

# **STATIC-99R & STATIC-2002R**

## **Evaluators' WORKBOOK**

Amy Phenix, L. Maaike Helmus, & R. Karl Hanson

October 19, 2016

This version updates and replaces the January 1, 2015 *Static-99R & Static-2002R Evaluators' Workbook* and all other previous versions. From the 2015 version, a new section has been added on the updated nominal risk categories, and tweaks have been made to phrasing and references. All normative data (e.g., recidivism estimates, risk ratios, percentiles) remain unchanged from the 2015 version.

**RDIMS 661841-V8**

## TABLE of CONTENTS

WHAT'S NEW IN 2016 .....	3
Revised Risk Levels .....	3
Estimates of Violent and General Recidivism Risk .....	5
WHAT WAS NEW IN 2015 .....	5
Percentiles .....	6
Relative Risk Ratios.....	7
Static-99R Recidivism Estimates .....	8
Static-2002R Recidivism Estimates .....	10
Samples Used To Construct Percentile Ranks .....	12
Samples Used To Construct Risk Ratios for Static-99R and Static-2002R.....	15
Static-99R Summary List of Samples for Recidivism Tables .....	19
Static-99R Sample Descriptions for Recidivism Tables .....	20
Static-2002R Summary List of Samples for Recidivism Tables .....	23
Static-2002R Sample Descriptions for Recidivism Tables .....	24
Report Writing Templates for Static-99R and Static-2002R.....	26
References.....	38
STATIC Supplementary Recidivism Tables .....	45

## WHAT'S NEW IN 2016

### Revised Risk Levels

In the original Static-99, total scores would translate into one of four risk categories: low, moderate-low, moderate-high, and high. For Static-2002, scores translated into one of five risk categories: low, low-moderate, moderate, moderate-high, and high. When the scales were revised (creating Static-99R and Static-2002R), we did not revise the cut-off scores for the risk categories. Our hope was that after completing our analyses on the other normative data for the scale (percentiles, risk ratios, and absolute recidivism estimates), we would revisit the risk categories to determine if they needed a change. As of 2016, we concluded that they did. We recommend that where the old Static-99R and Static-2002R risk categories are used, the new levels should replace them, as they are based on stronger empirical and conceptual grounds.

The revisions to the risk levels are also part of a broader movement towards improved risk communication. The status quo in risk assessment has been for scale developers to translate total scores into risk levels in ways that were poorly defined and difficult to compare across measures. Consequently, it was common for similar scales to place the same offenders in different risk categories (Barbaree, Langton, & Peacock, 2006; Jung, Pham, & Ennis, 2013; Mills & Kroner, 2006). Compounding this confusion, it was also common for professionals to have very different interpretations of what labels like “low,” “moderate,” and “high” risk mean (Hilton, Carter, Harris, & Sharpe, 2008; Monahan & Silver, 2003; Slovic, Monahan, & MacGregor, 2000).

We believe that the way forward in risk assessment will involve the development of universal, non-arbitrary risk levels. Such categories should ideally describe psychologically meaningful characteristics of the individual (not the scale), be linked to realistic options for action, be evidence-based, applicable to all risk scales, use a simple professional language, and be easy to implement across diverse jurisdictions, scales, and offenders. As part of this broader goal, the United States Council of State Governments Justice Center has assembled a working group to develop standardized risk levels for general offenders (Hanson, Bourgon et al., 2016). This working group includes two members of the STATIC development team (R. Karl Hanson & Kelly Babchishin).

The Justice Center has currently proposed five broad risk levels for general reoffending. The lowest risk category (Level I) would be generally prosocial individuals who have nonetheless committed crime. They would not be expected to have the criminal backgrounds, criminogenic needs, or the prognosis typical of offenders. The recidivism rates of Level I offenders would be indistinguishable from the rates of spontaneous offending among non-offenders (e.g., young males). Level II would be higher risk than non-offenders, but lower risk than typical offenders. It is expected that Level II offenders would have some

criminogenic needs, but that these life problems would be few and transient. Level III offenders would be the typical offenders in the middle of the risk distribution. Typical offenders have criminogenic needs in several areas, and require meaningful investments in structured programming to decrease their recidivism risk. Level IV offenders would be perceptibly higher risk than the typical offender. Most of these offenders would have chronic histories of rule-violations, poor childhood adjustment, and significant criminogenic needs across multiple domains. The Justice Center's framework also included a fifth category for the highest risk offenders, defined as those virtually certain to reoffend. Level V offenders are those typically found in high security units, where considerable resources are devoted to managing *current* antisocial behaviour.

The new risk levels for Static-99R and Static-2002R were developed in line with the Justice Center's proposed risk levels and informed by empirically based risk communication metrics (percentiles, risk ratios, and recidivism estimates; for further explanation of the new categories, see Hanson, Babchishin, Helmus, Thornton, & Phenix, 2016). Given that the Justice Center's standardized risk levels were based on general offending, not sexual offending, the new STATIC levels made two significant deviations from the Justice Center's proposed categories. Firstly, we defined Level I offenders as those whose sexual recidivism rates are generally indistinguishable from non-sex offenders with no known history of sex offending. In other words, this is a group whose risk of sexual reoffending is not different from other offenders in the criminal justice system who are not considered sex offenders. Secondly, given the low base rates of sexual recidivism, we are not currently able to empirically identify a group of sex offenders who are "virtually certain" to reoffend. Consequently, no Static-99R or Static-2002R scores meet the definition of a Level V offender. However, it is possible to distinguish two groups who are meaningfully higher risk than Level III offenders. Consequently, we have labelled the two highest risk levels as Level IVa and Level IVb.

**The revised Static-99R risk categories are as follows:**

- Level I – Very low risk (Scores of -3 to -2)
- Level II – Below average risk (Scores of -1 to 0)
- Level III – Average risk (Scores of 1 to 3)
- Level IVa – Above average risk (Scores of 4 to 5)
- Level IVb – Well above average risk (Scores of 6+)

**The revised Static-2002R risk categories are as follows:**

- Level I – Very low risk (Scores of -2 to -1)
- Level II – Below average risk (Scores of 0 to 1)
- Level III – Average risk (Scores of 2 to 4)
- Level IVa – Above average risk (Scores of 5 to 6)
- Level IVb – Well above average risk (Scores of 7+)

We recognize that evaluators tend to prefer labels for risk levels (e.g., “very low risk”) and we have provided them above. However, we also encourage evaluators to recognize biases, heuristics, and emotional reactions that are inherent in such common language terms. Consequently, we encourage evaluators to use “Level I” (and so forth) either instead of or in addition to the labels for each level. The language of “Levels” has the advantage of consistency with the Justice Center’s proposed definitions, and hopefully will become a common language used across diverse risk scales.

Although these are the new risk levels for Static-99R and Static-2002R, we recognize that risk categories are most useful when they are meaningfully linked to decisions (e.g., treatment or supervision resource allocation). Consequently, it is possible that some jurisdictions may develop their own risk categories to maximize the utility of Static-99R or Static-2002R for their decision-making purposes. For example, if a jurisdiction wants to refer the 10% highest risk offenders for high-intensity treatment, then it may make sense to create a high risk category defined by the top 10% of scores (using percentiles). Alternately, matching offenders to tiered services may necessitate reducing the five risk categories to three (if so, we would recommend clumping the first two categories together and the last two categories together). When evaluators or jurisdictions develop their own risk categories linked to specific policy actions, we recommend that when different words are used to describe site specific levels (different from the standard language proposed above), and when the site specific levels are identified as different from those proposed by the STATIC development team, that the definition of the site specific risk categories are clearly described in the report.

### **Estimates of Violent and General Recidivism Risk**

Static-99R and Static-2002R are intended to provide information on risk for sexual recidivism only. To comment on the risk for violent or general recidivism among sex offenders, we recommend using the BARR-2002R, which can be scored from Static-2002R items (see Babchishin et al., 2016).

### **WHAT WAS NEW IN 2015**

The 2015 Evaluator Workbook presented and summarized new absolute recidivism estimates. Those estimates are unchanged in this version. For a more detailed description of those recidivism estimates (beyond the summary of the samples included, which appears later) and how they differ from earlier recidivism estimates for the scale, you may want to refer to the 2015 version of the Evaluator Workbook ([www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org), under the ‘norms’ tab) or the full paper describing the development of the estimates (Hanson, Thornton, Helmus, & Babchishin, 2016).

## Estimated Percentiles for Canadian Sex Offenders

Static-99R Score	Percentile Rank defined as mid-point average		Observed Percentages		
	Percentile	95% CI	Below	Same	Higher
-3	1.3	0 – 2.9	0	2.7	97.3
-2	4.2	2.4 – 6.1	2.7	3.0	94.3
-1	9.7	5.7 – 13.9	5.7	7.9	86.4
0	18.7	13.4 – 24.1	13.6	10.3	76.1
1	31.7	23.8 – 39.7	23.9	15.7	60.4
2	48.3	39.5 – 57.1	39.6	17.5	42.9
3	65.7	57.0 – 74.3	57.1	17.2	25.7
4	79.6	74.0 – 85.1	74.3	10.7	15.0
5	88.7	84.6 – 92.5	85.0	7.4	7.6
6	94.2	91.9 – 96.2	92.4	3.6	4.0
7	97.2	95.6 – 98.6	96.0	2.5	1.5
8	99.1	98.2 – 99.8	98.5	1.2	0.3
9	99.9	99.5 – 100.0	99.7	0.28	0.02
10+	99.99	99.8 – 100.0	99.98	0.02	0

Static-2002R Score	Percentile Rank defined as mid-point average		Observed Percentages		
	Percentile	95% CI	Below	Same	Higher
-2	1.4	0 – 3.0	0	2.8	97.2
-1	4.2	2.6 – 6.1	2.8	2.9	94.3
0	9.0	5.5 – 12.8	5.7	6.7	87.6
1	17.3	12.3 – 22.5	12.4	9.7	77.9
2	30.1	22.2 – 38.3	22.1	16.0	61.9
3	47.1	38.1 – 56.1	38.1	17.9	44.0
4	63.7	55.9 – 71.4	56.0	15.3	28.7
5	78.0	71.1 – 84.7	71.3	13.5	15.2
6	88.3	84.3 – 92.1	84.8	7.1	8.1
7	93.3	91.3 – 95.1	91.9	2.8	5.3
8	95.9	94.2 – 97.4	94.7	2.5	2.8
9	98.3	96.9 – 99.5	97.2	2.3	0.5
10	99.7	99.3 – 100.0	99.5	0.4	0.1
11	99.97	99.8 – 100.0	99.9	0.09	0.01
12+	99.99	99.8 – 100.0	99.99	0.01	0

Source: Hanson, Lloyd, Helmus & Thornton (2012)

## Relative Risk Ratios

Static-99R Score	Frequency ( <i>n</i> )	Relative Risk Ratio
-3	73	0.19
-2	105	0.26
-1	384	0.37
0	473	0.52
1	565	0.72
2	599	1.00
3	598	1.39
4	491	1.94
5	333	2.70
6	209	3.77
7	120	5.25
8+	87	7.32

Note: Risk ratios were calculated from hazard ratios based on Cox regression coefficients derived from entering the continuous (i.e., unclumped) Static-99R scores ( $\beta = 0.332$ ; SE = .022), with sample as strata ( $k = 8$ ,  $n = 4,037$ ). Due to small sample size, risk ratios are not presented for Static-99R scores greater than 8. The analyses were based on routine (i.e., relatively unselected) correctional samples.

Static-2002R Score	Frequency ( <i>n</i> )	Relative Risk Ratio
-2	30	0.20
-1	36	0.28
0	102	0.38
1	135	0.52
2	192	0.72
3	221	1.00
4	220	1.38
5	195	1.90
6	137	2.63
7	88	3.62
8	45	5.00
9+	51	6.90

Note: Risk ratios were calculated from hazard ratios based on Cox regression coefficients derived from entering the continuous (i.e., unclumped) Static-2002R scores ( $\beta = 0.322$ ; SE = .038), with sample as strata ( $k = 3$ ,  $n = 1,452$ ). Due to small sample size, risk ratios are not presented for Static-2002R scores greater than 9. The analyses were based on routine (i.e., relatively unselected) correctional samples.

Source: Babchishin, Hanson, & Helmus (2012b); Hanson, Babchishin, Helmus, & Thornton (2013)

**Static-99R Recidivism Estimates**  
**ROUTINE SAMPLE**  
**Estimated 5-year sexual recidivism rates**

Logistic Regression Estimates			
Score	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% C.I.	
-3	0.9	0.6	1.3
-2	1.3	1.0	1.8
-1	1.9	1.4	2.5
0	2.8	2.2	3.5
1	3.9	3.3	4.7
2	5.6	4.8	6.5
3	7.9	7.0	8.8
4	11.0	10.0	12.1
5	15.2	13.8	16.6
6	20.5	18.4	22.8
7	27.2	24.0	30.7
8	35.1	30.5	40.0
9	43.8	37.8	50.1
10	53.0	45.6	60.3
11	--	--	--

Source: Hanson, Thornton, Helmus, & Babchishin (2016)



**STATIC-99R HIGH RISK/NEED GROUP**  
**Estimated 5-year and 10-year sexual recidivism rates**

Logistic Regression Estimates						
Score	5-Year Sexual Recidivism Rates			10-Year Sexual Recidivism Rates		
	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% C. I.		Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% C. I.	
-3	--	--	--	--	--	--
-2	--	--	--	--	--	--
-1	5.6	3.5	9.1	10.6	5.8	18.4
0	7.2	4.7	10.7	13.0	7.9	20.5
1	9.0	6.4	12.5	15.8	10.7	22.8
2	11.3	8.6	14.6	19.1	14.1	25.4
3	14.0	11.3	17.2	22.9	18.2	28.5
4	17.3	14.5	20.5	27.3	22.5	32.6
5	21.2	18.0	24.8	32.1	26.7	37.9
6	25.7	21.5	30.3	37.3	30.5	44.7
7	30.7	25.1	37.0	42.8	33.9	52.3
8	36.3	28.8	44.5	48.5	37.1	60.1
9	42.2	32.6	52.5	--	--	--
10	48.4	36.6	60.5	--	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Static-2002R Recidivism Estimates**  
**ROUTINE SAMPLE**  
**Estimated 5-year sexual recidivism rates**

---

Logistic Regression Estimates

---

Score	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% C. I.	
-2	1.0	0.6	1.7
-1	1.5	0.9	2.3
0	2.2	1.5	3.2
1	3.2	2.3	4.4
2	4.6	3.6	6.0
3	6.8	5.5	8.2
4	9.7	8.3	11.3
5	13.8	12.2	15.6
6	19.2	16.9	21.6
7	26.0	22.6	29.8
8	34.3	29.1	40.0
9	43.7	36.5	51.2
10	53.5	44.4	62.4
11	-	-	-
12	-	-	-
13	-	-	-

---

**STATIC-2002R HIGH RISK/NEED GROUP**  
**Estimated 5-year sexual recidivism rates**

---

Logistic Regression Estimates

---

Score	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% C. I.	
-2	-	-	-
-1	-	-	-
0	7.4	4.2	12.6
1	9.0	5.6	14.1
2	11.0	7.5	15.7
3	13.3	9.8	17.7
4	16.0	12.6	20.0
5	19.1	15.8	23.0
6	22.7	18.9	27.0
7	26.8	21.9	32.3
8	31.2	24.6	38.7
9	36.1	27.3	45.9
10	41.2	30.0	53.4
11	-	-	-
12	-	-	-
13	-	-	-

---

## **Samples Used To Construct Percentile Ranks for Static-99R and Static-2002R**

Ideally the percentiles calculated in the Evaluator Workbook would consider all Canadian adults convicted of a sexual offense as the reference category. An unbiased sample of all Canadian sexual offenders was not available; however, we were able to identify four relatively unbiased samples of sexual offenders released between 1990 and 2005 from the three major divisions of the Canadian criminal justice system: a) community, b) provincial prison (sentences of less than 2 years that are administered by the provinces), and c) federal prison (sentences of 2 years or more that are administered federally by the Correctional Service of Canada). We then used standard survey sampling statistics (Kalton, 1983) to estimate a representative normative (Canadian) sample from these multiple independent samples (see Hanson et al., 2012).

### **Canadian Samples**

**Dynamic Supervision Project** (Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007). This prospective study followed sex offenders on community supervision between 2001-2005 in all Canadian provinces and territories, and two U.S. states. For the current study, only Canadian offenders were considered because of difficulty obtaining reliable recidivism information for the U.S. states. Participating probation officers ( $n = 137$ ) were requested to submit demographic, offense history, and risk assessment information (Static-99, STABLE-2007, ACUTE-2007) on sex offenders consecutively entering their caseload. File review indicated that the cases were not always consecutive; however, the sample can be considered representative of the diverse group of sex offenders on community supervision.

Static-99 scores were coded prospectively by the probation officers. Static-2002 scores were coded by graduate students based on information from Static-99 scores and Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) records maintained by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP). Static-99R and Static-2002R were created by retrospectively reweighting the age variables of these measures.

Of the 595 offenders with the necessary data for the current analyses, 38 were supervised following a federal sentence ( $n = 38$ , 6.4%), 254 following a provincial sentence (42.7%), and 303 received solely a non-custodial sentence (e.g., probation, conditional sentence order, or in rare cases, a peace bond; 50.9%). Twenty-four offenders (4.0%) had a non-sexual violent index offense.

Interrater reliability for Static-99 was examined through file review of 88 cases coded by probation officers participating in the DSP project ( $ICC = .91$ ). An exceptionally high interrater reliability for Static-2002 coding ( $ICC = .98$ ,  $n = 25$  cases) was observed. Coding was based upon probation officers' obtained Static-99 scores and conviction information rather than interpretation of victim information or offense circumstances. Consequently, reliability for Static-2002 scores in this study should not be considered representative or typical.

**Canadian federal offenders: B.C.** (Boer, 2003). Archival data from the Offender Management System (OMS) maintained by Correctional Service Canada (CSC) were used to identify all federal male offenders serving a sentence for a sexual offense in British Columbia whose Warrant Expiry Date (WED; the end of their sentence) was between January 1990 and May 1994. Many offenders are granted conditional release before their WED; thus, offenders in this sample were released as early as 1986 ( $n = 296$ ). Interrater reliability was unavailable for this sample.

**Canadian federal offenders: 1995 WED** (Haag, 2005). OMS records were used to identify all federal sex offenders with a WED in 1995. Offenders were released as early as 1987 ( $n = 663$ ). Interrater reliability for Static-99 and Static-2002 scores was high ( $r = .92$  and  $.84$ , respectively;  $n = 66$  cases) when assessed by the lead researcher (Haag) and another psychologist.

**Canadian federal offenders: Quebec** (Bigras, 2007). This study included 94% of all sex offenders receiving a federal sentence in Quebec between 1995-2000 (6% refused participation in the research or were unable to provide consent). Static-99 and Static-2002 scores were coded from file data and offender interviews ( $n = 457$ ). Interrater reliability was unavailable for this sample.

*Characteristics of Canadian Samples*

Sample	<i>N</i>	Age <i>M (SD)</i>	Offender Type: % Rapists/ % Child Molesters	Static-99 <i>M (SD)</i>	Static-99R <i>M (SD)</i>	Static-2002 <i>M (SD)</i>	Static-2002R <i>M (SD)</i>
Dynamic Supervision Project	595	42 (14)	36/54	2.6 (1.9)	2.1 (2.3)	3.8 (2.2)	3.2 (2.4)
Federal: B.C.	296	41 (12)	40/55	3.2 (2.3)	2.8 (2.8)	4.5 (2.5)	3.9 (2.7)
Federal: 1995 WED	663	41 (12)	46/52	2.8 (2.0)	2.5 (2.6)	4.6 (2.4)	4.1 (2.6)
Federal: Quebec	457	43 (12)	38/46	2.7 (2.0)	2.1 (2.4)	4.1 (2.3)	3.5 (2.5)
Total	2,011	42 (13)	40/52	2.8 (2.0)	2.3 (2.5)	4.2 (2.3)	3.7 (2.5)

*Note.* Age refers to age at release.

## **Samples Used To Construct Risk Ratios for Static-99R and Static-2002R**

A risk ratio is a global term to describe a ratio to compare recidivism among two groups (e.g., scores of 7 compared to the median score of 2 on Static-99R or a score of 7 compared to the median score of 3 on Static-2002R). There are different ways to calculate risk ratios such as rate ratios, odds ratios, or hazard ratios. In these datasets, hazard ratios were used to define risk ratios (see Babchishin et al., 2012b; Hanson et al., 2013).

The 8 samples ( $n = 4,037$ ) used in the current study were selected from a larger group of studies used for the re-norming of Static-99 (Helmus, 2009). Of the 29 datasets available, 23 had the necessary information for calculating Static-99R risk ratios for sexual recidivism; however, only eight approximated routine samples that had not been preselected on risk-relevant characteristics or the need for treatment. These 8 samples were selected as most representative of the complete population of sexual offenders in their respective jurisdictions. Of these, 3 samples also had Static-2002R scores (Bigras [2007], Boer [2003], and Hanson et al. [2007]).

**Bartosh, Garby, Lewis, & Gray (2003).** The study examined sex offenders released from the Arizona Department of Corrections and subject to registration and notification.

**Bigras (2007).** The sample included 94% of all sexual offenders receiving a federal sentence (two or more years) in Quebec between 1995 and 2000 (6% refused participation in the research or were unable to provide consent).

**Boer (2003).** The study examined all male federal offenders serving a federal sentence for a sexual offense in British Columbia whose Warrant Expiry Date (WED; the end of their sentence) was between January 1990 and May 1994. Many offenders are granted conditional release prior to their WED; thus, offenders in this sample were released as early as 1976.

**Craissati, Bierer, & South (2008).** The study examined all contact sex offenders on probation in two boroughs in South East London during the study period.

**Eher, Rettenberger, Schilling, & Pfafflin (2009).** The study examined sex offenders released from prison in Austria. The sample size in this dataset was approximately twice the size of the sample in an earlier report of this project (Eher, Rettenberger, Schilling, & Pfafflin, 2008).

**Epperson (2003).** The study examined sex offenders in North Dakota who were either incarcerated or on probation.

**Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus (2007).** This prospective study followed offenders on community supervision between 2001-2005 in Canada, Alaska, and Iowa, although only Canadian offenders were used in the current study.

**Långström (2004).** The study examined sex offenders released from prison in Sweden.



*Descriptive Information for Static-99R samples*

Study	Cox Regression N	N <sub>5-year</sub> (Logistic Regression)	Static-99R M (SD)	Country	Recidivism Criteria	Type of Sample	Mostly Treated	Release Period	Md Year Release
Bartosh et al. (2003)	186	90	3.3 (2.9)	U.S.	Charges	Routine correctional	-	1996	1996
Bigras (2007)	480	206	2.1 (2.4)	Canada	Charges	Routine CSC	Mixed	1995-2004	1999
Boer (2003)	299	299	2.8 (2.8)	Canada	Conviction	Routine CSC	-	1976-1994	1990
Craissati et al. (2008)	209	200	2.2 (2.3)	U.K.	Conviction	Routine community supervision	Mixed	1992-2005	1998
Eher et al. (2008)	706	151	2.3 (2.3)	Austria	Conviction	Routine European prison	-	2000-2005	2003
Epperson (2003)	177	150	2.5 (2.6)	U.S.	Charges	Routine correctional	-	1989-1998	1995
Hanson et al. (2007)	702	-	2.4 (2.4)	Canada	Charges	Routine community supervision	-	2001-2005	2002
Långström (2004)	1,278	1,278	2.0 (2.4)	Sweden	Conviction	Routine European prison	No	1993-1997	1995
Total	4,037	2,374	2.3 (2.5)	-	-	-	-	1976-2005	1997

*Note.* CSC = Correctional Service Canada (administers all sentences of at least two years). Average Static-99R computed using sample size from cox regression. Sample includes all cases available for cox regression with sample as strata; three cases were deleted because the total follow-up time was less than the time to first observed recidivism event. Thirty-one cases from Hanson et al. (2007) were excluded from all 5-year analyses because there were no sexual recidivists in that group.

*Descriptive Information for Static-2002R samples*

Study	Cox Regression N	N <sub>5-year</sub> (Logistic Regression)	Static-02R M (SD)	Country	Recidivism Criteria	Type of Sample	Mostly Treated	Release Period	Mdn Year Release
Bigras (2007)	454	196	3.5 (2.5)	Canada	Charges	Routine CSC	Mixed	1995-2004	1999
Boer (2003)	296	296	3.9 (2.7)	Canada	Conviction	Routine CSC	-	1976-1994	1990
Hanson et al. (2007)	702	-	3.5 (2.5)	Canada	Charges	Routine community supervision	-	2001-2005	2002
Total	1,452	492	3.6 (2.5)	-	-	-	-	1976-2005	1997

*Note.* CSC = Correctional Service Canada (administers all sentences of at least two years). Average Static-2002R computed using sample size from cox regression. Sample includes all cases available for cox regression with sample as strata; three cases were deleted because the total follow-up time was less than the time to first observed recidivism event. Thirty-one cases from Hanson et al. (2007) were excluded from all 5-year analyses because there were no sexual recidivists in that group.

## Static-99R Summary List of Samples for Recidivism Tables

### **Routine Corrections**

**(with 5-year data, 10 samples,  $n = 4,325$ , with 358 recidivists)**

Bartosh et al. (2003)  
Bigras (2007)  
Boer (2003)  
Craissati et al. (2011)  
Eher et al. (2008)  
Epperson (2003)  
Hanson et al. (2014)  
Hanson et al. (2013)  
Långström (2004)  
Lehmann et al. (2013)

### **Preselected High-Risk/Need**

**(with 5-year data, 5 samples,  $n = 860$ , with 164 recidivists; with 10-year data,  $k = 2$ ,  $n = 350$ , with 98 recidivists)**

Bengtson (2008)  
Bonta & Yessine (2005)  
Haag (2005)  
Nicholaichuk (2001)  
Wilson et al. (2007A & B)

## Static-99R Sample Descriptions for Recidivism Tables

### Routine Corrections

*Bartosh, Garby, Lewis, & Gray, 2003.* The study sample consists of sex offenders released from the Arizona Department of Corrections and subject to registration and notification. The Static-99 was scored from file information and recidivism was coded from FBI records. Interrater reliability was reported ( $r = .90$ ), although the number of cases coded by multiple raters is unknown.

*Bigras, 2007.* The original sample contained 94% of all sexual offenders receiving a federal sentence (two or more years) in Quebec between 1995 and 2000 (6% refused participation in the research or were unable to provide consent). Assessment information was extracted from file data and interviews with offenders. Recidivism data was collected using CPIC records.

*Boer, 2003.* The study sample consists of all male federal offenders serving a sentence for a sexual offense in British Columbia whose Warrant Expiry Date (WED; the end of their sentence) was between January 1990 and May 1994. Many offenders are granted conditional release prior to their WED; thus, offenders in this sample were released as early as 1976. Recidivism information was collected using CPIC records. Category B sexual offenses (see A. J. R. Harris et al., 2003) were excluded from the definition of sexual recidivism.

*Craissati, Bierer, & South, 2011.* The study sample consists of all contact sex offenders on probation in two boroughs in South East London during the study period. The Static-99 was coded from file information and recidivism data was collected from four sources: the Police National Computer, the Violent and Sex Offenders Register, the Multiple Criminal Remote Access, and the EApps database.

*Eher, Rettenberger, Schilling, & Pfafflin, 2009.* The study sample consists of sex offenders released from prison in Austria (see Eher, Rettenberger, Schilling, & Pfafflin, 2008). Interrater reliability was assessed by having four raters code 27 cases ( $ICC = .90$ ). Recidivism information was collected from the Federal Department of the Interior.

*Epperson, 2003.* The study sample consists of sex offenders in North Dakota who were either incarcerated or on probation. Recidivism information was collected from North Dakota state records.

*Hanson, Helmus, & Harris, 2015.* This prospective study followed offenders on community supervision between 2001-2005 in Canada, Alaska, and Iowa, although only Canadian offenders were used in the current study. Static-99 was coded by community supervision officers and sent to the project staff, and interrater reliability was examined through file review of 88 cases coded by the

officers ( $ICC = .91$ ). Recidivism information was collected from CPIC records, supervising officers, provincial records, and informal police contacts (additionally, one recidivist was identified in a newspaper article).

*Hanson, Lunetta, Phenix, Neely, & Epperson, 2014.* This prospective study included a random sample of offenders released from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and who had a Static-99 scored between June, 2006 and June, 2007. Static-99 was scored by CDCR staff as part of routine practice. Interrater was assessed by having 55 corrections and probation officers score Static-99R for 14 common cases ( $ICC = .78$ ), Recidivism information was provided by the California Department of Justice.

*Långström, 2004.* The study sample consists of sex offenders released from prison in Sweden. The Static-99 was coded from file information and recidivism was coded from the National Council for Crime Prevention.

*Lehmann et al. (2013).* This sample included sexual offenders reported to the Berlin state police during the years 1994-2001 for a violent or abusive sexual offence. Static-99R items were extracted from police and criminal history record databases. Recidivism information was obtained from the National Conviction Registry of Germany.

### **Preselected as High Risk/Needs**

*Bengtson, 2008.* The study sample consists of sex offenders who received a pre-trial forensic psychiatric evaluation in Denmark. Such evaluations were typically conducted for offenders suspected of mental disorder or mental retardation, offenders deemed high risk by the courts, those accused of serious offenses, and those for whom an indefinite sentence was being considered. The Static-99 was coded from file information and criminal records. Recidivism information was obtained from the Danish Central Crime Register, and interrater reliability was assessed by having two raters code 20 cases ( $ICC = .94$ ).

*Bonta & Yessine, 2005.* The original sample consisted of three subgroups of Canadian offenders: 1) offenders flagged as potential Dangerous Offenders (subject to indeterminate sentence) by the National Flagging System, 2) offenders designated as Dangerous Offenders, and 3) offenders who committed a violent reoffense after being detained until their Warrant Expiry Date. Only offenders in the first group (flagged offenders), however, had Static-99 scores available. For these offenders, Static-99 was coded from file information and recidivism was coded from CPIC records and Offender Management System (OMS) records from the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). The definition of sexual recidivism excluded prostitution offenses, indecent phone calls, and

possession of child pornography. Given the low frequency of these offenses, it is expected that this restricted definition would have minimal impact on the results.

In some cases the offender's "current" offense (i.e., the offense that precipitated the flag) was non-sexual but there was a prior sexual offense on record. Their most recent sex offense was used as the index sex offense for Static-99 scoring purposes (as per the coding rules), but these cases are somewhat unique because the offenders spent time in the community after their index sex offense but before the recidivism follow-up period began. To retain a sample of offenders who were serving a sentence for a sexual offense or who had a recent sex offense on file, offenders with more than two years between their index sex offense and the current offense for which they were flagged were deleted ( $n = 22$ ).

*Haag, 2005.* The original study sample included all male Canadian federal sex offenders whose Warrant Expiry Date was in 1995, although 75% of offenders were released prior to their WED. Follow-up information was collected for 7 years after the WED. Because recidivism information was not recorded for the time period after release but before the WED, offenders who were released more than 30 days in advance of their WED were deleted, effectively reducing the sample to offenders who were detained until Warrant Expiry. Under Canadian legislation, offenders are to be automatically released after serving two thirds of their sentence. In some cases, however, CSC will make an application to have the offender detained until Warrant Expiry if the parole board is satisfied that if released, the offender poses a significant risk of committing a serious offense before their sentence expires. Recidivism information was collected from CPIC records. Interrater reliability was assessed by having 66 cases from the original sample coded by the main researcher and a CSC psychologist ( $r = .92$ ).

*Nicholaichuk, 2001.* The study sample consists of sex offenders treated at the Clearwater sex offender treatment program, located in a federal maximum-security forensic mental health facility in Saskatchewan. Recidivism information was coded from CPIC records.

*Wilson and colleagues (2007a & b).* The study sample consists of Canadian offenders combined from two previous studies: Wilson, Cortoni, and Vermani (2007a), and Wilson, Picheca, and Prinzo (2007b). Both studies consist of high-risk sex offenders who were detained in prison until their Warrant Expiry Date (the end of their sentence). In both studies, half of the offenders participated in Circles of Support and Accountability, while another (matched) group of sex offenders did not. Although the two studies had separate samples, they were combined into one dataset because both samples were selected in the same way and the basic descriptive information was the same for both studies.

## **Static-2002R Summary List of Samples for Recidivism Tables**

### **Routine**

**(with 5-year data, 4 samples,  $n = 1,964$ , with 217 recidivists)**

Bigras (2007)

Boer (2003)

Hanson et al. (2014)

Lehmann et al. (2013)

### **Preselected High-risk/Need**

**(with 5-year data, 2 samples,  $n = 497$ , with 97 recidivists)**

Bengston (2008)

Haag (2005)

## Static-2002R Sample Descriptions for Recidivism Tables

### Routine

*Bigras, 2007.* The original sample contained 94% of all sexual offenders receiving a federal sentence (two or more years) in Quebec between 1995 and 2000 (6% refused participation in the research or were unable to provide consent). Assessment information was extracted from file data and interviews with offenders. Recidivism data was collected using CPIC records.

*Boer, 2003.* The study sample consists of all male federal offenders serving a sentence for a sexual offense in British Columbia whose Warrant Expiry Date (WED; the end of their sentence) was between January 1990 and May 1994. Many offenders are granted conditional release prior to their WED; thus, offenders in this sample were released as early as 1976. Recidivism information was collected using CPIC records. Category B sexual offenses (see A. J. R. Harris et al., 2003) were excluded from the definition of sexual recidivism.

*Hanson, Helmus, & Harris, 2015.* This prospective study followed offenders on community supervision between 2001-2005 in Canada, Alaska, and Iowa, although only Canadian offenders were used in the current study. Static-99 was coded by community supervision officers and sent to the project staff, and interrater reliability was examined through file review of 88 cases coded by the officers ( $ICC = .91$ ). Recidivism information was collected from CPIC records, supervising officers, provincial records, and informal police contacts (additionally, one recidivist was identified in a newspaper article).

*Lehmann et al. (2013).* This sample included sexual offenders reported to the Berlin state police during the years 1994-2001 for a violent or abusive sexual offence. Static-99R items were extracted from police and criminal history record databases. Recidivism information was obtained from the National Conviction Registry of Germany.

### Preselected as High Risk/High Need (HRHN)

*Bengtson, 2008.* The study sample consists of sex offenders who received a pre-trial forensic psychiatric evaluation in Denmark. Such evaluations were typically conducted for offenders suspected of mental disorder or mental retardation, offenders deemed high risk by the courts, those accused of serious offenses, and those for whom an indefinite sentence was being considered. The Static-99 was coded from file information and criminal records. Recidivism information was obtained from the Danish Central Crime Register, and interrater reliability was assessed by having two raters code 20 cases ( $ICC = .94$ ).



*Haag, 2005.* The original study sample included all male Canadian federal sex offenders whose Warrant Expiry Date was in 1995, although 75% of offenders were released prior to their WED. Follow-up information was collected for 7 years after the WED. Because recidivism information was not recorded for the time period after release but before the WED, offenders who were released more than 30 days in advance of their WED were deleted, effectively reducing the sample to offenders who were detained until Warrant Expiry. Under Canadian legislation, offenders are to be automatically released after serving two thirds of their sentence. In some cases, however, CSC will make an application to have the offender detained until Warrant Expiry if the parole board is satisfied that if released, the offender poses a significant risk of committing a serious offense before their sentence expires. Recidivism information was collected from CPIC records. Interrater reliability was assessed by having 66 cases from the original sample coded by the main researcher and a CSC psychologist ( $r = .92$ ).

## **Report Writing Templates for Static-99R and Static-2002R**

The remaining sections of this Workbook provide various templates that could be used for reporting the results of Static-99R and Static-2002R (Hanson & Phenix, 2013). These templates are provided as examples only. Evaluators are free to use them, 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](http://www.static99.org).

In the following examples, two versions are presented: a simple, direct version and a more detailed version. The simple versions are intended for familiar audiences, i.e., readers expected to have some familiarity with the risk tool and its use in their setting. The more detailed versions are intended for audiences who may be being introduced to Static-99R/Static-2002R for the first time. In highly adversarial settings, greater detail may be desired in order to address real or anticipated criticisms.

## Template 1a

### Nominal Risk Levels, Familiar Audience (e.g., routine corrections)

Mr. XXXX was scored on Static-99R. Static-99R is intended to position offenders in terms of their relative degree of risk for sexual recidivism based on commonly available demographic and criminal history information that has been found to correlate with sexual recidivism in adult male sex offenders.

Static-99R has moderate accuracy in ranking offenders according to their relative risk for sexual recidivism, and is widely accepted by the scientific community and by applied evaluators. For further information, see [www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org).

Mr. XXXX's Static-99R was calculated based on official criminal history records provided by the RCMP dated August 15, 2013, and files provided by the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services dated September 4, 2013. As well, Mr. XXXX was interviewed on September 10, 2013, in order to verify the accuracy of the information contained in the police and correctional files.

Mr. XXXX received a total score of XXX which places him in Risk Level [I, II, III, IVa, IVb], ["Very low risk," "Below average risk," "Average risk," "Above average risk," or "Well above average risk"] for being charged or convicted of another sexual offence.

## Template 1b

### Nominal Risk Categories, Familiar Audience, Slightly Longer Description

Mr. XXXX was scored on Static-99R<sup>1,2</sup>. Static-99R is intended to position offenders in terms of their relative degree of risk for sexual recidivism based on commonly available demographic and criminal history information that has been found to correlate with sexual recidivism in adult male sex offenders. Static-99R contains 10 items, which are added together to create a total score. The original Static-99 was developed using data from 4 samples ( $n = 1,208$ ) across Canada and the United Kingdom. Static-99R was developed using data on sexual recidivism from 8,106 sex offenders across 23 samples, from Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Austria, Denmark, Germany, Sweden, and New

---

<sup>1</sup> Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving risk assessments for sex offenders: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*(1), 119-136. doi:10.1023/A:1005482921333

<sup>2</sup> Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., & Babchishin, K. M. (2012). 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, 24*(1), 64-101. doi:10.1177/1079063211409951

Zealand – specifically, 5,714 offenders were randomly assigned to the development sample and 2,392 were assigned to the validation sample.

Static-99R has moderate accuracy in ranking offenders according to their relative risk for sexual recidivism<sup>3</sup>. On average, there is a 70% chance that a randomly selected recidivist would have a higher score than a randomly selected non-recidivist. The ability of Static-99R to assess relative risk has been fairly consistent across a wide variety of samples, countries, and unique settings. Static-99R is widely accepted by the scientific community, by courts, and by applied evaluators. For further information, see [www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org).

Mr. XXXX's Static-99R was calculated based on official criminal history records provided by the RCMP dated August 15, 2013, and files provided by the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services dated September 4, 2013. As well, Mr. XXXX was interviewed on September 10, 2013, in order to verify the accuracy of the information contained in the police and correctional files.

### 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 LEVEL= _____		

Mr. XXXX received a total score of XXX which places him in Risk Level [I, II, III, IVa, IVb], ["Very low risk," "Below average risk," "Average risk," "Above average risk," or "Well above average risk"] for being charged or convicted of another sexual offence.

<sup>3</sup> Babchishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & Helmus, L. (2012a). Even highly correlated measures can add incrementally to predicting recidivism among sex offenders. *Assessment*, 19, 442-461. doi:10.1177/1073191112458312

Static-99R does not measure all relevant risk factors and Mr. XXXX's recidivism risk may be higher or lower than that indicated by Static-99R based on factors not included in this risk tool.

## Template 2

### Absolute recidivism rates – Routine sample as default reference group

In routine samples of sexual offenders, the average 5 year sexual recidivism rate is between 5% and 15%. This means that out of 100 sexual offenders of mixed risk levels, between 5 and 15 would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between 85 and 95 would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

Mr. XX's Static-99R score was XX. In routine samples with the same score, the 5 year sexual recidivism rate is between XX% and XX%. This means that out of 100 sexual offenders with the same risk score between XX and XX would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between XX and XX would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

The above values are based on the table entitled "Static-99R Routine Sample: Estimated 5-year Sexual Recidivism Rates" in Phenix, Helmus & Hanson (October 19, 2016) Static-99R & Static-2002R Evaluators' Workbook. Available from [www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org).

Static-99R does not measure all relevant risk factors and Mr. XXXX's recidivism risk may be higher or lower than that indicated by Static-99R based on factors not included in this risk tool.

### Template 3a

#### **Absolute recidivism rates – Routine sample as considered reference group**

In routine samples of sexual offenders, the average 5 year sexual recidivism rate is between 5% and 15%. This means that out of 100 sexual offenders of mixed risk levels, between 5 and 15 would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between 85 and 95 would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

In order to use Static-99R to estimate recidivism rates, it is necessary to select the reference group that the offender most closely resembles. Recidivism rate norms are provided for routine samples and samples that have been preselected to be high risk and high needs. The routine samples are the appropriate reference group for most situations, but it is possible that the high risk and high needs samples may be appropriate in some circumstances. This determination is based on the density of external risk factors not measured by Static-99R.

The STABLE-2007<sup>4</sup> was used to assess risk factors external to Static-99R. Mr. XX's STABLE-2007 was 6, which is similar to the average value in routine correctional samples (7)<sup>5</sup>. Consequently, there was not a strong justification to use norms other than the routine correctional samples as the reference group for Mr. XX.

Mr. XX's Static-99R score was XX. In routine samples with the same score, the 5 year sexual recidivism rate is XX. The margin of error for this estimate is between XX% and XX%, 19 times out of 20. A recidivism rate of between XX% and XX% means that out of 100 sexual offenders with the same risk score between XX and XX would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between XX and XX would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

The above values are based on the table entitled "Static-99R Routine Sample: Estimated 5-year Sexual Recidivism Rates" in Phenix, Helmus & Hanson (October 19, 2016) Static-99R & Static-2002R Evaluators' Workbook. Available from [www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org).

---

<sup>4</sup> Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project* (Corrections User Report No 2007-05). Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada. Available at [www.publicsafety.gc.ca](http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca)

<sup>5</sup> Distribution norms for the STABLE-2007 were based on the meta-analysis by R. K. Hanson & D. Thornton (2012, October). *Preselection effects can explain variability in sexual recidivism base rates in Static-99R and Static-2002R validation studies*. Presentation at the 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Denver, CO.

## Template 3b

### Absolute recidivism rates – High Risk/High Need (HRHN) as considered reference group

In routine samples of sexual offenders, the average 5 year sexual recidivism rate is between 5% and 15%<sup>6,7</sup>. This means that out of 100 sexual offenders of mixed risk levels, between 5 and 15 would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between 85 and 95 would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

In order to use Static-99R to estimate recidivism rates, it is necessary to select the reference group that the offender most closely resembles. Recidivism rate norms are provided for routine samples and samples that have been preselected to be high risk and high needs. The routine samples are the appropriate reference group for most situations, but it is possible that the high risk and high needs samples may be appropriate in some circumstances. This determination is based on the density of external risk factors not measured by Static-99R.

The VRS-SO<sup>8</sup> was used to assess risk factors external to Static-99R. Mr. XX's VRS-SO Dynamic Risk score was 30, which is similar to the average value in pre-selected groups of higher risk sexual offenders (27.2)<sup>9</sup>. Consequently, the norms for High Risk/High Need samples were used as the reference group for Mr. XX.

Mr. XX's Static-99R score was XX. In High Risk/High Need samples with the same score, the 5 year sexual recidivism rate is XX. The margin of error for this estimate is between XX% and XX%, 19 times out of 20. A recidivism rate of between XX% and XX% means that out of 100 sexual offenders with the same risk score between XX and XX would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between XX and XX would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

---

<sup>6</sup> 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 and Behavior*, 39(9), 1148-1171.

<sup>7</sup> Harris, A.J.R., & Hanson, R. K. (2004). *Sex offender recidivism: A simple question* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2004-03). Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada. Available from [www.publicsafety.gc.ca](http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca)

<sup>8</sup> Olver, M. E., Wong, S. C., Nicholaichuk, T., & Gordon, A. (2007). The validity and reliability of the Violence Risk Scale-Sexual Offender version: assessing sex offender risk and evaluating therapeutic change. *Psychological Assessment*, 19(3), 318-329.

<sup>9</sup> Distribution norms for the VRS-SO were based on the meta-analysis by R. K. Hanson & D. Thornton (2012, October). *Preselection effects can explain variability in sexual recidivism base rates in Static-99R and Static-2002R validation studies*. Presentation at the 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Denver, CO.



The above values are based on the table entitled “Static-99R High Risk/Need Group: Estimated 5-Year and 10-Year Sexual Recidivism Rates” in Phenix, Helmus & Hanson (October 19, 2016) Static-99R & Static-2002R Evaluators’ Workbook. Available from [www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org).

## Template 4a

### Percentile Ranks – midpoint average as default, for familiar audience

Mr. XX scored 6 on Static-2002R. Mr. XX's score is higher than 88% of sexual offenders in routine correctional samples.

or

Mr. XX scored -1 on Static-2002R. Mr. XX's score places him in the bottom 4% of sexual offenders in routine correctional samples. In other words, out of 100 sexual offenders, 3 would have a lower score and 94 would have a higher score.

## Template 4b

### Percentile Ranks – extended version

Percentile ranks describe the offender's risk in comparison to other sexual offenders. Because some offenders have the same scores, there are different ways of reporting percentile ranks (% higher, % lower, mid-point average). Absolute recidivism rates cannot be inferred from percentile rankings. For Static-99R, percentile ranks are based on routine/complete correctional samples from Canada, which have shown to be reasonably stable in international comparisons with Sweden and California<sup>10</sup>.

Mr. XX's Static-99R score was 0. In routine correctional samples, this score represents the 19<sup>th</sup> percentile, defined as a mid-point average (14% have a lower score, 76% have a higher score, and 10% have the same score). In other words, out of 100 sexual offenders, 14 would have a lower score, 10 would have the same score, and 76 would have a higher score. With the 95% confidence interval, the score could span the 13<sup>th</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> percentile.

---

<sup>10</sup> 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 scales. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 11(1), 9-23. doi:10.1080/14999013.2012.667511

## Template 5a

### Risk Ratios – for familiar audience

In routine samples of sexual offenders, the average 5 year sexual recidivism rate is between 5% and 15%. This means that out of 100 sexual offenders of mixed risk levels, between 5 and 15 would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between 85 and 95 would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

Mr. XX had a Static-2002R score of 1. On average, offenders with this score have a sexual recidivism rate that is half the rate of offenders in the middle of the risk distribution.

or

Mr. XX had a Static-2002R score of 3. On average, offenders with this score have a sexual recidivism rate that is the same as the rate of offenders in the middle of the risk distribution.

or

Mr. XX had a Static-2002R score of 7. On average, offenders with this score have a sexual recidivism rate that is the 3.6 times the rate of offenders in the middle of the risk distribution.

## Template 5b

### Risk Ratios – extended version

In routine correctional samples of sexual offenders, the average 5 year sexual recidivism rate is between 5% and 15%<sup>11,12</sup>. This means that out of 100 sexual offenders of mixed risk levels, between 5 and 15 would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between 85 and 95 would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

Risk ratios describe differences between recidivism rates. For Static-99R, risk ratios compare the expected recidivism rate for offenders with a particular score, to the expected recidivism rate of offenders in the middle of the risk distribution.

---

<sup>11</sup> 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 and Behavior*, 39(9), 1148-1171. doi:10.1177/0093854812443648

<sup>12</sup> Harris, A.J.R., & Hanson, R. K. (2004). *Sex offender recidivism: A simple question* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2004-03). Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada. Available from [www.publicsafety.gc.ca](http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca)

The middle of the risk distribution is defined as the rate for offenders having the median score (2). Risk ratios for Static-99R are reasonably stable across follow-up times and jurisdictions<sup>13</sup>.

Mr. XX had a Static-99R score of 1. On average, offenders with this score have a sexual recidivism rate that is 3/4 the rate of offenders in the middle of the risk distribution.

---

<sup>13</sup> Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2013). Quantifying the relative risk of sex offenders: Risk ratios for Static-99R. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25 (5), 482 - 515. doi:10.1177/1079063212469060

## Template 6a

### **Complete results (categories and quantitative indicators) – Routine as default reference, for familiar audiences**

Mr. XXXX was scored on Static-99R. Static-99R is intended to position offenders in terms of their relative degree of risk for sexual recidivism based on commonly available demographic and criminal history information that has been found to correlate with sexual recidivism in adult male sex offenders.

Static-99R has moderate accuracy in ranking offenders according to their relative risk for sexual recidivism, and is widely accepted by the scientific community and by applied evaluators. For further information, see [www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org).

Mr. XXXX's Static-99R was calculated based on official criminal history records provided by the RCMP dated August 15, 2013, and files provided by the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services dated September 4, 2013. As well, Mr. XXXX was interviewed on September 10, 2013, in order to verify the accuracy of the information contained in the police and correctional files.

Mr. XXXX received a total score of 6 which places him in Risk Level IVb (Well above average risk) for being charged or convicted of another sexual offence. Mr. XX's score is higher than 94% of routine samples of sexual offenders.

In routine samples of sexual offenders, the average 5 year sexual recidivism rate is between 5% and 15%. This means that out of 100 sexual offenders of mixed risk levels, between 5 and 15 would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between 85 and 95 would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

On average, offenders with a Static-99R score of 6 have a sexual recidivism rate that is the 3.8 times the rate of offenders in the middle of the risk distribution.

Within routine correctional samples of sexual offenders with a Static-99R score of 6, the 5 year sexual recidivism rate is between 18% and 23%. This means that out of 100 sexual offenders with the same risk score between 18 and 23 individuals would be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence after 5 years in the community. Conversely, between 77 and 82 individuals would not be charged or convicted of a new sexual offence during that time period.

Static-99R does not measure all relevant risk factors and Mr. XXXX's recidivism risk may be higher or lower than that indicated by Static-99R based on factors not included in this risk tool.

## References

- Aalen, O. O., Borgan, O., & Gjessing, H. K. (2008). *Survival and event history analysis: A process point of view*. New York: Springer.
- Allan, M., Grace, R. C., Rutherford, B., & Hudson, S. M. (2007). Psychometric assessment of dynamic risk factors for child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 19*, 347-367.
- Babchishin, K. M., & Hanson, R. K. (2009). Improving our talk: Moving beyond the “low”, “moderate”, and “high” typology of risk communication. *Crime Scene, 16*(1), 11-14.
- Babshishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & Blais, J. (2016). Less is more: Using Static-2002R subscales to predict violent and general recidivism among sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(3), 187-217. doi:10.1177/1079063215569544
- 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. (2012b). 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>
- Barbaree, H.E., Langton, C.M., & Peacock, E.J. (2006). Different actuarial risk measures produce different risk rankings for sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 18*, 423–440. doi:10.1177/107906320601800408
- Bartosh, D. L., Garby, T., & Lewis, D., & Gray, S. (2003). Differences in the predictive validity of actuarial risk assessments in relation to sex offender type. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 47*, 422-438.
- Bengtson, S. (2008). Is newer better? A cross-validation of the Static-2002 and the Risk Matrix 2000 in a Danish sample of sexual offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 14*, 85-106.
- Bigras, J. (2007). La prédiction de la récidive chez les délinquants sexuels [Prediction of recidivism among sex offenders]. *Dissertations Abstracts International, 68* (09). (UMI No. NR30941).

- Boer, A. (2003). *Evaluating the Static-99 and Static-2002 risk scales using Canadian sexual offenders*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom.
- Bonta, J., & Yessine, A. K. (2005). [Recidivism data for 124 released sexual offenders from the offenders identified in *The National Flagging System: Identifying and responding to high-risk, violent offenders* (User Report 2005-04). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada]. Unpublished raw data.
- Brouillette-Alarie, S., & Proulx, J. (2008, October). *Predictive and convergent validity of phallometric assessment in relation to sexual recidivism risk*. Poster presented at the annual conference for the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Atlanta, GA.
- Cortoni, F., & Nunes, K. L. (2007). *Assessing the effectiveness of the National Sexual Offender Program* (Research Report No. R-183). Unpublished report, Correctional Service of Canada.
- Craissati, J., Bierer, K., & South, R. (2011). Risk, reconviction, and "sexually risky behaviour" in sex offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 17*, 153-165. doi:10.1080/13552600.2010.490306
- Crawford, J. R., & Garthwaite, P. H. (2009). Percentiles please: The case for expressing neuropsychological test scores and accompanying confidence limits as percentile ranks. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 23*, 193-204. doi:10.1080/13854040801968450
- 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
- Eher, R., Rettenberger, M., Schilling, F., & Pfafflin, F. (2009). [*Data from sex offenders released from prison in Austria*]. Unpublished raw data.
- Eher, R., Rettenberger, M., Schilling, F., & Pfafflin, F. (2008). Failure of Static-99 and SORAG to predict relevant reoffense categories in relevant sexual offender subtypes: A prospective study. *Sexual Offender Treatment, 8*(1), 1-20. [Note: this reference provides some information on the raw data used from Eher et al., 2009.]
- Epperson, D. L. (2003). *Validation of the MnSOST-R, Static-99, and RRASOR with North Dakota prison and probation samples*. Unpublished Technical Assistance Report, North Dakota Division of Parole and Probation.

- Grann, M., & Pallvik, A. (2002). An empirical investigation of written risk communication in forensic psychiatric evaluations. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 8, 113-130. doi:10.1080/10683160208401812
- Haag, A. M. (2005). [recidivism data from 198 offenders detained until their warrant expiry date. From: Do psychological interventions impact on actuarial measures: An analysis of the predictive validity of the Static-99 and Static-2002 on a re-conviction measure of sexual recidivism. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 66 (08), 4531B. (UMI No. NR05662)]. Unpublished raw data.
- Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2013). Quantifying the relative risk of sex offenders: Risk ratios for Static-99R. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25, 482-515. doi:10.1177/1079063212469060
- 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
- Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., McGrath, R., Kroner, D., D'Amora, D. A., Thomas, S. S., & Tavaréz, L. P. (2016). *A five-level risk and needs system: Maximizing assessment results in corrections through the development of a common language*. New York: The Council of State Governments Justice Center.
- Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2007-05). Ottawa, ON, Canada: Public Safety Canada.
- 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., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2010). Predicting recidivism amongst sexual offenders: a multi-site study of Static-2002. *Law and Human Behavior*, 34, 198-211. doi:10.1007/s10979-009-9180-1
- 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(1), 9-23. doi:10.1080/14999013.2012.667511

Hanson, R. K., Lunetta, A., Phenix, A., Neeley, J., & Epperson, D. (2014). The field validity of the Static-99/R sex offender risk assessment tool in California. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, 1, 102-117.

Hanson, R. K., & Phenix, A. (2013, October). *Report writing for Static-99R and Static-2002R*. Preconference workshop presented at the 32nd Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago, IL.

Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving risk assessments for sex offenders: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24, 119-136. doi:10.1023/A:1005482921333

Hanson, R. K. & Thornton, D. (2012, October). *Preselection effects can explain variability in sexual recidivism base rates in Static-99R and Static-2002R validation studies*. Presentation at the 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Denver, CO.

Hanson, R. K., Thornton, D., Helmus, L., & Babchishin, K. M. (2016). What sexual recidivism rates are associated with Static-99R and Static-2002R scores? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 28, 218-252. doi:10.1177/1079063215574710

Harkins, L., & Beech, A.R. (2007). *Examining the effectiveness of sexual offender treatment using risk band analysis*. Unpublished manuscript.

Harris, A. J. R., & Hanson, R. K. (2004). *Sex offender recidivism: A simple question* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2004-03). Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada. Available from [www.publicsafety.gc.ca](http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca)

Harris, A. J. R., Phenix, A., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2003). *Static-99 coding rules: Revised 2003*. Ottawa, ON: Solicitor General Canada. Retrieved from [http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/\\_fl/2003-03-stc-cde-eng.pdf](http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/_fl/2003-03-stc-cde-eng.pdf)

Heilbrun, K., O'Neil, M. L., Stevens, T. N., Strohmman, M. A., Bowman, Q., & Lo, Y. W. L. (2004). Assessing normative approaches to communicating violence risk: A national survey of psychologists. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 22, 187-196. doi:10.1002/bsl.570

- Heilbrun, K., O'Neil, M. L., Strohman, L. K., Bowman, Q., & Philipson, J. (2000). Expert approaches to communicating violent risk. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*, 137-148. doi:10.1023/A:1005435005404
- 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. (2012). Improving the predictive accuracy of Static-99 and Static-2002 with older sex offenders: Revised age weights. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 24*(1), 64-101. doi:10.1177/1079063211409951
- Hill, A., Habermann, N., Klusmann, D., Berner, W., & Briken, P. (2008). Criminal recidivism in sexual homicide perpetrators. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 52*, 5-20.
- Hilton, N. Z., Carter, A., Harris, G. T., Sharpe, A. J. B. (2008). Does using nonnumerical terms to describe risk aid violence risk communication? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*, 171-188. doi:10.1177/0886260507309337
- Hilton, N. Z., Harris, G. T., & Rice, M. E. (2010). *Risk assessment for domestically violent men: Tools for criminal justice, offender interventions, and victim services*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Johansen, S. H. (2007). Accuracy of predictions of sexual offense recidivism: A comparison of actuarial and clinical methods. *Dissertations Abstracts International, 68* (03), B. (UMI No. 3255527).
- Jung, S., Pham, A., & Ennis, L. (2013). Measuring the disparity of categorical risk among various sex offender risk assessment measures. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 24*, 353-370. doi:10.1080/14789949.2013.806567
- Kalton, G. (1983). *Introduction to survey sampling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications
- Långström, N. (2004). Accuracy of actuarial procedures for assessment of sexual offender recidivism risk may vary across ethnicity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 16*, 107-120.

- Lehmann, R. J. B., Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Gallasch-Nemitz, F., Biedermann, J., & Dahle, K.-P. (2013). Interpreting multiple risk scales for sex offenders: Evidence for averaging. *Psychological Assessment, 25*, 1019-1024. doi:10.1037/a0033098
- Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (2006). The effect of discordance among violence and general recidivism risk estimates on predictive accuracy. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 16*, 155-166. doi:10.1002/cbm.623
- Monahan, J., & Silver, E. (2003). Judicial decision thresholds for violence risk management. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 2*, 1-6.
- Nicholaichuk, T. (2001, November). *The comparison of two standardized risk assessment instruments in a sample of Canadian Aboriginal sexual offenders*. Paper presented at the annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, San Antonio, TX.
- Olver, M. E., Wong, S. C., Nicholaichuk, T., & Gordon, A. (2007). The validity and reliability of the Violence Risk Scale-Sexual Offender version: assessing sex offender risk and evaluating therapeutic change. *Psychological Assessment, 19*(3), 318-329.
- Phenix, A., Doren, D., Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2009). *Coding rules for Static-2002*. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/sttc-2002-eng.aspx>
- Saum, S. (2007). A comparison of an actuarial risk prediction measure (Static-99) and a stable dynamic risk prediction measure (Stable-2000) in making risk predictions for a group of sexual offenders. *Dissertations Abstracts International, 68* (03), B. (UMI No. 3255539).
- Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and even occurrence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Slovic, P., Monahan, J., & MacGregor, D. G. (2000). Violence risk assessment and risk communication: The effects of using actual cases, providing instruction, and employing probability versus frequency formats. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*, 271-296. doi:10.1023/A:1005595519944
- Swinburne Romine, R., Dwyer, S. M., Mathiowetz, C., & Thomas, M. (2008, October). *Thirty years of sex offender specific treatment: A follow-up Study*. Poster presented at the conference for the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Atlanta, GA.

Ternowski, D. R. (2004). Sex offender treatment: An evaluation of the Stave Lake Correctional Centre Program. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 66 (06), 3428B. (UMI No. NR03201).

Wilson, R. J., Cortoni, F., & Vermani, M. (2007a). *Circles of support and accountability: A national replication of outcome findings* (Report No. R-185). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Wilson, R. J., Picheca, J. E., & Prinzo, M. (2007b). Evaluating the effectiveness of professionally-facilitated volunteerism in the community-based management of high-risk sexual offenders: Part two – A comparison of recidivism rates. *The Howard Journal*, 46, 327-337.

### STATIC Supplementary Recidivism Tables

These tables supplement the following article: Hanson, R. K., Thornton, D., Helmus, L. M., & Babchishin, K. M. (2016). What sexual recidivism rates are associated with Static-99R and Static-2002R scores? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 28, 218-252. doi:10.1177/1079063215574710

Observed and estimated 5 year sexual recidivism rates for Static-99R: Routine Sample

Score	Fixed Follow-up		Logistic Regression Estimates		
	Recidivists/ total	Observed Recidivism Rate (%)	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% CI	
-3	0/61	0.0	0.9	0.6	1.3
-2	1/90	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.8
-1	10/357	2.8	1.9	1.4	2.5
0	13/468	2.8	2.8	2.2	3.5
1	23/590	3.9	3.9	3.3	4.7
2	24/661	3.6	5.6	4.8	6.5
3	48/675	7.1	7.9	7.0	8.8
4	58/576	10.1	11.0	10.0	12.1
5	52/365	14.2	15.2	13.8	16.6
6	47/231	20.3	20.5	18.4	22.8
7	36/133	27.1	27.2	24.0	30.7
8	29/79	36.7	35.1	30.5	40.0
9	10/26	38.5	43.8	37.8	50.1
10	5/10	50.0	53.0	45.6	60.3
11	2/3	66.7			
Total	358/4,325	8.3			

Observed and estimated 5 year sexual recidivism rates for Static-99R: High Risk/Need Sample

Score	Fixed Follow-up		Logistic Regression Estimates		
	Recidivists/ total	Observed Recidivism Rate (%)	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% CI	
-3	0/1	0.0			
-2	0/5	0.0			
-1	1/21	4.8	5.6	3.5	9.1
0	1/28	3.6	7.2	4.7	10.7
1	5/64	7.8	9.0	6.4	12.5
2	11/63	17.5	11.3	8.6	14.6
3	10/103	9.7	14.0	11.3	17.2
4	30/152	19.7	17.3	14.5	20.5
5	28/143	19.6	21.2	18.0	24.8
6	30/122	24.6	25.7	21.5	30.3
7	23/86	26.7	30.7	25.1	37.0
8	14/45	31.1	36.3	28.8	44.5
9	6/18	33.3	42.2	32.6	52.5
10	5/8	62.5	48.4	36.6	60.5
11	0/1	0.0			
Total	164/860	19.1			

Observed and estimated 10 year sexual recidivism rates for Static-99R: High Risk/need Sample

Score	Fixed Follow-up		Logistic Regression Estimates		
	Recidivists/ total	Observed Recidivism Rate (%)	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% CI	
-3					
-2	0/1	0.0			
-1	1/13	7.7	10.6	5.8	18.4
0	1/15	6.7	13.0	7.9	20.5
1	4/33	12.1	15.8	10.7	22.8
2	8/22	36.4	19.1	14.1	25.4
3	4/38	10.5	22.9	18.2	28.5
4	23/75	30.7	27.3	22.5	32.6
5	21/63	33.3	32.1	26.7	37.9
6	16/39	41.0	37.3	30.5	44.7
7	11/25	44.0	42.8	33.9	52.3
8	6/18	33.3	48.5	37.1	60.1
9	0/2	0.0			
10	3/6	50.0			
11					
Total	98/350	28.0			

Observed and estimated 5 year sexual recidivism rates for Static-2002R: Routine Sample

Score	Fixed Follow-up		Logistic Regression Estimates		
	Recidivists/ total	Observed Recidivism Rate (%)	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% CI	
-2	0/24	0.0	1.0	0.6	1.7
-1	0/35	0.0	1.5	0.9	2.3
0	4/83	4.8	2.2	1.5	3.2
1	5/137	3.6	3.2	2.3	4.4
2	7/245	2.9	4.6	3.6	6.0
3	18/306	5.9	6.8	5.5	8.2
4	34/399	8.5	9.7	8.3	11.3
5	46/323	14.2	13.8	12.2	15.6
6	34/190	17.9	19.2	16.9	21.6
7	30/103	29.1	26.0	22.6	29.8
8	19/60	31.7	34.3	29.1	40.0
9	12/42	28.6	43.7	36.5	51.2
10	5/11	45.5	53.5	44.4	62.4
11	3/6	50.0			
12	-	-			
Total	217/1,964	11.0			



Observed and estimated 5 year sexual recidivism rates for Static-2002R: High Risk/need Sample

Score	Fixed Follow-up		Logistic Regression Estimates		
	Recidivists/ total	Observed Recidivism Rate (%)	Predicted Recidivism Rate	95% CI	
-2					
-1	0/1	0.0			
0	1/17	5.9	7.4	4.2	12.6
1	1/19	5.3	9.0	5.6	14.1
2	7/39	17.9	11.0	7.5	15.7
3	3/52	5.8	13.3	9.8	17.7
4	18/92	19.6	16.0	12.6	20.0
5	14/71	19.7	19.1	15.8	23.0
6	15/75	20.0	22.7	18.9	27.0
7	9/50	18.0	26.8	21.9	32.3
8	14/46	30.4	31.2	24.6	38.7
9	6/17	35.3	36.1	27.3	45.9
10	6/10	60.0	41.2	30.0	53.4
11	3/7	42.9			
12	0/1	0.0			
Total	97/497	19.5			