

STABLE-2007 EVALUATOR WORKBOOK

REVISED 2017

Andrew E. Brankley, L. Maaïke Helmus, & R. Karl Hanson

May 8, 2017

For more information, contact

Andrew E. Brankley, M.A.
Phone: (647) 444-7078

Andrew.Brankley@psych.ryerson.ca

Public Safety Canada
340 Laurier Ave West
Ottawa, Ontario
CANADA K1A 0P8

L. Maaïke Helmus, Ph.D.

LMaaïkeHelmus@gmail.com

Victoria University of Wellington
&
Forensic Assessment Group

R. Karl Hanson, Ph.D.
Phone: (613) 991-2840

Karl.Hanson@canada.ca
RKarlHanson@gmail.com

Public Safety Canada
340 Laurier Ave West
Ottawa, Ontario
CANADA K1A 0P8

Author note: We would like to thank Ian Barsetti, Lea Chankin, Marie-Hélène Dufresne, Yolanda Fernandez, Martin Rettenberger, and Anton Schweighofer for helpful comments on earlier versions of this workbook.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Overview of STABLE-2007 Development and Normative Data.....	5
Interpretation of STABLE-2007 Scores.....	6
Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R/2002R Tools.....	9
Combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000.....	15
Report Writing Templates for STABLE-2007.....	18
Section 1. STABLE-2007.....	19
Section 2. STABLE-2007 combined with Static-99R/2002R.....	22
Section 3. STABLE-2007 combined with Risk Matrix 2000.....	25
References.....	26
 Appendix A: Standardized Risk Levels for Sexual Offending – Descriptions.....	29
Appendix B: Static Risk Assessment Tools Descriptions.....	32
Appendix C: Optimizing Standardized Risk Levels through Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R/2002R.....	33
Appendix D: Recidivism Types, Sources of Information, and Creating Estimates.....	34
Appendix E: Risk Ratios for Static-99R/2002R and STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels..	36

List of Tables

Table 1. Distribution of STABLE-2007 Items for Males at First Assessment.....	7
Table 2. Distribution of STABLE-2007 Total Scores for Males at First Assessment.....	8
Table 3. Approximate Risk Ratios for STATIC/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels.....	9
Table 4. Rules for Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R.....	10
Table 5. Recidivism Rates for Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels.....	11
Table 6. Rules for Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-2002R.....	12
Table 7. Recidivism Rates for Static-2002R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels.....	13
Table 8. Rules for Combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000.....	15
Table 9. Recidivism Rates for Risk Matrix-S/STABLE-2007 Nominal Risk Levels.....	16
Table 10. Recidivism Rates for Risk Matrix-V/STABLE-2007 Nominal Risk Levels.....	16
Table 11. Recidivism Rates for Risk Matrix-C/STABLE-2007 Nominal Risk Levels.....	17
Table 12. Guidance for Selecting Report Writing Templates.....	19
Table 13. Descriptions of the Standardized Risk Levels for Sexual Offending.....	31
Table 14. Risk Ratios for Static-99R/2002R and STABLE-2007 Combinations.....	37

Introduction

Overview

This document is a technical and interpretative manual for evaluators using STABLE-2007. This version updates and replaces the October 21, 2013 STABLE-2007 Evaluators' Workbook (Helmus & Hanson, 2013) and all other previous versions.

STABLE-2007 is a measure of risk factors relevant for the treatment and supervision of adult males charged or convicted of a sexually motivated offence. It was first described in a government report (Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007) and later as a journal article (Hanson, Harris, & Helmus, 2015).

It is intended that this document be used in conjunction with the latest *STABLE-2007 coding manual* (Current version is from 2014; Fernandez, Harris, Hanson, & Sparks, 2014). Evaluators interested in using these risk tools should have received training from a certified trainer (for a list of STABLE-2007 certified trainers, contact Dr. Dana Anderson at Simcoe Psychology, dana.anderson@rogers.com. A list of Static-99R and Static-2002R certified trainers is available at www.static99.org).

What's new in the 2017 Evaluator Workbook?

In this document, readers will find updated psychometric information on STABLE-2007 (i.e., percentiles, distributions), updated rules for combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R/2002R to produce standardized risk levels, and updated recidivism tables that can be used in applied reports. Also included in this document are new relative risk ratios for the standardized risk levels and reporting templates.

The purpose of using standardized risk levels in this document reflects a larger movement to improve risk communication. Advances in risk assessment have led to a variety of risk tools, each with different sets of items and scoring rules. The convention of using nominal risk levels (e.g., “low,” “high”) to interpret scores does not facilitate objective comparisons across scales. The standardized risk framework is a non-arbitrary method for defining levels of risk based upon thresholds relevant for decision making (i.e., percentiles, absolute and relative risk) and not the characteristics of any single tool. For more information on the standardized risk levels see Appendix A, “Standardized Risk Levels for Sexual Offending.”

The methods and estimates associated with combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000 have not changed since the 2013 version. New combination rules and recidivism estimates for combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000 to produce standardized risk levels is forthcoming.

For more information about Static-99R, Static-2002R, and Risk Matrix 2000, see Appendix B, “Static Risk Assessment Tools Descriptions.”

Overview of STABLE-2007 Development and Normative Data

How was the STABLE-2007 made?

STABLE-2007 was developed as part of the Dynamic Supervision Project. The Dynamic Supervision Project was a federal/provincial/territorial research collaboration initiated in 2000 by Public Safety Canada (then Solicitor General Canada), intended to improve risk assessment for adult males on community supervision who were recently convicted of a sexual offence. For more information, please see the journal article (Hanson et al., 2015).

Data were collected by officers during routine community supervision of adult males recently convicted of sexual offences in Canada, Alaska, and Iowa ($n = 795$). Supervising officers attended a two-day training session, although in rare cases, officers submitted data who had been trained by apprenticing with other local officers. The first STABLE assessment was to be completed within the first three months of supervision, and then every six months thereafter.

Collection of Additional Normative Data

A second sample ($n = 4,292$) from British Columbia was added to the data collected from the Dynamic Supervision Project to provide more reliable normative data (see Table 1 and 2 below). Since 2005, British Columbia's community supervision officers began using STABLE with all adult males who had either a current or previous charge or conviction for a sexual offence, or a sexually motivated offence. This included all those with a provincial sentence as well as individuals with federal sentences who also had a provincial sentence during the study period. We consider this additional sample to be fairly representative of the overall/routine population of adult males convicted of sexual offences in the Province of British Columbia as it represents all such individuals who had received such an assessment until June 4th, 2013. Individuals self-identified as one of six ethnic groups: Caucasian ($n = 2,617$; 63.1% of available), East Asian, including China, Japan, and Korea ($n = 114$, 2.7%), South Asian, including all of the Indian sub-continent ($n = 155$, 3.7%), Black ($n = 61$, 1.5%), Latino ($n = 59$, 1.4%), and Indigenous Canadians, including Inuit and Metis ($n = 921$, 22.4%). The ethnicity of a small group of individuals ($n = 221$, 5.3%) were classified as "other"; they represented ethnic groups such as Middle Eastern, Pacific Asian, or chose not to respond. Data were not available for a small number of individuals ($n = 144$).

Detailed Information on the Sample Used for Recidivism Estimates

Recidivism estimates were based on a subset of individuals from the Dynamic Supervision Project ($n = 611$). Recidivism analyses excluded Iowa and Alaska due to incomplete recidivism information. Data on individuals were obtained from 137 supervision officers from 14 different jurisdictions: all Canadian provinces and territories, as well as the Atlantic region of the Correctional Service of Canada. On average, the individuals were 41 years old and serving their first sentence for a sexual offence (69%). Half the sample had child victims (22% were incest, and 28% had at least one child victim outside the family), approximately 10% had only non-contact offences, 35% had adult victims, and 6% had multiple categories. Most sexual offences (77%) involved physical contact but not overt physical injury. Approximately 14% of the individuals self-identified as being of Indigenous heritage, 12% had been hospitalized overnight for a psychiatric condition at some point of their life, and 5% had previously been diagnosed as developmentally delayed.

Interpretation of STABLE-2007 Scores

What do STABLE-2007 scores mean and how do I communicate that to others?

STABLE-2007 measures empirical risk factors that are routinely addressed as part of correctional rehabilitation (i.e., criminogenic needs) for adult males convicted of sexual offences against a child or non-consenting adult. It has 13 items, each scored using a three-point rating system, where 0 refers to “no problem,” 1 refers to “some concern/slight problem,” and 2 refers to “present/definite concern.” Evaluators who use STABLE-2007 should obtain a current copy of the scoring manual (Fernandez et al., 2014).

Risk for sexual offending is based upon multiple psychological factors, including a general propensity for rule-breaking/criminality and sexual-specific risk factors (Brouillette-Alarie & Hanson, 2015). STABLE-2007 items measure both of these psychological domains (e.g., Impulsivity, Sex as Coping, respectively). Although the STABLE-2007 items have been organized into thematic categories in previous editions of this workbook (e.g., Intimacy Deficits, Social Influences), and these categories may be useful for reporting STABLE-2007 scores, we recommend against making strong interpretations based on these conceptually derived categories. Research into the psychological constructs measured by STABLE-2007 is ongoing, and will likely result in a different subscale structure than that originally proposed.

Total scores on STABLE-2007 are calculated by summing all item scores. Given that one item (Emotional Identification with Children) is scored only for offenders with at least one sex offence victim under 14 years old, this means that total scores can range from 0-26 for individuals who offended against children and 0-24 for other individuals assessed. Total scores are interpreted as the relative density of criminogenic needs and can be assigned to one of three levels: low density (0 to 3), moderate density (4 to 11), and high density (12 to 26). We recommend that evaluators interested in an overall assessment of recidivism risk consider STABLE-2007 in combination with a measure of static factors (e.g., Static-99R).

Percentile Rankings

Table 1 presents the distribution of STABLE-2007 item scores ($n = 5,087$) and Table 2 presents the percentiles for total scores ($n = 3,407$)¹. Tables are presented in four different formats: the observed percentage who obtained a lower or a higher score, and the same percentages centered on the midpoint of the interval (to account for ties; see Crawford, Garthwaite, & Slick, 2009). Crawford et al. (2009) express a preference for percentiles centered on the midpoint (the last two columns). Evaluators are encouraged to choose the format that most suits their risk communication needs. It is recommended that the type of percentile is specified in the risk communication report—for more please refer to “Report Writing Templates for STABLE-2007.”

We consider the combined samples to be representative of the overall/routine population of adult males convicted of sexual offences. Evaluators who work in settings where individuals are preselected based on certain criteria (e.g., high intensity treatment programs, civil commitment evaluations) would likely see higher item endorsement in their ratings compared to these data.

¹ Of the 4,292 individuals assessed from the new British Columbia dataset, 1,680 were assessed using STABLE-2000, and 2,612 using STABLE-2007. Given that 10 items are identical across both scales, the full sample was used to describe these items. For analyses of total scores or items specific to STABLE-2007, only offenders with STABLE-2007 scores were used.

Table 1. Distribution of STABLE-2007 Items for Males at First Assessment ($n = 5,087$)

STABLE-2007 Items	% (n) With Same Score		
	0	1	2
1) Significant Social Influences	53.2 (2,694)	32.7 (1,658)	14.1 (716)
2) Capacity for Relationship Stability	23.2 (789)	44.0 (1,495)	32.8 (1,115)
3) Emotional Identification with Children	75.2 (2,010)	20.8 (556)	4.0 (108)
4) Hostility Towards Women	64.8 (3,292)	28.5 (1,446)	6.7 (339)
5) General Social Rejection/Loneliness	42.8 (2,171)	44.4 (2,253)	12.8 (652)
6) Lack of Concern for Others	61.9 (3,142)	28.3 (1,434)	9.9 (500)
7) Impulsive Acts	46.8 (2,371)	39.1 (1,979)	14.2 (717)
8) Poor Cognitive Problem Solving	37.3 (1,890)	46.6 (2,362)	16.1 (816)
9) Negative Emotionality/Hostility	66.9 (3,393)	24.5 (1,241)	8.6 (435)
10) Sex Drive/Preoccupation	61.0 (3,095)	30.7 (1,558)	8.3 (422)
11) Sex as Coping	67.7 (3,434)	23.6 (1,199)	8.7 (439)
12) Deviant Sexual Interests	35.3 (1,202)	44.2 (1,504)	20.5 (699)
13) Cooperation with Supervision	68.3 (3,464)	23.4 (1,186)	8.4 (424)

Note: Data are from DSP ($n = 795$) and BC Corrections ($n = 4,292$)

For items 2, 3, and 12, data from BC Corrections are limited to complete STABLE-2007 scores only ($n = 2,612$), Total n for those items is 3,407

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Cases were excluded if more than one STABLE-2007 item was missing.

Table 2. Percentiles for STABLE-2007 Total Scores for Males at First Assessment ($n = 3,407$)

Density of Criminogenic Needs	Score	Frequency	Defined as Midpoint Average			Observed Percentages		
			Percentile Rank	95% CI		Below	Same	Higher
				LL	UL			
Low $n = 740$	0	59	0.9	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.7	98.3
	1	170	4.2	1.8	6.8	1.7	5.0	93.3
	2	223	10.0	6.7	13.4	6.7	6.5	86.8
	3	288	17.5	13.2	21.9	13.3	8.5	78.2
Moderate $n = 2,035$	4	330	26.6	21.6	31.6	21.7	9.7	68.6
	5	322	36.1	31.2	41.1	31.4	9.5	59.1
	6	291	45.1	40.6	49.7	40.9	8.5	50.6
	7	293	53.7	49.1	58.3	49.4	8.6	42.0
	8	225	61.3	57.6	65.0	58.0	6.6	35.4
	9	220	67.8	64.2	71.4	64.6	6.5	28.9
	10	185	73.8	70.6	76.9	71.1	5.4	23.5
	11	159	78.8	76.0	81.6	76.5	4.7	18.8
High $n = 632$	12	127	83.0	80.7	85.3	81.2	3.7	15.1
	13	109	86.5	84.4	88.5	84.9	3.2	11.9
	14	101	89.6	87.7	91.4	88.1	3.0	8.9
	15	67	92.0	90.6	93.4	91.0	2.0	7.0
	16	63	93.9	92.6	95.2	93.0	1.8	5.2
	17	55	95.7	94.5	96.7	94.9	1.6	3.5
	18	43	97.1	96.2	97.9	96.5	1.3	2.2
	19	30	98.2	97.5	98.8	97.7	0.9	1.4
	20	18	98.9	98.4	99.3	98.6	0.5	0.9
	21	14	99.4	98.9	99.7	99.1	0.4	0.5
	22	9	99.7	99.4	99.9	99.6	0.3	0.1
	23	2	99.9	99.7	100.0	99.8	0.1	0.1
	24	2	99.9	99.7	100.0	99.9	0.1	<0.1
	25	1	>99.9	99.8	100.0	99.9	<0.1	<0.1
	26	1	>99.9	99.9	100.0	>99.9	<0.1	0.0

Note: Data are from DSP ($n = 795$) and BC Corrections ($n = 2,612$)

Average score was 7.4, with a standard deviation of 4.7; Median of 7.

Midpoint averages were computed using the method described in Hanson, Lloyd, Helmus, & Thornton, 2012

Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R/2002R Tools

Why are there new combination rules and how do I use them?

This section describes how to combine and interpret STABLE-2007 scores with the standardized risk levels of Static-99R and Static-2002R (Hanson, Babchishin, Helmus, Thornton, & Phenix, 2016; Phenix, Helmus, & Hanson, 2016). For more information on the development of these rules see Appendix C.

Conceptually, individuals are preliminarily placed in the standardized risk levels with the STATIC tools. This placement can be optimized by considering information from the STABLE-2007. The updated rules for combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R/2002R can be found in Tables 4 and 6, respectively. A three-step method for using Table 4 and 6 is described below:

A Three-Step Approach	Example	
(1) Identify the row with the Static-99R/2002R score	Static-99R	-1
(2) Identify the column with the STABLE-2007 score	STABLE-2007	3
(3) Find the cell where the STATIC row and STABLE column intersect.	Standardized Risk Level	II

Recidivism Estimates

Tables 5 and 7 present updated recidivism estimates for STABLE-2007 with Static-99R or Static-2002R, respectively. Tables include estimates for five outcomes and the sample size of individuals in that level. Recidivism rates from survival analysis (and accompanying confidence intervals) are presented for 1, 3, and 5 years of follow-up. These estimates replace those presented in Appendix G of the 2014 version of STABLE-2007 coding manual and the 2013 version of the STABLE-2007 Evaluator Workbook. Estimates were generated from the DSP sample only because the B.C. sample had a limited definition of recidivism (return to B.C. corrections) whereas multiple, diverse sources were used to identify recidivism in the DSP sample (see Appendix D for details on how estimates were defined and produced).

Risk Ratios

Risk ratios are used to communicate how similar an evaluatee is to the average individual convicted of a sexually offence (i.e. Level III). Risk ratios for the combined STATIC/STABLE standardized risk levels were relatively consistent across versions of STATIC and types of recidivism allowing for overall comparisons. See Table 3, below, for approximate risk ratios and interpretations.

Table 3. Approximate Risk Ratios for STATIC/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels

Risk Level	Approximate Risk Ratio	“Individuals in Level [#] are expected to have roughly [<i>Interpretation</i>] the rate of recidivism compared to the average individual convicted of a sexually motivated offence.”
I	0.25	“...roughly one quarter the rate....”
II	0.50	“...roughly one half the rate....”
III	1.00	“...roughly the same rate as”
IVa	2.00	“...roughly twice the rate....”
IVb	3.50	“...roughly three to four times the rate....”

For information on how these ratios were defined and produced, see Appendix E.

[illegible]

Table 5. Recidivism Rates for Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels

	Recidivism Rates								
	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
	%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Level I “Very Low Risk” (n = 40)									
Sexual Recidivism	0	-	-	2.8	0.0	8.1	2.8	0.0	8.1
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	2.6	0.0	7.7	5.4	0.0	12.7	5.4	0.0	12.7
Violent (including contact sexual)	0	-	-	2.8	0.0	8.1	2.8	0.0	8.1
Any Crime Recidivism	0	-	-	2.8	0.0	8.1	2.8	0.0	8.1
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	2.6	0.0	7.7	5.4	0.0	12.7	5.4	0.0	12.7
Level II “Below Average” (n = 124)									
Sexual Recidivism	0.8	0.0	2.4	3.4	0.1	6.6	5.3	1.2	9.4
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	0.8	0.0	2.4	4.2	0.6	7.9	6.1	1.7	10.5
Violent (including contact sexual)	1.6	0.0	3.9	9.3	4.1	14.6	13.3	7.0	19.5
Any Crime Recidivism	4.1	0.6	7.6	15.2	8.7	21.7	19.2	11.9	26.4
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	7.4	2.7	12.0	18.6	11.5	25.6	22.5	14.8	30.1
Level III “Average” (n = 237)									
Sexual Recidivism	3.8	1.4	6.3	6.1	3.0	9.1	7.5	4.1	11.0
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	3.8	1.4	6.3	6.1	3.0	9.1	8.1	4.5	11.6
Violent (including contact sexual)	6.0	2.9	9.0	9.5	5.7	13.3	13.5	9.0	18.0
Any Crime Recidivism	9.0	5.3	12.6	15.3	10.6	19.9	20.8	15.4	26.2
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	11.5	7.4	15.6	20.0	14.9	25.2	26.7	20.8	32.6
Level IVa “Above Average” (n = 122)									
Sexual Recidivism	4.1	0.6	7.6	11.8	6.0	17.6	13.6	7.4	19.8
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	6.6	2.2	10.9	16.0	9.4	22.5	17.8	10.9	24.7
Violent (including contact sexual)	7.4	2.7	12.0	27.1	19.1	35.1	31.8	23.3	40.3
Any Crime Recidivism	17.2	10.5	23.9	41.2	32.3	50.0	46.7	37.6	55.8
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	27.0	19.2	34.9	48.5	39.5	57.5	53.1	44.0	62.1
Level IVb “Well Above Average” (n = 88)									
Sexual Recidivism	14.9	7.4	22.3	21.9	13.2	30.6	26.8	17.4	36.3
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	21.7	13.1	30.4	28.8	19.2	38.3	33.7	23.7	43.7
Violent (including contact sexual)	17.0	9.2	24.9	36.8	26.6	47.0	40.4	30.1	50.8
Any Crime Recidivism	34.1	24.2	44.0	51.6	41.1	62.2	54.1	43.5	64.6
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	51.1	40.7	61.6	62.9	52.8	73.1	66.7	56.7	76.7
Total (n = 611)									
Sexual Recidivism	4.6	3.0	6.3	8.8	6.5	11.1	10.8	8.3	13.4
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	6.3	4.4	8.2	10.9	8.4	13.5	13.2	10.5	16.0
Violent (including contact sexual)	6.6	4.6	8.6	16.6	13.6	19.6	20.4	17.1	23.8
Any Crime Recidivism	12.7	10.1	15.4	25.0	21.5	28.5	29.5	25.7	33.2
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	19.0	15.9	22.2	30.8	27.1	34.6	35.7	31.8	39.6

[illegible]

Table 7. Recidivism Rates for STATIC-2002R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels

	Recidivism Rates								
	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
	%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Level I “Very Low Risk” (n = 33)									
Sexual Recidivism	0	-	-	3.0	0.0	8.9	3.0	0.0	8.9
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	3.0	0.0	8.9	6.1	0.0	14.2	6.1	0.0	14.2
Violent (including contact sexual)	0	-	-	3.0	0.0	8.9	3.0	0.0	8.9
Any Crime Recidivism	0	-	-	3.0	0.0	8.9	3.0	0.0	8.9
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	3.0	0.0	8.9	6.1	0.0	14.2	6.1	0.0	14.2
Level II “Below Average” (n = 107)									
Sexual Recidivism	0.9	0.0	2.8	2.9	0.0	6.0	3.9	0.1	7.6
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	0.9	0.0	2.8	2.9	0.0	6.0	3.9	0.1	7.6
Violent (including contact sexual)	0.9	0.0	2.8	4.8	0.7	8.9	8.1	2.7	13.5
Any Crime Recidivism	2.8	0.0	6.0	9.6	3.9	15.2	12.9	6.3	19.4
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	5.6	1.3	10.0	12.4	6.1	18.7	16.9	9.5	24.2
Level III “Average” (n = 223)									
Sexual Recidivism	3.6	1.2	6.1	5.9	2.8	9.0	8.3	4.6	12.0
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	4.1	1.5	6.6	6.8	3.5	10.1	9.7	5.8	13.7
Violent (including contact sexual)	5.4	2.4	8.4	10.0	6.0	13.9	14.4	9.7	19.1
Any Crime Recidivism	8.1	4.5	11.7	16.3	11.5	21.2	22.3	16.7	27.9
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	11.7	7.5	15.9	21.3	15.9	26.7	27.8	21.8	33.8
Level IVa “Above Average” (n = 130)									
Sexual Recidivism	5.4	1.5	9.3	13.2	7.4	19.1	14.8	8.7	21.0
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	5.4	1.5	9.3	14.8	8.6	20.9	16.4	10.0	22.8
Violent (including contact sexual)	10.0	4.8	15.2	31.2	23.2	39.3	35.4	27.0	43.7
Any Crime Recidivism	21.5	14.5	28.6	46.5	37.9	55.2	51.4	42.8	60.1
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	30.0	22.1	37.9	53.5	44.8	62.1	57.5	49.0	66.1
Level IVb “Well Above Average” (n = 77)									
Sexual Recidivism	15.7	7.5	23.8	23.6	14.1	33.2	27.6	17.6	37.7
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	24.8	15.2	34.5	32.8	22.2	43.3	36.8	25.9	47.6
Violent (including contact sexual)	18.2	9.6	26.8	39.0	28.1	49.9	42.9	31.8	53.9
Any Crime Recidivism	35.1	24.4	45.7	51.9	40.8	63.1	54.5	43.4	65.7
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	53.2	42.1	64.4	64.9	54.3	75.6	68.8	58.5	79.2
Total (n = 570)									
Sexual Recidivism	4.9	3.1	6.7	9.2	6.8	11.6	11.3	8.7	13.9
Sexual (including sexual breaches)	6.5	4.5	8.5	11.3	8.7	14.0	13.6	10.8	16.5
Violent (including contact sexual)	7.0	4.9	9.1	17.4	14.3	20.5	21.2	17.8	24.6
Any Crime Recidivism	13.4	10.6	16.2	26.0	22.4	29.7	30.5	26.6	34.3
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	19.9	16.6	23.2	32.0	28.2	35.9	36.9	32.9	40.9

Combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000

Combination Method for Nominal Risk Levels

This section describes nominal risk levels (i.e., low, moderate) that result from combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000. The nominal labels for the combined Risk Matrix/STABLE levels refer to relative risk (i.e., evaluatees in the “very high” level would be expected to be more likely to reoffend than evaluatees in the “high” level) and may or may not conform to any thresholds for specific decisions.

Presently, the rules for combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix are identical to those produced in the 2013 STABLE-2007 Evaluators’ Workbook (See Table 8 for combination rules). A three-step method for using Table 8 is described below, regardless of which Risk Matrix scale is being used (i.e., /Sex, /Violence, or /Combined).

A Three-Step Approach	Example	
(1) Identify the column with the Risk Matrix 2000.S/V/C risk level	Risk Matrix 2000.S/V/C	High
(2) Identify the row with the STABLE-2007 score	STABLE-2007	3
(3) Find the cell where the Risk Matrix column and STABLE row intersect	Nominal Risk Level	Moderate

STABLE-2007 users are free to condense and re-label the Risk Matrix/STABLE-2007 levels if different groupings better fit the decisions at hand. For example, if intensive treatment is to be provided to the riskiest 20%, then the “high” and “very high” levels could be combined into a single “high” level for decision purposes.

Rules for combining information from STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000 to produce the standardized risk levels (similar to Static-99R and Static-2002R) are forthcoming.

Risk Estimates

Tables 9, 10, and 11 include the recidivism estimates for the nominal Risk Matrix/STABLE risk levels. Each table includes the Risk Matrix scale of most interest for each outcome. Estimates for sexual and any sexual (including sexually motivated breaches) recidivism are provided for combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000/Sex. Estimates for non-sexual violent recidivism are provided for combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000/Violence. Estimates for any violent, any crime, and any recidivism (including breaches) are provided for combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000/Combined. For more information on how these estimates were produced, please see Appendix D and Helmus and colleagues (2015).

Note: In the 2013 STABLE-2007 Evaluators’ Workbook, these tables contained a “Moderate Low” level. This was an error and has been corrected here to read “Moderate.”

Table 8. Rules for Combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000

						Risk Matrix 2000.S/V/C Risk Levels			
						Low	Moderate	High	Very High
STABLE-2007 Scores	0	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High				
	1	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High				
	2	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High				
	3	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High				
	4	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High				
	5	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High				
	6	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High				
	7	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High				
	8	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High				
	9	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High				
	10	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High				
	11	Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High				
	12	Moderate	Moderate-High	High	Very High				
	13	Moderate	Moderate-High	High	Very High				
	14	Moderate	Moderate-High	High	Very High				
	15	Moderate	Moderate-High	High	Very High				
	16	Moderate	Moderate-High	High	Very High				
	17+	Moderate	Moderate-High	High	Very High				

Table 9. Recidivism Rates for Risk Matrix-Sex/STABLE-2007 Nominal Risk Levels

		Recidivism Rates								
		1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low (n = 239)										
	Sexual Recidivism	1.7	0.05	3.3	4.2	1.7	6.8	6.1	3.0	9.2
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	2.1	0.3	3.9	5.1	2.3	7.9	7.0	3.7	10.3
Moderate (n = 166)										
	Sexual Recidivism	1.8	0.0	3.8	6.6	2.8	10.4	7.9	3.8	12.0
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	1.8	0.0	3.8	6.6	2.8	10.4	8.6	4.3	12.8
Moderate-High (n = 98)										
	Sexual Recidivism	7.2	2.0	12.3	12.5	5.9	19.1	13.6	6.7	20.5
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	11.3	5.0	17.6	19.8	11.8	27.7	20.9	12.7	29.1
High (n = 47)										
	Sexual Recidivism	14.9	4.7	25.1	23.5	11.4	35.7	28.0	15.1	41.0
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	21.3	9.6	33.0	27.7	14.9	40.5	32.2	18.8	45.7
Very High (n = 20)										
	Sexual Recidivism	35.0	14.1	55.9	40.0	18.5	61.5	50.0	28.1	71.9
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	40.0	18.5	61.5	45.0	23.2	66.8	55.0	33.2	76.8
Total (n = 570)										
	Sexual Recidivism	4.9	3.1	6.7	9.2	6.8	11.6	11.3	8.7	13.9
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	6.5	4.5	8.5	11.3	8.7	14.0	13.6	10.8	16.5

Table 10. Recidivism Rates for Risk Matrix-Violence/STABLE-2007 Nominal Risk Levels

	n	Violent (Non-Sexual) Recidivism Rates								
		1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
		%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low	270	0.4	0.0	1.1	1.9	0.2	3.5	3.6	1.3	5.9
Moderate	154	2.6	0.1	5.1	9.2	4.6	13.9	12.0	6.8	17.3
Moderate-High	81	7.4	1.7	13.1	22.2	13.2	31.3	26.0	16.4	35.6
High	50	16.0	5.8	26.2	36.4	22.9	49.8	40.5	26.8	54.2
Very High	7	42.8	6.2	79.5	59.2	21.5	96.8	59.2	21.5	96.8
Total	562	3.9	2.3	5.5	10.6	8.0	13.2	13.1	10.3	16.0

Table 11. Recidivism Rates for Risk Matrix-Combined/STABLE-2007 Nominal Risk Levels

	Recidivism Rates								
	1 Year			3 Years			5 Years		
	%	95% CI		%	95% CI		%	95% CI	
Low (n = 214)									
Violent (including contact sexual)	1.9	0.1	3.7	5.2	2.2	8.2	8.4	4.6	12.3
Any Crime Recidivism	3.8	1.2	6.3	9.0	5.1	12.9	12.8	8.2	17.4
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	7.0	3.6	10.5	12.8	8.3	17.3	16.6	11.5	21.7
Moderate (n = 164)									
Violent (including contact sexual)	3.7	0.8	6.6	11.1	6.2	15.9	15.0	9.4	20.5
Any Crime Recidivism	7.3	3.3	11.3	18.4	12.5	24.4	23.0	16.5	29.6
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	9.8	5.2	14.3	22.7	16.3	29.2	28.7	21.6	35.7
Moderate-High (n = 111)									
Violent (including contact sexual)	12.6	6.4	18.8	30.0	21.5	38.6	33.8	24.9	42.7
Any Crime Recidivism	19.8	12.4	27.2	42.8	33.6	52.1	47.6	38.2	57.0
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	30.6	22.0	39.2	50.9	41.6	60.3	56.6	47.3	65.9
High (n = 59)									
Violent (including contact sexual)	18.6	8.7	28.6	41.0	28.4	53.6	44.5	31.7	57.3
Any Crime Recidivism	44.1	31.4	56.7	59.6	47.0	72.2	64.9	52.6	77.1
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	59.3	46.8	71.8	73.2	61.8	84.6	76.9	66.0	87.7
Very High (n = 14)									
Violent (including contact sexual)	28.6	4.9	52.2	51.1	24.5	77.7	59.3	32.7	85.8
Any Crime Recidivism	50.0	23.8	76.2	78.6	57.1	100.0	78.6	57.1	100.0
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	71.4	47.8	95.1	85.7	67.4	100.0	85.7	67.4	100.0
Total (n = 562)									
Violent (including contact sexual)	7.0	4.8	9.1	16.7	13.6	19.8	20.4	17.0	23.8
Any Crime Recidivism	13.4	10.6	16.2	25.5	21.9	29.1	29.8	26.0	33.6
Any Recidivism (including breaches)	19.6	16.3	22.9	31.4	27.5	35.3	36.1	32.1	40.2

Report Writing Templates for STABLE-2007

This section of the Evaluator Workbook provides examples of how to communicate results from STABLE-2007 in reports, both on its own and in combination with information from static risk assessment tools (e.g., Static-99R, Static-2002R, Risk Matrix 2000). There are three sets of templates. Within each template set, choices are offered with the understanding that evaluators' needs vary greatly based upon the referral question, intended audience, and context in which the evaluation is taking place.

Table 12 is provided to help evaluators select which templates would be most appropriate for their use. However, these templates are examples only and evaluators are free to revise the wording as they see fit.

STABLE-2007

Two sets of templates are presented for reporting STABLE-2007 results: a simple, direct version (1.1) and a more detailed version (1.2). The simple version (1.1) is intended for familiar audiences, i.e., readers expected to have some familiarity with STABLE and its use in their setting. The more detailed version (1.2) is intended for audiences who may be introduced to STABLE for the first time. In highly adversarial settings, greater detail (version 1.2) may also be desired in order to address real or anticipated criticisms.

Standardized Risk Levels from STABLE-2007 combined with Static-99R/2002R

Section 2 is for reporting the standardized risk levels from combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R or Static-2002R. We strongly recommend evaluators begin with a description of the standardized risk levels (2.1) as it was intended to provide a non-arbitrary, objective description of risk. For audiences unfamiliar with the standardized risk levels, or in high-stakes situations, evaluators may include additional descriptive information (2.1.1 – 2.1.5). For a more comprehensive description of an assessed individual's risk, we recommend evaluators also include information on recidivism estimates (2.2) and relative risk ratios (2.3) associated with the individual's standardized risk level.

This section should be included after the results of Static-99R/2002R and STABLE-2007 (Section 1) are reported separately. For further information on Static-99R/2002R reporting templates, please see Phenix, Helmus, and Hanson (2016) or visit www.static99.org.

Nominal Risk Levels from STABLE-2007 combined with Risk Matrix 2000

Section 3 is for reporting nominal risk levels from combining STABLE-2007 with Risk Matrix 2000. Evaluators can include both a description of the nominal risk level (3.1) and recidivism estimates (3.2).

This section should be included after the results of Risk Matrix 2000 and STABLE-2007 (Section 1) are reported separately. For more information on reporting results from Risk Matrix, see Thornton (2010).

Table 12. Guidance for Selecting Report Writing Templates

Section	Sub-Sections
1. STABLE-2007 (Select 1.1 or 1.2)	1.1 Simple Description
	1.2 Detailed Description
2. Integration with STATIC Risk Tools	2.1 Combined Standardized Risk Level (Select one from 2.1.1 - 2.1.5 as needed)
	2.1.1 Level I
	2.1.2 Level II
	2.1.3 Level III
	2.1.4 Level IVa
	2.1.5 Level IVb
	2.2 Recidivism Estimates
3. Integration with Risk Matrix 2000	2.3 Relative Risk Ratios
	3.1 Nominal Risk Level
	3.2 Recidivism Estimates

Note for Templates: Text in square brackets “[]” is meant to be removed or edited: it may contain directions that will be removed or placeholders which should be replaced with the appropriate information, such as evaluatee’s name.

Report Writing Template - Section 1. STABLE-2007

[1.1 Short Description]

Mr. [X] was scored on STABLE-2007^{2,3}. STABLE-2007 measures empirical risk factors that are routinely addressed as part of correctional rehabilitation (i.e., criminogenic needs) for adult males convicted of sexual offences against a child or non-consenting adult. The STABLE-2007 consists of 13 items related to psychological, interpersonal, and sexual functioning, which are added together to create a total score. For individuals who did not offend against a child less than 14 years of age, there are only 12 items. Research has demonstrated that amongst adult males convicted of sexual offences, high scores on the STABLE-2007 add to static risk measures in the prediction of sexual recidivism.

Mr. [X] scored [X] out of a possible [24/26] points on STABLE-2007 which places him in the [low/moderate/high] density range of criminogenic needs. This score represents the [#]^{th/st/rd} percentile, defined as a mid-point average, of adult males in the instrument's standardization sample ([#]% have a lower scores, [#]% have a higher score, and [#]% have the same score). In other words, out of 100 individuals convicted of a sexual offence, [#] would have a lower score, [#] would have the same score, and [#] would have a higher score. With a 95% confidence interval, the score could range from the [LL_{CI}] to the [UL_{CI}] percentile.

The following need areas have been identified as a clinically significant concern for Mr. [X]: [*list those scored as a "2" on the tally sheet - Significant Social Influences, Capacity for Relationship Stability, Emotional Identification with Children, Hostility Toward Women, General Social Rejection/Loneliness, Lack of Concern for Others, Impulsive Acts, Poor Problem Solving Skills, Negative Emotionality, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Sex as Coping, Deviant Sexual Preference, Cooperation with Supervision*].

STABLE-2007 does not measure all targets relevant to risk and to correctional rehabilitation and Mr. [X] may have other needs not included in this measure.

1.2 Longer Description]

Mr. [X] was scored on STABLE-2007^{4,5}. STABLE-2007 measures empirical risk factors that are routinely addressed as part of correctional rehabilitation (i.e., criminogenic needs) for adult males convicted of sexual offences against a child or non-consenting adult. The STABLE-2007 consists of 13 items related to psychological, interpersonal, and sexual functioning, which are added together to create a total score. For individuals who did not offend against a child under 14 years old, there

² Fernandez, Y., Harris, A. J. R., Hanson, R. K., & Sparks, J. (2014). *STABLE-2007 coding manual – revised 2014*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

³ Hanson, R. K., Helmus, L.-M., & Harris, A. J. R. (2015). Assessing the risk and needs of supervised sexual offenders: A prospective study using STABLE-2007, Static-99R, and Static-2002R. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42, 1205–1224. doi.10.1177/0093854815602094

⁴ Fernandez, Y., Harris, A. J. R., Hanson, R. K., & Sparks, J. (2014). *STABLE-2007 coding manual – revised 2014*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

⁵ Hanson, R. K., Helmus, L.-M., & Harris, A. J. R. (2015). Assessing the risk and needs of supervised sexual offenders: A prospective study using STABLE-2007, Static-99R, and Static-2002R. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42, 1205–1224. doi.10.1177/0093854815602094

are only 12 items. STABLE-2007 was constructed using a sample of 795 adult males across Canada, as well as the states of Alaska and Iowa, who were convicted of a sexual offence who were under community supervision. An additional 4,292 individuals were added to create normative data.

Mr. [X]'s STABLE-2007 score was based on the [year] version of the coding manual, using official criminal history records provided by [X] dated [#] and reports from [X] dated [#]. As well, Mr. [X] was interviewed for this report on [#].

Mr. [X] scored [X] out of a possible [24/26] points on STABLE-2007 which places him in the [low/moderate/high] density range of criminogenic needs. This score represents the [#]^{th/st/rd} percentile, defined as a mid-point average, of adult males in the instrument's standardization sample ([#]% have a lower scores, [#]% have a higher score, and [#]% have the same score). In other words, out of 100 individuals convicted of a sexual offence, [#] would have a lower score, [#] would have the same score, and [#] would have a higher score. With a 95% confidence interval, the score could range from the [LL_{CI}] to the [UL_{CI}] percentile.

Mr. [X]'s STABLE-2007 item scores are summarized in the table below alongside the percent of individuals in the normative sample who scored "0 - No Problem" on each item. The following need areas have been identified as [a] clinically significant concern[s]: *[list those scored as a "2" on the tally sheet - Significant Social Influences, Capacity for Relationship Stability, Emotional Identification with Children, Hostility Toward Women, General Social Rejection/Loneliness, Lack of Concern for Others, Impulsive Acts, Poor Problem Solving Skills, Negative Emotionality, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Sex as Coping, Deviant Sexual Preference, Cooperation with Supervision]*.

STABLE-2007 Score Summary		
Item	Score	% scored 0
1) Significant Social Influences		53.2
2) Capacity for Relationship Stability		23.2
3) Emotional Identification with Children		75.2
4) Hostility Towards Women		64.8
5) General Social Rejection/Loneliness		42.8
6) Lack of Concern for Others		61.9
7) Impulsive Acts		46.8
8) Poor Cognitive Problem Solving		37.3
9) Negative Emotionality/Hostility		66.9
10) Sex Drive/Preoccupation		61.0
11) Sex as Coping		67.7
12) Deviant Sexual Interests		35.3
13) Cooperation with Supervision		68.3
Total Score		/[24/26]

STABLE-2007 does not measure all targets relevant to risk and to correctional rehabilitation and Mr. [X] may have other needs not included in this measure.

Report Writing Template – Section 2. STABLE-2007 combined with Static-99R/2002R

[2.1 Combined Standardized Risk Level.]

STABLE-2007 can be combined with [Static-99R/Static-2002R] to provide a composite assessment of risk/needs, and to produce estimates of sexual recidivism, sexual recidivism with sexually-motivated breaches, violent recidivism, and any criminal recidivism both with and without breaches. Mr. [X] was scored in the [low/moderate/high] density range of criminogenic needs on the STABLE-2007 and was preliminarily placed in Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb] on the [Static-99R/Static-2002R]. When these measures are combined, his composite assessment places him in Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb] for supervision and intervention using the standardized risk framework^{6,7,8}.

[2.1.1 Level I Description, Optional]. Individuals placed in Level I are considered *Very Low Risk* using the standardized risk level framework. If they have criminogenic needs, they would likely be few and/or transitory in nature. They often have clearly identifiable prosocial resources and strengths within the psychological, interpersonal, and lifestyle domains. Their risk of new sexually criminal behaviour is no different from the rate of spontaneous, first-time sexual offending amongst individuals with a non-sexual, criminal history (i.e., about 0.4% per year)⁹. The prognosis, given the already low expected rate of reoffending, is good. Most individuals placed in Level I are expected to desist from criminal behaviour, even without a correctional response.

[2.1.2 Level II Description, Optional]. Individuals placed in Level II are considered *Below Average Risk* using the standardized risk level framework. Most individuals have few identifiable criminogenic needs and have clearly identifiable prosocial resources and strengths. When moderate levels of criminogenic needs are observed, these needs are expected to be transitory, rather than ingrained, problems. The risk of new criminal behaviour for individuals in Level II is lower than the average individual convicted of sexually motivated offences, but greater than individuals in Level I. It is expected that most individuals will transition down to a Level I, *Very Low Risk*, if appropriate correctional strategies are provided or should they remain offence-free in the community for 5 years.¹⁰

⁶ Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., McGrath, R. J., Kroner, D., D'Amora, D. A., & Thomas, S. S. (2017). *A five-level risk and needs system: Maximizing assessment results in corrections through the development of a common language*. New York, NY: Justice Centre

⁷ Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Helmus, L. M., Thornton, D., & Phenix, A. (2016). Communicating the results of criterion referenced prediction measures: Risk categories for the Static-99R and Static-2002R sexual offender risk assessment tools. *Psychological Assessment*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/pas0000371

⁸ Hanson, R. K., & Bourgon, G. (2017). Advancing sexual offender risk assessment: Standardized risk levels based on psychologically meaningful offender characteristics. In Faye Taxman (Ed.), *Risk and Need Assessment: Theory and Practice* (pp. 244-268). New York: Routledge

⁹ Kahn, R. E., Ambroziak, G., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2017). Release from the sex offender label. Advance online publication. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. doi:10.1007/s10508-017-0972-y

¹⁰ Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Letourneau, E., Helmus, L. M., & Thornton, D. (In press). Reductions in risk based on time offence free in the community: Once a sexual offender not always a sexual offender. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*.

[2.1.3 Level III Description, Optional]. Individuals placed in Level III are considered *Average Risk* using the standardized risk level framework. They often have multiple criminogenic needs—varying in severity—in psychological, interpersonal, and lifestyle domains. These needs are likely to be barriers to effective use of any available prosocial resources and strengths. The rate of reoffending for individuals in Level III is generally equivalent to the average rate of sexual reoffending in the overall population of individuals convicted of sexually motivated offences. It is expected that about half the individuals at Level III will transition down to a Level II, *Below Average Risk*, within a year or two after a sufficient dosage of treatment or positive life changes. All will eventually transition to Level II or Level I should they remain offence-free in the community for 10 to 15 years.¹¹

[2.1.4 Level IVa Description, Optional]. Individuals placed in Level IVa are considered *Above Average Risk* using the standardized risk level framework. They often have many criminogenic needs, most of which are chronic and severe. Access to prosocial resources and strengths is likely limited due to significant barriers. The rate of sexual reoffending for individuals in Level IVa is roughly equivalent to twice the average rate of reoffending for the overall population of individuals convicted of sexually motivated offences. The prognosis includes a significant reduction of reoffending with many individuals in Level IVa transitioning down to a Level III, *Average Risk*, within a year or two after a sufficient dosage of treatment or positive life changes. Most will transition to Level III after a sufficient dose of treatment, positive life changes, or should they remain offence-free in the community for 10 to 15 years.¹²

[2.1.5 Level IVb Description, Optional]. Individuals placed in Level IVb are considered *Well Above Average Risk* using the standardized risk level framework. They often have many criminogenic needs, most of which are chronic and severe. Access to prosocial resources and strengths is likely limited due to significant barriers. The rate of sexual reoffending for individuals in Level IVb is about three to four times the average rate of reoffending for the overall population of individuals convicted of sexually motivated offences. Most will transition to Level III after a sufficient dose of treatment, positive life changes, or should they remain offence-free in the community for 10 to 15 years.¹³

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

[2.2 Recidivism Estimates]

The risk of Mr. [X] reoffending can be described by examining absolute rates of reoffending over a time period. Out of 100 individuals convicted of sexually motivated offences with the same risk profile as Mr. [X], [#] would be expected to recidivate [sexually/sexually with breaches/violently/with any criminal recidivism/with any criminal recidivism including breaches] over [three/five] years. Conversely, [100-#] out of 100 would not recidivate with [this type of offence] after [three/five] years in the community. [Choose the outcome(s) and follow-up period(s) most relevant to the referral question and repeat section as needed].

[2.3 Relative Risk Ratios]

The risk of reoffending can [also] be described using risk ratios, which summarizes the risk of a particular Level compared to the average individual convicted of a sexually offence (i.e., Level III). Level III is used as the comparison group because it is defined by the average rate of recidivism. Mr [X] was placed in Level [#].

[Choose one from following:]

[Level I, “On average, individuals in Level I are expected to have roughly one quarter the rate of recidivism compared to the average individual convicted of a sexually motivated offence.”]

[Level II, “On average, individuals in Level II are expected to have roughly half the rate of recidivism compared to the average individual convicted of a sexually motivated offence.”]

[Level III, “On average, individuals in Level III are expected to have roughly the same as the rate of recidivism of the average individual convicted of a sexually motivated offence.”]

[Level IVa, “On average, individuals in Level IVa are expected to have roughly twice the rate of recidivism compared to the average individual convicted of a sexually motivated offence.”]

[Level IVb, “On average, individuals in Level IVb are expected to have roughly three to four times the rate of recidivism compared to the average individual convicted of a sexually motivated offence.”]

Report Writing Template – Section 3. STABLE-2007 combined with Risk Matrix 2000**[3.1 Description of Nominal Risk Levels]**

STABLE-2007 can be combined with the Risk Matrix 2000 nominal risk levels to provide a composite assessment of risk/needs, and to produce estimates of sexual recidivism, sexual recidivism with sexually-motivated breaches, violent recidivism, and any criminal recidivism both with and without breaches.

Mr. [X] was scored in the [low/moderate/high] density range of criminogenic needs on STABLE-2007 and was placed in the [low/moderate/high/very high] nominal risk level on Risk Matrix 2000/Sex/Violence/Combined. When these measures are combined, his composite assessment places him in the low/moderate/moderate-high/high/very high nominal risk level for supervision and intervention in comparison to other individuals convicted of sexually motivated offences who have been assessed using these measures.

[3.2 Recidivism Estimates]

The risk of Mr. [X] reoffending can be described by examining absolute rates of reoffending over a time period. Out of 100 individuals convicted of sexual offences with the same risk profile as Mr. [X], [#] would be expected to recidivate [sexually/sexually with breaches/violently/with any criminal recidivism/with any criminal recidivism including breaches] over [three/five] years. Conversely, [100-#] out of 100 would not recidivate with [this type of offence] after [three/five] years in the community. [Choose the outcome(s) and follow-up period(s) most relevant to the referral question and repeat section as needed].

References

- Babchishin, K.M., Hanson, R.K., & Helmus, L. (2011). *The RRASOR, Static-99R and Static-2002R all add incrementally to the prediction of recidivism among individuals convicted of sexual offences*. Corrections User Report 2011-02. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada.
- Babchishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & Helmus, L. (2012a). Even highly correlated measures can add incrementally to actuarial risk prediction. *Assessment*, 19, 442-461. doi:10.1177/1073191112458312
- Babchishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & Helmus, L. (2012). Communicating risk for sex offenders: Risk ratios for Static-2002R. *Sexual Offender Treatment*, 7(2), 1-12. Available from <http://www.sexual-offender-treatment.org/111.html>.
- Brouillette-Alarie, S., & Hanson, R. K. (2015). Comparaison de deux mesures d'évaluation du risque de récidive des délinquants sexuels. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 47, 292–304. doi:10.1037/cbs0000019
- Crawford, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., & Slick, D. J. (2009). On percentile norms in neuropsychology: Proposed reporting standards and methods for quantifying the uncertainty over the percentile ranks of test scores. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 23, 1173-1195. doi:10.1080/13854040902795018
- Fernandez, Y., Harris, A. J. R., Hanson, R. K., & Sparks, J. (2014). *STABLE-2007 coding manual – revised 2014*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.
- Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Helmus, L. M., Thornton, D., & Phenix, A. (2016, September 12). Communicating the results of criterion referenced prediction measures: Risk categories for the Static-99R and Static-2002R sexual offender risk assessment tools. *Psychological Assessment*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/pas0000371
- Hanson, R. K., & Bourgon, G. (2017). Advancing sexual offender risk assessment: Standardized risk levels based on psychologically meaningful offender characteristics. In Faye Taxman (Ed.), *Risk and Need Assessment: Theory and Practice* (pp. 244-268). New York: Routledge.
- Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., Helmus, L., & Hodgson, S. (2009). The principles of effective correctional treatment also apply to sexual offenders: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 865-891. doi:10.1177/0093854809338545
- Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., McGrath, R. J., Kroner, D., D'Amora, D. A., & Thomas, S. S. (2017). *A five-level risk and needs system: Maximizing assessment results in corrections through the development of a common language*. New York, NY: Justice Centre.
- Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Letourneau, E., Helmus, L. M., & Thornton, D. (in press). Reductions in risk based on time offense free in the community: Once a sexual offender, not always a sexual offender. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*.
- Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T.-L., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project* (User Report No. 2007-05). Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada. Available from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/_fl/crp2007-05-en.pdf

- Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2014). High risk sex offenders may not be high risk forever. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29, 2792-2813. doi: 10.1177/0886260514526062
- Hanson, R. K., Helmus, L.-M., & Harris, A. J. R. (2015). Assessing the risk and needs of supervised sexual offenders: A prospective study using STABLE-2007, Static-99R, and Static-2002R. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42, 1205–1224. doi:10.1177/0093854815602094
- Hanson, R. K., Lloyd, C. D., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2012). Developing non-arbitrary metrics for risk communication: Percentile ranks for the Static-99/R and Static-2002/R sexual offender risk tools. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 11, 9-23. doi:10.1080/14999013.2012.667511
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (1999). *Static-99: Improving actuarial risk assessments for individuals convicted of sexual offences*. User Report 99-02. Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving risk assessments for individuals convicted of sexual offences: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24, 119-136. doi:10.1023/A:1005482921333
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2003). *Notes on the development of Static-2002*. (Corrections Research User Report No. 2003-01). Ottawa, ON: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Helmus, L., Babchishin, K. M., & Hanson, R. K. (2013). The predictive accuracy of the Risk Matrix 2000: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Offender Treatment*, 8(2), 1-24. Available from <http://www.sexual-offender-treatment.org/index.php?id=125andtype=123>.
- Helmus, L.-M., & Hanson, R. K. (2013). *STABLE-2007: Updated recidivism rates (includes combinations with Static-99R, Static-2002R, and Risk Matrix 2000)*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.
- Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., & Thornton, D. (2015). Sex offender risk assessment with the Risk Matrix 2000: Validation and guidelines for combining with the STABLE-2007. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 21, 136-157. doi:10.1080/13552600.2013.870241
- Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., Thornton, D., Babchishin, K. M., & Harris, A. J. R. (2012). Absolute recidivism rates predicted by Static-99R and Static-2002R sex offender risk assessment tools vary across samples: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 39, 1148-1171. doi:10.1177/0093854812443648
- Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R.K., & Babchishin, K.M. (2011). *Assessing the risk of older individuals convicted of sexual offences: Developing the Static-99R and Static-2002R*. Corrections User Report 2011-01. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada.
- Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., & Babchishin, K. M. (2012). Improving the predictive accuracy of Static-99 and Static-2002 with older individuals convicted of sexual offences: Revised age weights. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 24, 64-101. doi:10.1177/1079063211409951

- Justice Center. (2014). *A common language for risk assessment: Experts convene in Washington*. Retrieved from <http://csgjusticecenter.org/reentry/posts/a-common-language-for-risk-assessments-expertsconvene-in-washington/>
- Justice Center. (2016). *A five-level risk and needs system: Maximizing assessment results through the development of a common language*. New York, NY: Author.
- Kahn, R. E., Ambroziak, G., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2017). Release from the sex offender label. Advance online publication. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. doi:10.1007/s10508-017-0972-y
- Lehmann, R. J. B., Thornton, D., Helmus, L. M., & Hanson, R. K. (2016). Developing non-arbitrary metrics for risk communication: Norms for the Risk Matrix 2000. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 43, 1661-1687. doi:10.1177/0093854816651656
- Phenix, A., Fernandez, Y., Harris, A. J. R., Helmus, L.-M., Hanson, R. K., Thornton, D. (2016). *Static-99R coding rules*. Unpublished report. Available from www.Static99.org.
- Phenix, A., Helmus, L.-M., & Hanson, R. K. (2016). *Static-99R & Static-2002R evaluators' workbook*. Unpublished report. Available from www.Static99.org.
- Schmucker, M., & Lösel, F. (2015). The effects of sexual offender treatment on recidivism: An international meta-analysis of sound quality evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(4), 597-630. doi:10.1007/s11292-015-9241-z
- Singh, J. P., Fazel, S., Gueorguieva, R., & Buchanan, A. (2014). Rates of violence in patients classified as high risk by structured risk assessment instruments. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 204, 180–187. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.131938
- Soothill, K. L., & Gibbens, T. C. N. (1978). Recidivism of sexual offenders: A re-appraisal. *British Journal of Criminology*, 18, 267-276.
- Thornton, D. (2010). *Scoring guide for Risk Matrix 2000.10/SVC*. Unpublished document.
- Thornton, D., Mann, R., Webster, S., Blud, L., Travers, R., Friendship, C., & Erikson, M. (2003). Distinguishing and combining risks for sexual and violent recidivism. In R. A. Prentky, E. S. Janus, & M. C. Seto (Eds.), *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences: Vol. 989. Sexually coercive behavior: Understanding and management* (pp. 225–235). New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Appendix A: Standardized Risk Levels for Sexual Offending

How do we compare the results of risk assessments conducted with different instruments?

There are currently hundreds of different risk tools used worldwide (Singh, Fazel, Gueorguieva, & Buchanan, 2014), each with its own interpretive levels. Although these tools are trying to measure risk and needs, each instrument is unique in that it may comprise varying factors and weight those factors differently from other tools. Furthermore, the field is just beginning to set standards or specifications about the terminology used to describe risk and needs levels.

The standardized risk framework (Hanson et al., 2017; based on proposals by Justice Centre 2014; 2016) is a method for quantifying risk in criterion referenced tools that is independent of the characteristics of any single tool. This framework aims to improve consistency in understanding and interpreting risk assessment results across different tools. Information in scales can be matched to five broad levels of riskiness defined by the following principles:

Rater reliability refers to consistency in measurement and is improved when fewer individuals are placed near the boundaries and many cases are placed in the middle of the risk levels.

Percentile ranks measure the unusualness of scores. They are useful for prediction tools because they are easily calculated, easily understood, and may be sufficient for resource allocation decisions. Risk Level III is centered on a tool's median score.

Absolute risk is central to decisions based on the absolute (not relative) likelihood of an outcome. A threshold for defining Level I would be those whose risk for a new offense is no different than spontaneous rates of first time offending in the general population—or for sexual offending risk, that the risk is no different than that of individuals with a non-sexual criminal history (i.e., 1% to 2% within the first 5 years; Kahn, Ambroziak, Hanson, & Thornton, 2017). Level V, the highest risk level, includes individuals virtually certain to reoffend (i.e., greater than 85%).

Risk ratios compare the recidivism rate of individuals with a particular score to the recidivism rate of a reference group (e.g., the average score on a tool). The upper and lower boundaries of Level III can be defined by a meaningful difference in risk (e.g., the reduction in reoffending after the successful completion of an evidence-based treatment program) from the average absolute recidivism rate.

The five standardized risk levels were designed to inform case planning, guide how corrections and criminal justice professionals conceptualize risk and needs, and help identify people who can benefit most from intervention. Additionally, it is designed to facilitate consistency in definitions across contexts or jurisdictions where different risk tools are used.

The interpretations of the five levels were based on risk-relevant characteristics related to offending in general (e.g., antisocial attitudes, poor problem solving). Risk for sexual offending is related to both general criminality and sexual criminality (e.g., atypical sexual preferences, emotional identification with children). Table 13 provides a summary of Hanson and colleagues' (Hanson & Bourgon, 2017; Hanson et al., 2016) results to adapt the interpretation of the five standardized risk levels for individuals convicted of sexual offending.

The prognosis associated with each risk level is based on meta-analyses of the typical effect of specialized treatment programs for individuals with a history of sexual crime (Hanson, Bourgon, Helmus, & Hodgson, 2009; Schmucker & Lösel, 2015) as well as on long term recidivism studies examining desistance and the effects of years offence free in the community (Hanson, Harris, Helmus, & Thornton, 2014; Hanson, Harris, Letourneau, Helmus, & Thornton, 2017). The standardized risk levels are intended to be theoretically meaningful constructs supported by evidence. Consequently, the inferences that can be supported by risk level membership will evolve as research advances.

Table 13. Descriptions of the Standardized Risk Levels for Sexual Offending

Level	Risk Profile	Criminogenic Needs	Correctional Treatment Dose	Treatment Effect	Prognosis Following Intervention
I	Very Low Risk —similar to people with non-sexual criminal histories, < 2% after 5 years	None or few —if any, mild and/or transitory; clear resources and strengths. Generally prosocial	None —if needed, refer to community services	None —Risk so low that it will not be reduced further	Excellent —individuals will stay in Level I
II	Below Average Risk —higher than very low (I) risk profile but lower than average (III)	A few —some mild, transitory, or possibly acute; clear resources and strengths. Vulnerable prosocial	Minimal —if any, very short term, refer to community services if needed	Minor —Risk so low that intervention can only have a minor impact	Very good —most individuals move from Level II to I
III	Average Risk —the middle of the risk distribution	Multiple —some severe, several domains; Some resources/strengths	Significant —treatment programs, and change-focused supervision activities	Significant —Intervention impact can meaningfully reduce reoffending	Good —many individuals will move from Level III to II
IV	a Above Average Risk —approximately 2x the average risk (III)	Multiple, persistent —some chronic and severe, problems cover all domains; few resources/strengths if any	Intensive —High intensity treatment programs	Beneficial —Significant reduction in risk, although residual risk still above the lowest levels	Improvement —some individuals will move to IVa, III, and as low as II after several years
	b Well Above Average Risk —3 to 4x the average risk (III)				
V*	Virtually Certain to Reoffend —Entrenched criminal profile: virtually certain to sexually reoffend, >85% after 5 years	Multiple, entrenched —chronic, severe, and entrenched, likely across most or all domains; no resources/strengths	Extensive —High intensity treatment programs provided over several years.	Potential —Intervention can have an impact but initial risk so high that emphasis is on treatment readiness and behavioural management	Poor — Risk likely to continue to be above average despite reductions; expected to move to III and II with age-related desistance

* Individuals at this level are not presently identified using Static-99R/2002R and STABLE-2007

Appendix B: Static Risk Assessment Tools Descriptions

Static-99R (Hanson & Thornton, 1999, 2000; Helmus, Thornton, Hanson, & Babchishin, 2011, 2012). Static-99R is an empirically derived actuarial risk assessment tool designed to predict sexual recidivism in adult male individuals charged or convicted of sexual offences (see also www.static99.org). The Static-99R items are identical to Static-99 with the exception of updated age weights. The scale has ten items assessing criminal history, victim characteristics, and relationship history. For each item, one point is awarded for higher risk (with the exception of two items which are worth more than one point: prior sex offences and age). The total score (ranging from -3 to 12) is calculated by summing all item points and can be used to place evaluatees in one of five standardized risk levels: Level I “Very Low Risk” (-3, -2), Level II “Below Average” (-1, 0), Level III “Average Risk” (1, 2, 3), Level IVa “Above Average” (4, 5), and Level IVb “Well Above Average” (6 through 12). Static-99R has been found to have moderate predictive accuracy for sexual recidivism (Helmus, Hanson, Thornton, Babchishin, & Harris, 2012). For more information about Static-99R and Static-2002R, see www.static99.org.

Static-2002R (Hanson & Thornton, 2003; Helmus, Thornton et al., 2011, 2012). Static-2002R is also an empirical actuarial risk assessment tool for adult male individuals convicted of sexual offences (see also www.static99.org). Static-2002R is designed to predict sexual recidivism, although 6 of its items can be combined into a separate scale (called the BARR-2002R) to predict violent and any recidivism. The scale has 14 items grouped into 5 main subscales: age at release (1 item), persistence of sex offending (3 items), sexual deviance (3 items), relationship to victims (2 items), and general criminality (5 items). Most items assign one point for the presence of the risk factor, but some items are worth more points (age, prior sentencing occasions for a sex offence, prior sentencing occasions for any offence). The Static-2002R items are identical to the original Static-2002 with the exception of updated age weights. The total score for Static-2002R can range from -2 to 13 and can be used to place evaluatees in one of five standardized risk levels: Level I “Very Low Risk” (-2, -1), Level II “Below Average” (0, 1), Level III “Average Risk” (2, 3, 4), Level IVa “Above Average” (5, 6), and Level IVb “Well Above Average” (7 through 13). Static-2002R has moderate predictive accuracy (Helmus, Hanson et al., 2012) and is similar to the predictive accuracy of Static-99R (Babchishin, Hanson, & Helmus, 2011, 2012a). For more information about Static-99R and Static-2002R, see www.static99.org.

Risk Matrix 2000 (Thornton, 2010; Thornton et al., 2003). The Risk Matrix 2000 is a static actuarial scale developed to assess the risk of adult male individuals convicted of sexual offences, and consists of three separate risk scales. The Risk Matrix 2000/Sex (7 items) is designed to predict sexual recidivism and the Risk Matrix 2000/Violence (3 items) is designed to predict non-sexually violent recidivism. Both scales can also be combined into an overall scale (the Risk Matrix 2000/Combined), which is designed to predict any violent recidivism (sexual or non-sexual). All scales can be easily scored based on commonly available demographic and criminal history information. In all three scales, the evaluatee is placed in one of four risk levels: low, moderate, high, and very high. A meta-analysis of 16 samples found that the Risk Matrix 2000 had moderate to high predictive accuracy (Helmus, Babchishin, & Hanson, 2013). For more information about the Risk Matrix 2000, see Thornton (2010), Helmus, Hanson, Babchishin, and Thornton (2015) and Lehmann, Thornton, Helmus and Hanson (2016).

Appendix C: Optimizing Standardized Risk Levels through Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R/2002R

The following section contains a summary of the steps used to improve placement within the standardized risk categories by using information from both Static-99R/2002R and STABLE-2007.

Previous Method for Combing STATIC/STABLE to produce Nominal Risk Levels

Previous editions of the workbook described a method for combining Static/STABLE by using the STABLE-2007 to adjust STATIC risk levels. Individuals would stay at their STATIC risk level if they were in the “moderate” STABLE level. If they were “low” on the STABLE they would go down one nominal level, or go up one nominal level if their STABLE level was “high.”

Current Method for Combing STATIC/STABLE to produce Standardized Risk Levels

As individuals are initially placed into the standardized risk levels by their STATIC scores, the development team tested a series theoretically and empirically driven strategies to see how information from STABLE could optimize placements. The current Static/STABLE combination method is based on two premises:

- (1) STABLE-2007 is correlated with STATIC scores. In other words, as STATIC scores go up, it is expected that assessed individuals will have higher STABLE scores. From linear regression, the average STABLE-2007 score for each Static-99R or Static-2002R risk level is as follows:¹⁴ Level I = STABLE-2007 score of 3; II = 5; III = 7; IVa = 9; and IVb = 12. In other words, these five STABLE-2007 scores represent the average or expected score of individuals placed in each STATIC risk level.
- (2) Changing standardized risk level placement is justified when the evaluatee's STABLE-2007 scores is higher or lower than expected based on their STATIC level. If an evaluatee's STABLE score is higher/lower than what would be expected beyond measurement error¹⁵ at their STATIC risk level (see Premise 1) they should move to a higher/lower risk level¹⁶.

The final version of the decision rules were selected based on both statistical model fit in a validation sample (n > 4,000) as well as utility perceived by experienced STABLE-2007 users and trainers.

¹⁴ Specifically, predicted STABLE-2007 scores were calculated for each Static-99R and Static-2002R total score using the data from the Dynamic Supervision Project. Average scores per category were calculated based on a weighted average of the scorewise predicted values. After rounding, the average STABLE-2007 scores per risk level were identical for Static-99R and Static-2002R.

¹⁵ This was defined as the standard error of the predicted STABLE score, 4.5 STABLE units.

¹⁶ If their observed STABLE score is approximately beyond two standard errors of their predicted STABLE score, the individual may move two risk levels.

Appendix D: Recidivism Types, Sources of Information, and Creating Estimates

The following section contains information relevant to the interpretation of recidivism estimates including how recidivism is defined in this workbook, the sources of information used in the Dynamic Supervision Project, and the method for calculating recidivism estimates. This information can be found in Hanson, Helmus, and Harris (2015).

Defining Recidivism

Recidivism Type	Definition
Sexual	Any contact or non-contact offence that was considered sexually motivated (regardless of what the charge or conviction was). This included Category “B” sex offences as defined by the Static-99R coding rules (e.g., possession of child pornography, prostitution offences; Phenix, Fernandez, et al., 2016).
Sexual including breaches	This category includes all sexual recidivism incidents as well as sexual breaches, defined as official sanctions for sexually motivated violations of the conditions of community supervision (e.g., being in the company of children contrary to a supervision condition).
Violent (including sexual)	All crimes that involved direct confrontation with the victim. This category included contact sexual offences, but excluded non-contact sex offences and sexually motivated breaches.
Violent (non-sexual)	This category included everything in the ‘violence’ category, except for sexual offences.
Any criminal	Includes all crimes but excludes technical offences
Any recidivism	Includes all crimes (sexual, violent, non-violent), as well as all technical offences (e.g., breach of conditional release), regardless of whether they were sexually motivated.

Sources of Information

Information concerning new offences was gathered from reviews of provincial and national criminal history records, as well as from supervising officers, local police jurisdictions, and searches of newspaper databases. National criminal history records maintained by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were received in August 2005, June 2006, and March 2011. Provincial records were received from the following jurisdictions: British Columbia (January, 2006), Manitoba (April, 2005), and Ontario (December, 2005). The Offender Management System of CSC was checked in May, 2005, for the CSC participants registered in the project. Police jurisdictions were contacted to obtain information on all new sexual and violent recidivism incidents identified from official records (as well as some technical or non-violent incidents where a serious sanction was applied) – this process also resulted in identification of new recidivism incidents not appearing on official criminal records. Lastly, newspaper databases were searched for each individual in the summer of 2011 to identify new charges or convictions that may not be on criminal records.

Where possible, information on the date and circumstances of new offences was obtained in order to classify them. Recidivism was considered to have occurred if the agency reporting the information believed that the offence occurred. For breaches, however, an official record of parole revocation or a new conviction for violation of conditional release was required. Given that criminal history records were the major source of recidivism information, the vast majority of recidivism events were linked to an officially recorded charge or conviction.

Calculating Recidivism Estimates

Recidivism estimates for STABLE-2007 (when combined with Static-99R, Static-2002R, or the Risk Matrix) were calculated using life table survival analysis (Soothill & Gibbens, 1978). This is the same method used to produce the original Static-99 recidivism estimates (Hanson & Thornton, 2000). Survival analysis corrects for unequal follow-up times by estimating what the recidivism rate for the sample would be if everyone had been followed up to that point (based on information from cases with that length of follow-up). Survival analysis estimates are generally reliable provided that there are a sufficient number of cases with follow-up data for the time period being estimated. We believe the sample provides fairly reliable information about officially detected recidivism for up to five years after release.

For the overall sample, 5-year recidivism rates (from survival analysis) were 10.8% for sexual recidivism, 13.2% for sexual recidivism including breaches, 14.8% for non-sexually violent recidivism, 20.4% for any violent recidivism, 29.5% for any new crime, and 35.7% for any recidivism. These rates may be higher than recidivism rates published from other relatively routine samples of individuals convicted of sexual offences for several reasons: recidivism information was obtained from multiple diverse sources, attempts were made to identify the circumstances of offences so that seemingly non-sexual offences could be classified as sexual offences if there was a sexual motivation, and analyses used the date of offence, which was often much sooner than the date of charge/conviction that is typically used in other studies.

Appendix E: Risk Ratios for Static-99R/2002R and STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels

The following section contains more detail on the calculation and interpretation of risk ratios for each STATIC/STABLE combination and for each recidivism type.

There are different ways to calculate risk ratios such as rate ratios, odds ratios, or hazard ratios (Babchishin, Hanson, & Helmus, 2012b). Following the same procedures used for Static-99R/2002R, hazard ratios were used to define risk ratios in this workbook. Using data from the Dynamic Supervision Project, cox regression coefficients were derived from entering STATIC/STABLE risk levels, with the assessed individuals' jurisdiction (i.e., province or region) used as a strata variable, allowing for separate baseline hazard functions. Results are reported in Table 14.

Across both scales (Static-99R and Static-2002R) and across five recidivism outcomes, the results were remarkably consistent: compared to Risk Level III, lower risk levels were associated with increasingly halving the risk for recidivism, and higher risk levels were associated with increasingly doubling the risk for recidivism. In other words, Level II has half the risk of Level III, and Level I has half the risk of Level II (roughly one quarter the risk of Level III). Level IVa is roughly double the risk of Level III, and Level IVb is three to four times the risk of Level III. Given the consistency across scales and outcomes, overall risk ratios of 0.25, 0.50, 1.00, 2, and 3.5 were considered to be defensible and intuitive interpretations for the Standardized Risk Levels from combining Static-99R/2002R with STABLE-2007.

Table 14. Risk Ratios for Static-99R/2002R and STABLE-2007 Combinations

		Relative Risk Ratios	
		Static-99R/STABLE-2007	Static-2002R/STABLE-2007
Level I “Very Low Risk”			
	Sexual Recidivism	0.27	0.25
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	0.24	0.21
	Violent (including contact sexual)	0.35	0.28
	Any Crime Recidivism	0.34	0.29
	Any Recidivism (including breaches)	0.31	0.26
Level II “Below Average”			
	Sexual Recidivism	0.52	0.50
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	0.49	0.46
	Violent (including contact sexual)	0.59	0.53
	Any Crime Recidivism	0.58	0.54
	Any Recidivism (including breaches)	0.55	0.51
Level III “Average”			
	Sexual Recidivism	1.00	1.00
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	1.00	1.00
	Violent (including contact sexual)	1.00	1.00
	Any Crime Recidivism	1.00	1.00
	Any Recidivism (including breaches)	1.00	1.00
Level IVa “Above Average”			
	Sexual Recidivism	1.91	2.01
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	2.02	2.19
	Violent (including contact sexual)	1.69	1.90
	Any Crime Recidivism	1.73	1.86
	Any Recidivism (including breaches)	1.81	1.95
Level IVb “Well Above Average”			
	Sexual Recidivism	3.64	4.03
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	4.10	4.82
	Violent (including contact sexual)	2.86	3.62
	Any Crime Recidivism	2.98	3.47
	Any Recidivism (including breaches)	3.27	3.81
Hazard Ratios β (SE)			
	Sexual Recidivism	0.646 (0.130)	0.697 (0.135)
	Sexual (including sexual breaches)	0.705 (0.120)	0.786 (0.126)
	Violent (including contact sexual)	0.525 (0.092)	0.643 (0.098)
	Any Crime Recidivism	0.546 (0.075)	0.622 (0.077)
	Any Recidivism (including breaches)	0.592 (0.070)	0.669 (0.072)