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Approaches to Sex Offender Risk Assessment

- Unstructured clinical judgment
- Research guided clinical opinion (the list)
- Pure actuarial-static risk factors
- Adjusted actuarial

Domains Associated with Sexual Reoffense

- Youth
- General criminal behavior
- Sexual criminal behavior

Actuarial Risk Assessment

- Considers a number of variables
- Provides a specific statistical weight for each variable
- Gives a total risk score
- Gives an associated probability of sexual reoffense for the study sample
Effect Size Indicator

- d (standardized mean difference)
  - Small .20
  - Moderate .50
  - Large .80

Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2009) Meta-Analysis of Approaches to Prediction of Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designed for Sexual Recidivism</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical-actuarial</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured professional judgment</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured professional judgment</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generations of Risk Assessment

- Unstructured professional judgment
- Static actuarial instruments
- Incorporate criminogenic needs, or dynamic risk factors (aggression, impulsivity, antisocial attitudes) and provide treatment interventions

Choosing an Actuarial Instrument for Sexual Reoffense

- Development
- Validations
- Predictive accuracy
- Ease of scoring
- General acceptance in court
Validation of Actuarial Instruments

- Validation means to test the instrument on different samples of sexual offenders to see if it works as well as on the developmental sample.

Actuarial Instruments Based on Static Risk Factors

- Static-99/Static-99R
- Static-2002/Static-2002R
- Minnesota Sex Offender Screening Tool-Revised (MnSOST-R)
- MnSOST-III
- Sex Offender Risk Appraisal Guide (SORAG)

Static-99/Static-99R

- Most widely used instrument
- Recently revised with new age item and new norms
- Originally developed on 677 Canadian offenders and validated on 531 UK prisoners
- New age item developed on 5,736 offenders, validated on 2,392

Static-99

- 64 validation on over 20,000 sex offenders
  - International samples
  - Corrections, parole, probation, pre-trial forensic evaluations/psychiatric, prison and out-patient treatment programs, civil commitment, designated dangerous offenders
Static-99 Validations

- US, UK, Austria, NZ, Belgium, Germany, France, Japan
- IL, WA, PA, AZ, ND, MN, TX, MA.

Static-99R Items-new age item

1. Young
   Aged 18 to 34.9 1
   Aged 35 to 39.9 0
   Aged 40 to 59.9 -1
   Aged 60 or older -3

2. Ever lived with a lover for two years 0-1

3. Index non-sexual violence-any convictions 0-1

4. Prior non-sexual violence-any convictions 0-1

Static-99R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>Conv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Static-99R Items (cont.)

6. Prior Sentencing Dates  0-1
7. Any convictions for non-contact sex offences  0-1
8. Any unrelated victims  0-1
9. Any stranger victims  0-1
10. Any male victims  0-1

Difference between the Static-99 and Static-99R

- New age item (Score can be -3 to 12)
- New norms
  - Contemporary reoffense rates have decreased
  - Depending on the sample, base rates vary significantly based on factors outside the Static-99R.

The Age Item

- Static-99R fully accounts for age
- Probabilities will still be reduced for very advanced age
- For an older offender consider how recently they offended.
- Consider the relative risk for older offenders which remains stable
- Continue to consider physical condition and mobility outside the actuarial instrument

Pre-selection Effects on group differences in sexual recidivism rates in Static-99R

- A base rate if the proportion of a pre-defined group (or category) that will experience an outcome (sexual recidivism)
- We estimate future base rates from past experience with similar cases
Static-99 Development

- Absolute recidivism rates for the original Static-99 were tested on 3 different samples.
- No significant variability was observed.
- So all samples were combined into one larger sample and resulted in only one recidivism rate table.

Static-99 Sample

- Millbrook, Ontario (CM) N=191 FU=23 yr
- Institute Philippe Pinel N=344 FU=4 yr
- Oak Ridge (Penetang) N=142 FU=10 yr
- Validation Sample: Her Majesty Prison Service (UK) N=531 FU=16 yr

Recidivism Rates for Static-99 Samples

Norms and More Norms

- Updated norms in 2008 (Harris et al., ATSA presentation) and 2009 (Helmus MS thesis)
- Significant variability was found
- The differences in recidivism rates across samples was large enough to matter
- Published in meta-analysis by Helmus, Hanson, Thornton, Babchishin and Harris in Criminal Justice and Behavior (2012)
Why is there variability?

- Is it random?
- Depends on jurisdiction?
- Different definitions of recidivism?
- The result of pre-selection effects on risk relevant variables?

Helmus Thesis Examined This

- Moderator Variables
  - Recidivism criteria
  - Number of recidivism sources
  - Used national criminal records
  - Street time (deducts time spent in prison for non-sexual offenses form the follow-up time used for sexual recidivism)

Moderator Variables Examined in Helmus Thesis

- Citing the Coding rules (proxy for assessment quality)
- Provincial v federal jurisdiction
- Offender Type
- Country
- Age at release
- Year of release

Moderator Variables Examined in Helmus Thesis

- Race (white, aboriginal, non-white)
- Treatment (started & completed)
- Setting (corrections, mental health)
- Sample type
3 Moderator Variables Contributed to Prediction of Recidivism
- Age at Release
- Sample Type
- Country (In 10 years not found to predict after controlling for age and sample type)

Pre-selected Norms
- Consider two constructs
  - Pre-selection
  - Level of criminogenic needs

Problems with using Pre-selection
- No inter-rater reliability study
- Each sample in the three norms had different demographics and subject to different procedures
  - Some in HRN held to warrant expiry, others committed to psychiatric hospital for dangerousness

Sample Types that Explain Base Rate Variability
- Routine Norms- “relatively random and unselected sample from correctional system
- Pre-selected for Treatment Norms-Through some formal or informal process, offenders were judged as requiring treatment intervention
- High Risk Need Norms-Considered for “rare, infrequent measure/intervention, sanction (warrant expiry, indefinite sentence, psychiatric commitments)
External Risk Factors Explain Base Rate Variability

- **Routine Norms** - not subject to any special selection/no evidence of unusually high levels of external factors
- **Treatment Need Norms** - have been subject to special process thought to select for higher levels of external risk factors.
- **High Risk/Need Norms** - have been subject to special process thought to select for highest levels of external risk factors (need exceptional measures to manage)

Selecting the Correct Norms

- Consider
  - Pre-selection processes (Hanson 2012, ATSA)
  - Observable levels of external risk factors.

Examining the Degree of Risk Factors External to Static-99R

- Examined
  - VRS-SO (Olver et al., 2007)
  - SRA-FV (Thornton)
  - STABLE-2007 (Hanson et al., 2007)

Sample Type differed in their Degree of Risk Factors External to Static-99R

- 19 studies, N=3976
- 8 studies Canada, 7 from US
- Sample types
  - Routine (N=1198; 2 studies)
  - Pre-selected Treatment (N=1566, 12 studies)
  - High Risk Need (N=1212; 5 studies)
Sample Type Differ in their Degree of Risk Factors External to Static-99R

- Insert Graph

For Each Instrument Sample Type Differed in Their Degree of Risk Factors External to Static-99R

- Routine Samples least risk relevant criminogenic needs
- Pre-selected for Treatment Samples had “some” criminogenic needs
- High Risk Needs samples had the highest risk relevant criminogenic needs.

Rater Reliability: Kappa=.92 (95% agreement: 19/20)

Conclusions

- Consistent differences in external risk factors based on sample type
- High Risk High Need samples 1 SD above Treatment Samples
- Routine samples 1 SD below Treatment Sample

Examined if sample type recid rates match recid rates of offenders with different criminogenic needs

- 4 data sets included data for Static-99R AND VRS-SO, SRA-FV and/or Stable-2007 (5 year fixed follow-up)
Conclusions

- The Static-99R sample type recidivism rates closely match the recidivism rates expected for offenders who have different density of criminogenic needs.

- Considering external risk factors with Sttic-99R improves risk predictions.

Old Static-99 Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Static-99 score</th>
<th>Label for Risk Category</th>
<th>Sexual recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Static-99R Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut off Score</th>
<th>Routine</th>
<th>Pre-Selected Treatment</th>
<th>HR/Need</th>
<th>Non-Routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reporting Risk on Static-99R

- Percentiles
- Relative Risk Ratio
- Risk Level (low, med., high)
- Norms (probability of sexual rearrest for the study sample at each cut off score for 5 and 10 years)
Relative Risk Measures

- Most stable measure
- Helps to compare the offender to a “typical offender”
- Tells us what “high” looks like
- Pertinent to determining levels of community supervision
- Informative in civil commitment proceedings

Time Free Community and Recidivism Rates on Static-99R

- 20 of 23 samples from Static-99 re-norming project
- N=7740
- 9 Canadian studies, 5 US US

When is Risk Sufficiently Reduced?

- Low Risk offenders - low at time of release
- Moderate offenders (Scores 0-4) =14 years
- High Risk offenders (Scores 5 and above) =17 years

When is a released sex offender very low risk?

- The longer the SO is out the less likely they are to reoffend
- Non-sexual offenders have very low rates of sexual offending (.09 to 3.8% in 3-15 year follow-ups)
- Ultimately a sexual offender who is free in the community has no greater risk than a non-sex offender to commit a new offense
New Findings on Time Free

- No precise clinical guidelines yet
- Initial results suggest that continued offending of any type increases the risk for subsequent sexual recidivism
- Competing effect of time-free which decreases the risk
  - Reoffend quickly > risk new sex offense
  - Reoffend many years after release overall risk low

In the Future

- Article demonstrating the effect of time-free in community in revise and resubmit stage.
- Development of defensible empirical adjustments based on time free in the community (about a year away).
- Take into consideration non-sexual offending as well as time-free in community.

Static-99R & Static-2002R Item Analysis (Helmus, ATSA 2012)

- Do all the static items significantly predict sexual recidivism?
- Do the items predict consistently across samples?
  - If not what moderates the predictive accuracy?

Should We Expect Stability?

- Validation studies differ on a variety of factors
  - Charging practices
  - Criminal record info available
  - Depth of info (offence name vs details, victim info)
  - Sample pre-selection
  - Type of offender
Study

- 22 samples for Static-99R (N=8053)
- 8 samples for Static-2002R (N=2951)
  - Any prior involvement in criminal justice system and prior sentencing occasions combined into one item
  - 4 items identical to Static-99R (unrelated v, stranger v, male v, non-contact offence) Not examined separately for Static-2002R samples

Results

- All but Static-99R item “index non-sexual violence” predicts sexual recidivism

Do the Items Predict Consistently?

- The following items had significant variability across samples
  - Index non-sexual violence (99R)
  - Prior sex offences (99R)
  - Noncontact sexual conviction (99R/02R)
  - Any stranger victim (99R/02R)
  - Any male victim (99R/02R)
  - High rate of sex offending (02R)

Strengths of the Static-99R

- Fully accounts for age (usually)
- Repeatedly validated on a huge number of samples, many in US
- Widely used and accepted
- Easy to score from records
- Published and peer reviewed article in Journal of Sexual Abuse
Limitations of the Static-99R

- Modest predictive accuracy
- Sometimes difficult to choose correct norms
- Still does not include all risk factors for sexual recidivism, either static or dynamic

Static-99R Publication

- Helmus, Thornton, Hnason & Babchishin (2011), Improving the Predictive Accuracy of Static-99 and Static-2002R With Older Sex Offenders: Revised Age Weights. Sexual Abuse

Coding Instructions Static-99 and Static-99R

- & amyphenix.com (services & training)
- NEW ITEM ONE

New Item One Scoring

- See Static99.org website
- Go to Research
- Revised Age Weights article
Static-2002R

- Developed on samples from Canada, US and UK (n=2169)
- Validated on 8 samples from Canada, US, UK, Denmark (n=2605)
- Designed to predict theoretically meaningful characteristics presumed to be the cause of recidivism risk
- Like Static-99R can be used by mental health professionals, law enforcement

Static-2002R

- New Age item
- Now fully accounts for age
- #1 Age at release
  - 50 or older=0
  - 35-49.9=1
  - 25 to 34.9=2
  - 18 to 24.9=3

Static-2002R Categories

- Age
- Persistence of sexual offending
- Deviant sexual interests
- Relationship to victims
- General Criminality

Persistence of Sexual Offending

2. Prior Sentencing Occasions for Sexual Offenses

3. Any Juvenile Arrest for a Sexual Offense and Convicted as an Adult for a Separate Sexual Offense

4. Rate of Sexual Offending
Deviant Sexual Interests

5. Any Sentencing Occasion for Non-contact Sex Offenses
6. Any Male Victim
7. Young, Unrelated Victims

Relationship to Victims

8. Any Unrelated Victim
9. Any Stranger Victim

General Criminality

11. Any Prior Involvement with the Criminal Justice System
11. Prior Sentencing Occasions for Anything
12. Any Community Supervision Violation
13. Years Free Prior to the Index Sex Offence

Reporting the results of Static-2002R

- Percentiles
- Relative Risk Ratio
- Risk Level (low, med., high)
- Norms (probability of sexual rearrest for the study sample at each cut off score for 5 and 10 years)
Strengths of Static-2002R

- Provides incremental validity to Static-99R
- Identifies the source of risk
- Fully accounts for age
- Widely used and accepted in courts
- Easy to score from records
- Published and peer reviewed article

Limitations of Static-2002R

- Limited validations
- No Pre-selected for Treatment Norms
- Non-Routine norms are weighted toward higher recidivism rates
- Modest predictive accuracy and no improvement over Static-99R
- Does not include all risk factors for sexual recidivism, either static or dynamic

MnSOST-R

(Epperson, Kaul, & Hesselton, 1998)

- Developed using logistic regression
- 16 items (4 dynamic)
- Sample of 256 MN. incarcerated sex offenders released primarily in 1988 or 1990
- Validated on 220 MN prisoners
- Recidivism defined as arrest for a new hands on sex offense in 6 years

MnSOST-R-III

- Replaced the MnSOST-R
- MnSOST-R remains a reasonable measure of overall risk but not threat
Distinctions Between Concepts

- Risk
- Dangerousness/Threat
- Risk Management

Considerations in the Use of Multiple Actuarial Instruments

- Using logistic regression no combination of instruments showed advantage over predictive accuracy of the *single best* actuarial instrument (Seto, 2005)
- Chose the highest risk (or lowest)
- Interpret the results one scale at a time (no integration)

Choosing an Actuarial Instrument in 2013….

Measuring Predictive Accuracy: Receiver Operator Characteristic Curve

- AUC = .72
Predictive Accuracy

- The likelihood that a randomly selected recidivist would have a higher score on Static-99R than a randomly selected non-recidivist

Predictive Accuracy of MnSOST-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total CV sample (n=220)</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 year risk sample (170)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND Prison</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND Probation</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictive Accuracy of Static-99R, Static-99, Static-2002R, RRASOR and SACJ-Min (n=1,208)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actuarial Instrument</th>
<th>AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static-99R</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static-99</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static-2002R</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRASOR</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACJ-Min</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meta-Analysis Comparing Different Actuarial Tools (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actuarial Instrument</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static-99R</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static-2002</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnSOST-R</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACJ-Min</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Static-99 and MnSOST-R in ND Prison and Probation Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RRASOR Charge/Convict</th>
<th>STATIC99 Charge/Convict</th>
<th>MnSOST-R Charge/Convict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prison (N=182)</strong></td>
<td>.73/.73</td>
<td>.75/.75</td>
<td>.76/.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation (N=271)</strong></td>
<td>.77/.80</td>
<td>.78/.80</td>
<td>.75/.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meta-analysis of Prediction AUC Areas for Static-99R and Static-2002R (Babchishin, Hanson, & Helmus, 2012)

- Static-99R .684
- Static-2002R .686
- RRASOR .661
- Static-99R .694
- RRASOR .650
- Static-2002R .686

Static-99R & Static-2002R AUC

- Previously Static-2002 had higher predictive accuracy than Static-99.
- No more-likely due to increase in predictive accuracy of Static-99R with addition of age item because Static-2002 already had the age item

Incremental Validity

- Incremental validity is the extent to which new information improves the accuracy of a prediction above and beyond that of the previous instrument(s) used.
Early Evidence of Incremental Validity with 3 Actuarial Instruments (Epperson, 2004)

- North Dakota data indicated that RRASOR scores did not add incremental validity beyond the MnSOST-R or Static-99
- MnSOST-R and the Static-99 added incremental validity to each other.

Incremental Validity for the Statics (Babchishin, Hanson, Helmus 2011)
- RRASOR, Static-99R and The Static-2002R all add incrementally to the Prediction of Recidivism among Sex Offenders
- N=7491, K=20
- Static-99R and Static-2002R outperformed RRASOR
- Averaging best estimate of absolute probability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>5 year % risk</th>
<th>10 year % risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static-99R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate - High</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static-2002R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averaged Reconv. Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical Application of the Use of Static-99R and Static-2002R

What I use…make your choice!
- Static-99R
- Static-2002R
- SORAG
- MnSOST-R
- MnSOST-III
- RRASOR
The Use of Static Risk Scales in the Community Management of Sex Offenders

- Provides initial base rate of risk once released to the community
- Provides a way to divide sex offenders into risk level
- Provides a scientific rational for management plans for sex offenders
- Is defensible in court

Identifying Risk

- You can conduct risk assessment based purely on atheoretical actuarial predictors (like in the Static’s)
- Assessments respond better to the needs of decision makers and those being assessed when the evaluator can explain the source of risk
- Development of third-generation instruments to assist intervention efforts

Conclusions on Use of Multiple Actuarial Instruments

- Provides converging evidence of overall risk (or not)
- Covers examination of increased number of risk factors
- Provides incremental validity

Daubert / Frye Considerations for Admissibility of Actuarials in Court
Daubert / Frye Considerations for Admissibility of Actuarials in Court

- Whether the technique has been or can be tested
- Whether it has been subjected to peer review and publication
- Whether it has been generally accepted by the scientific community
- The known or potential error rate

Dynamic Risk Assessment

Identification of Dynamic Risk Factors

- Changeable risk factors that are the target of treatment
- Also called “psychological risk factors” or “long-term vulnerabilities” or “criminogenic” factors
- Damn we keep changing the names!!!!

Dynamic Risk Factors

- Gendreau et.al. (1996) meta-analysis found dynamic factors predicted general recidivism as well or better than static risk factors
- What dynamic factors would predict sexual recidivism?
Hanson & Morton Bourgon (2005)

- Meta-analysis of 82 recidivism studies (n=29,450)
- Focused on factors considered important to the understanding and management of sex offenders
- Were weak or controversial in the earlier meta-analysis

Promising Dynamic Risk Factors

- Any deviant sexual interest
- Sexual preoccupations
- Antisocial personality disorder
- PCL-R
- General self-regulation Problems
- Employment instability
- Hostility.

Mann, Hanson & Thornton (2010)

- Identified “Psychological Meaningful” risk factors for sexual reoffense
- Defined as individual propensities which may or may not manifest during any particular time period.

What Constitutes a Psychologically Meaningful Risk Factor for Sexual Recidivism?

- A cause of sexual recidivism
- Can target it in treatment to reduce risk
- Empirical evidence that it predicts sexual reoffense
  - At least 3 studies (meta-analyses) show it predicts
  - More than trivial (d > .15)
Psychologically Meaningful Risk Factors with empirical support (use them now!)

- Sexual Preoccupation (d=.39)
  - An abnormally intense interest in sex that dominates psychological functioning. Sex if engaged in or itself, as a way of defining self or as self-medication. High levels of sexual behavior not directed to romantic partner.

Emotional Congruence with Children (d=.42)

- Feeling that relationships with children are more emotionally satisfying than relationships with adults.
- Finds children easier to relate to, feels like child himself, children understand him
- May be “in love” with child victims

Sexual Preference for Children (d=.32)

- Children victim is females 0-12 and males 0-13.
- Identified by self-report, offense history or PPG/AASI.

Sexualized Violence (d=.18)

- An interest in sadism or preference for coercive sex over consenting sex.
- The common element is abusive control/domination having become a significant source of sexual arousal. The mere fact that a sexual assault is painful/terrifying or humiliating for the victim does not mean this factor applies.
Multiple Paraphilias (d=.21)
- Two or more rare, unusual or socially deviant sexual interests in persons, objects or activities

Offense-Supportive Attitudes (d=.22)
- Beliefs that that justify or excuse sexual offending in general.
- Condone sexual offenses in others or in general rather than accounts to justify their own offense.
  - Children enjoy sex
  - Adult-child sex if harmless
  - Children are sexually provocative

Lack of Emotionally Intimate Relationships with Adults (d=.32)
- No intimate relationship
- Repeated conflict/infidelity
- Applies to offenders who desire intimacy but unable to find it and those who do not want intimacy

Lifestyle Impulsiveness (d=.22-.37)
- Low self-control
- Chronic instability in employment and housing
- Lack of meaningful daily routines
- Irresponsible decisions
- Lack of or limited long term goals
Poor Problem Solving (d=.22)
- Difficulty in generating and identifying effective solutions to problems of daily living.
- Avoids, ruminates

Grievance/Hostility (d=.20)
- Perception of having been done wrong by the world
- Others are responsible for their problems
- Wanting to punish others as a consequence
- Preoccupied with gaining the respect they desire from others.
- Ruminates on vengeance themes.

Resistance to Rules And Supervision (d=.30-.62)
- Rule breaking and opposition to external control
- Combination of childhood behavior problems, noncompliance with supervision and violation of conditional release
- 2 facets
  - Defiant attitude to authority
  - History of oppositional behavior

Negative Social Influences (d=.26)
- Social network with people involved in crime, promoting criminal behavior or weaken the behavioral controls of the offender
- NAMBLA
Promising Risk Factors for Sexual Reoffense
- Hostile beliefs about women
- Machiavellianism
- Lack of concern for others
- Dysfunctional coping
- Sexualized coping
- Externalized coping

Unsupported predictors with support in only one study
- Denial
- Low self-esteem
- Major mental illness
- Loneliness

Not Psychologically Meaningful Risk Factors
- Depression
- Social Skills Deficits
- Poor victim empathy
- Lack of motivation for treatment as assessed pre-treatment

The Use of Psychologically Meaningful Risk Factors
- None of these factors have a strong relationship with sexual reoffence
- Do not weigh any single factor to strongly
- A comprehensive assessment of these factors will have the most predictive power
- Mechanical combinations of these factors will out perform human judgment
Instruments Containing Psychologically Meaningful Risk Factors

- Stable-2007 (Hanson & Harris)
- Structured Risk Assessment-Forensic Version (SRA-FV) (Thornton)
- Violence Risk Assessment-Sex Offender (VRS-SO)

Dynamic Supervision Project (Hanson & Harris)

- Item are Stable Dynamic Factors-recent focus
- Recidivism new sex offense under supervision in Canada, Iowa and Alaska
- Follow-up 41 months, n=997
- Data collected from interviews with supervising officers and case notes
- Stable-2007 AUC=.77 all officers
- Static-99 & Stable-2007 AUC=.83
- Added incremental validity over Static-99

Validation of Stable-2007, Ehrs (2010)

- N=263 German sex offenders released from prison
- Followed 6.4 years
- Stable-2007 AUC=.67 to .71
- Stable did not add incrementally to predictive accuracy of Static-99 (added new information) but approached significance

Stable-2007 Dynamic Risk Factors

- Significant Social Influences
- Intimacy Deficits
  - Lovers/Intimate partners
  - Emotional identification with children
  - Hostility towards women
  - Loneliness/Social rejection
  - Lack of concern for others
- Sexual self-regulation
  - Sex drive/Preoccupation
  - Sex as coping
  - Deviant sexual interests
Stable-2007 (cont.)
- Cooperation with supervision
- General self-regulation
  - Impulsive acts
  - Poor cognitive problem solving skills
  - Negative emotionality/Hostility

Stable-2000 vs. Stable-2007
- In the Ehrs (2010) validation of Stable-2000 and Stable-2007 the Stable-2007 was clearly superior

Strengths STABLE-2007
- User-friendly
- Well designed for community-supervision
- One validation studies

Limitations of STABLE-2007
- Constructed on community sample and tested with prisoners serving short-term sentences; generalization to long sentence offenders unknown
- Validation only with short follow up
- Evidence for incremental validity is relatively weak and incremental validity appears to be small to moderate
- Can not use to pick a sample type for Static-99R norms
VRS-SO (Olver & Wong)
- Designed to measure treatment readiness and changes and inform the delivery of sex offender treatment
- 7 Static factors and 17 dynamic factors
- Statistically significant incremental validity relative to static instrument
- The predictive accuracy of this score has been tested in two samples
  - Olver et al (2007) – AUC = 0.66
  - Beggs & Grace (2010) – AUC = 0.80

Strengths of VRS-SO
- Best instrument to evaluate treatment progress
- Shows significant incremental validity to their static instrument
- Shown to predict long-term recidivism
- Two validation studies

Limitations of VRS-SO
- Complex to score
- Only tested with treatment participants
- Developed and initially validated on a high risk sample
- Can not use to pick a sample type for Static-99R norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Term Vulnerability</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable Dynamic</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SRA-FV (Thornton)

- Items are long-term vulnerabilities-life history focus
- Constructed on 93-96 prisoners and community samples from Bridgewater MA.
- Validated on 365-444 Bridgewater cases
- AUC=.72 at 5 and 10 years
- Substantial and highly statistically significant incremental validity at 5 and 10 year follow-ups

Includes 4 Domains

- Sexual Interests
- Relational Style
- Self-Management
- Had to leave out Distorted Attitudes because of difficulty measuring it.

Scoring SRA-FV

- Can use Light Version if you do not administer the PCL-R
- Do not need an interview
- Clear operational definitions of each item
- Scoring manual
- Requires training by Dr. Thornton

SRA:FV Need Assessment: Domains & Factors

- **Sexual Interests Domain (SID)**
  - SID1: Sexual Preference for Children
  - SID2: Sexualized Violence
  - SID3: Sexual Predisposition (average of rule and concept based sexual preoccupation)

- **Relational Style Domain (RSD)**
  - RSD1: Emotional Congruence with Children
  - RSD2: Lack of Emotionally Intimate Relationships with Adults (LEIRA)
  - RSD3: Callousness (facet 2 from the PCL-R)
  - RSD4: Grievance Thinking (average of narrow grievance thinking and pervasive anger)

- **Self-Management Domain (SMD)**
  - SMD1: Lifestyle Impulsiveness (facet 3 from the PCL-R)
  - SMD2: Resistance to Rules and Supervision (facet 4 from the PCL-R)
  - SMD3: Dysfunctional Coping
From Score Can Select Static-99R and Static-2002R Norms

- Below 1.5: Below Routine Norms
- 1.5-1.7: Routine Norms
- 1.8-2.3: Above Routine & Below Tx Need
- 2.4-2.6: Tx Need Norms
- 2.7-3.2: Above Tx Need & Below HRN
- 3.3-3.5: HRN Norms
- 3.6 and above: Above HRN Norms

Strengths

- Largest validation sample of dynamic instruments
- Larger and highly significant incremental predictive validity
- Shown to predict short & long-term recidivism
- Works under adversarial conditions
- Can use to pick sample type for Static-99R norms

Limitations

- Only one validation sample
- Sample from an earlier era and validated on the same sample (Bridgewater)
- Only tested in pre-selected sample
- Does not include the Distorted Attitudes domain
- No published article on development

Frye/Daubert Criteria Psychological Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA-FV</th>
<th>STABLE</th>
<th>VRS-SO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether the technique has been or can be tested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether it has been subjected to peer review and publication</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether it has been generally accepted by the scientific community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The known or potential error rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Practice**

- Switch to the revised versions of the Static-99 and Static-2002
- Consider one or more static actuarial instruments.
- Use both static and dynamic risk instruments that best represent the individual you are evaluating.
- Do not over-ride risk levels with risk factors not predictive of sexual reoffense.

**Future Directions in Risk Assessment**

- Third Generation instruments will prevail.
- More research is needed on factors outside the actuarials that affect base rate variability.
- More validations of the dynamic instruments will allow us to know which one works the best with different samples.

**Future Directions in Risk Assessment**

- More empirically derived treatment targets will be identified leading to treatments that are more effective.
- Third generation instruments will increasingly guide sex offender management policy in the community (specialized caseloads, intensive supervision, GPS, notification, treatment intensity).
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