendant's criminal personality; it is a designation arising from a standardized assessment used to assess future risk of criminality. In other words, the COMPAS assessment is not an express determination that defendant is a criminal by nature, it is a tool to predict her recidivism rate based on specific facts surrounding her history and the offense. Because defendant fails to show, or even allege, her COMPAS assessment was improperly scored on the basis of inaccurate information, we conclude that the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying defendant's challenge to her PSIR.

Affirmed.

/s/ Colleen A. O'Brien
/s/ Thomas C. Cameron
/s/ Allie Greenleaf Maldonado