

Reporting Static-99R scores with 2009 recidivism norms (routine samples):

A template for cases in which the norms for routine samples apply.

Note: This template is provided as an example only. Evaluators are free to use this template, or to revise the wording as they see fit. Further information concerning the research upon which this template is based can be found at www.static99.org.

Mr. XXX was scored on Static-99R, which is an actuarial measure of relative risk for sexual offense recidivism. Given that Static-99R was found to fully incorporate the relationship between age at release and sexual recidivism, whereas the original Static-99 scale did not (Helmus, Thornton, Hanson, & Babchishin, 2011)¹, the developers of Static-99 recommend that the revised version of the scale (Static-99R) replace Static-99 in all contexts where it is used. Static-99R has shown moderate accuracy in ranking offenders according to their relative risk for sexual recidivism. Furthermore, its accuracy in assessing relative risk has been consistent across a wide variety of samples, countries, and unique settings (Helmus, 2009)². As the table below illustrates, Mr. XXX received a total score of XXX which places him in the Low, Moderate-Low, Moderate-High, or High Risk Category for being charged or convicted of another sexual offence.

Static-99R Score Summary

	Risk Factor	Yes = 1, No = 0	Scores
1	Age at Release? (Score range is -3 to 1)		
2	Ever lived with (no two year relationship)?		
3	Index non-sexual violence, any conviction?		
4	Prior non-sexual violence, any convictions?		
5	Prior sex offenses? (Score range is 0-3)		
6	Prior sentencing dates (excluding index)?		
7	Convictions for non-contact sex offenses?		
8	Any unrelated victims?		
9	Any stranger victims?		
10	Any male victims?		
TOTAL SCORE =			_____
RISK CATEGORY=			_____

Percentile data are from 2,011 cases from 4 samples of Canadian sex offenders, which were reweighted to approximate the distribution of all convicted sex offenders in

¹ Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., & Babchishin, K. M. (2011). Improving the predictive accuracy of Static-99 and Static-2002 with older sex offenders: Revised age weights. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1079063211409951

² Helmus, L. (2009). *Re-norming Static-99 recidivism estimates: Exploring base rate variability across sex offender samples*. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Canada. These percentiles appear highly stable in international comparisons with large, relatively representative samples in Sweden and California (Hanson, Lloyd, Helmus, & Thornton, 2011).³ Given ties (i.e., several offenders receiving the same score), there are several different ways of reporting percentiles, including the percentage scoring below, the percentage above, and a midpoint average of these values. Percentile rankings are useful in situations where the allocation of limited resources must be made, such as for treatment, community supervision, etc. Absolute degrees of recidivism risk cannot be directly inferred from the percentile rankings.

Compared to other adult male sex offenders, Mr. XXX's score is in the XXth percentile (defined as a midpoint average). Taking into account that about XX% of sex offenders shared the same score as Mr. XXXX, the percentile means that roughly XX% of offenders scored lower than Mr. XXXX, and XX% scored higher.

Relative risk ratios refer to the ratio of two recidivism rates. Research has found the relative risk associated with different Static-99R scores to be consistent even when the overall base rate of recidivism varies across samples. Risk ratios for Static-99R scores were based on 8 samples of sexual offenders from Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Austria, and Sweden ($n = 4,037$). The analyses were based on routine (i.e., relatively unselected) correctional samples. The recidivism rate for sex offenders with the same score as Mr. XXXX would be expected to be approximately (half/two thirds) of (FOR SCORES LOWER THAN 2), the same as (FOR SCORES OF 2), X.X times higher than (FOR SCORES GREATER THAN 2) the recidivism rate of the typical sexual offender (defined as median score of 2).

There have been a large number of studies examining the absolute sexual recidivism rates associated with Static-99 scores. Helmus (2009) combined 28 Static-99 replication studies and was able to calculate Static-99R scores for 23 of these samples. The samples ($n = 8,139$) were drawn from Canada, the United States, United Kingdom, western Europe and New Zealand. Recidivism was defined as charges in about half of these studies and as convictions in the other half.

Although the relative risk was consistent across studies, the observed recidivism base rates varied considerably across samples based on factors not measured by Static-99R. Samples that were preselected to be high-risk/high needs (6 samples) show the highest recidivism rates, samples preselected based on treatment need (6 samples) had intermediate recidivism rates, and routine (i.e., unselected) correctional samples had recidivism rates substantially lower than the preselected groups (and also lower than the recidivism rates in the original development samples for Static-99).

In applying the recidivism norms it is ideal to use local norms that are applicable to the group of offenders to which this offender most closely resembles. Given that these norms are not often available, the routine sample will usually reflect the most

³ Hanson, R. K., Lloyd, C. D., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (in press). 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*.

appropriate recidivism rates as they are representative of typical sex offenders in correctional systems. A description of the routine correctional samples follows:

Routine Correctional Samples

This group consisted of eight samples of sex offenders from Canada, the United States, England, Austria and Sweden. These samples were relatively random (i.e., unselected) samples from a correctional system (as opposed to samples from specific institutions or subject to specific measures). In other words, they can be considered roughly representative of all adjudicated sex offenders. Some offenders in these samples would have been subsequently screened for treatment or other special measures (e.g., psychiatric admission or exceptional measures related to dangerousness), but these samples represent the full population of all offenders prior to any preselection processes. The recidivism norms for the unselected samples are the closest available to a hypothetical average of all sex offenders.

Mr. XXXX scored a XX on the Static-99R. Offenders from routine correctional samples with the same score as Mr. XXXX have been found to sexually reoffend at a rate of XXXX percent in five years.