

Name of Tool	Risk Matrix 2000 (RM2000)
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Thornton and Colleagues
Year	2003

### Description

- The RM2000 is a statistically-derived risk assessment tool for use with adult (18+) males convicted of sexual offences. At least one of these sexual offences should have been committed after the age of 16 ([Wakeling, Howard and Barnett, 2011](#)).
- The instrument is comprised of three subscales: RM-S, RM-V and RM-C. These provide an estimate of the long-term likelihood of reconviction for sexual (RM-S) or non-sexual violent (RM-V) offences. The RM-C is a combination of the scores obtained for RM-S and RM-V subscales. Two steps are involved in scoring the subscales. The first step looks at risk items: the number of occasions sentenced for a sexual offence, the number of occasions sentenced and age on release. The second step looks at four aggravating factors. The presence of 2 aggravating factors increases the risk category by 1 level; four of these raises the category of risk by 2 levels ([Smid et al., 2014](#)).
- Each level parallels a statistical likelihood of reconviction: low (score of 1), medium (score of 2 or 3), high (score of 4 or 5) and very high (score of 6+).

### Age Appropriateness

18+

### Assessor Qualifications

Assessors must complete the appropriate training awarded by NOMS in order to use this tool.

Tool is designed for use with those involved in the risk assessment and management: police officers, social workers, probation officers and other practitioners.

### Strengths

- The RM2000 appears to perform in a stable manner across the UK and generalisations can be made in Scotland ([Grubin, 2011](#)).
- Easy to score and interpret, yet training should be required for scoring accuracy and quality assurance measures introduced ([Grubin, 2011](#)).
- Multi-agency use across Police and Probation, giving the benefits of a common language and understanding to the management of cases particularly in the context of MAPPA ([Nicholls and Webster, 2014](#)).
- The RM2000 is financially effective for services to use on a large-scale, given it is light on resources and time ([Pryboda, Tully and Browne, 2015](#)).

- It could be useful as screening mechanism in further assessments to allow for the allocation of resources.

### Empirical Grounding



This tool was developed as a revision and improvement of the SACJ-minimum (Structured Anchored Clinical Judgment Scale-Minimum). Similar to the SACJ-Min, the RM2000 utilizes a stepwise approach and is composed of two main scales ([Grubin, 1998](#); [Hanson and Thornton, 2000](#)).

Recent developments have explored the combining of RM2000 with Stable 2007 (Hanson et al., 2007), where the static and dynamic risk scales are joined together in a structured manner. Findings indicated that the STABLE-2007 generally added incremental predictive validity to the RM2000. ([Helmus et al., 2015](#)).

### Inter-Rater Reliability



a) UK Research

- [Wakeling, Mann and Milner \(2011\)](#) found excellent inter-rater reliabilities (ICCs) in two studies ranging from .71 for Study 1 and .93 for Study 2. .
- [Looman and Abracen \(2009\)](#) found an ICC value for the RM2000 composite score of .81.

b) International Research

- [Bengtson \(2008\)](#) - good inter-rater reliability was found for the sexual offending subscale of the RM2000 (ICC = .72; k = .85).
- [Knight and Thornton \(2007\)](#) - the RM2000 achieved an ICC of .82.

### Validation History

#### General Predictive Accuracy



a) UK Research

- The sexual and non-sexual offence subscales generated moderate to high AUCs of .73 and .76 respectively in a sample of Scottish individuals who had committed sexual offences ([Grubin, 2011](#)).
- [Barnett, Wakeling and Howard \(2010\)](#) found moderate predictive accuracy for the RM-S subscale (.68) and higher predictive accuracy for the RM-V (.80) and RM-C (.73) subscales.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Craig et al. (2008)</a> reported high levels of predictive accuracy in relation to non-sexual violent reconvictions with AUCs with the .80 to .87 in a 10-year follow-up study.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Wakeling, Howard and Barnett (2011)</a> found that the RM2000 scales had moderate to very good predictive accuracy ranging between .67 and .87. It should be noted, however, that the RM2000 overestimated the risk posed by those who had committed internet offences.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Webb et al. (2007)</a> - RM2000 significantly predicted formal failure (e.g. reconviction, breach/recall) for those who had engaged in child molestation offences (AUC = .71) and other sexually risky behaviours (AUC = .69); although in the case of internet offences, the RM2000 was only able to moderately predict drop out from treatment (AUC =.69).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Osborn et al. (2010)</a> administered the RM2000 to 73 individuals convicted of internet offences; it was found that the tool overestimated the risk levels posed.</li> </ul>
<p>b) International Research</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Looman and Abracen (2010)</a> – the RM-S and RM-V subscales generated moderate to high predictive accuracy for sexual re-offending in individuals convicted of rape offences (AUCs = .70 and .65 respectively).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Kingston et al. (2008)</a> - the RM2000 attained moderate predictive accuracy with AUC values of .64 and .65 for the RM-V and RM-S subscales respectively.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Knight and Thornton (2007)</a> - moderate predictive accuracy with AUCs ranging between .63 and .67 in the follow-up periods.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Parent, Guay and Knight (2011)</a> examined the predictive accuracy of sexual recidivism for 590 individuals. The AUCs were .68, .52 and .62 for the RM2000/s, RM2000/v and RM2000/c respectively.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Lehmann et al. (2016)</a> found the RM2000 demonstrated moderate accuracy in predicting sexual, non-sexual violent and violent recidivism in an international sample of 3144 individuals from the UK, Germany and Canada.</li> </ul>

<b>Validation History</b>									
<b>Applicability: Females</b>									

No empirical evidence at present.

**Validation History**

Applicability: Ethnic Minorities

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

No empirical evidence at present.

**Validation History**

Applicability: Mental Disorders

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

a) UK Research

- [Langton et al. \(2009\)](#) - In a sample of personality disordered individuals, only the RM-V subscale predicted damage to property (AUC=.74).
- [Lindsay et al. \(2008\)](#) - the RM2000 was unable to significantly predict recidivism in a sample of male adults with learning disabilities. Further research using the RM2000 was recommended, however, since it just fell short of significance.

b) International Research

- In their review of literature, [Pryboda, Tully and Browne \(2015\)](#) concluded that the use of the RM2000 was not supported as a measure of static risk for intellectual disabled individuals. It is suggested this may be attributable to the RM2000 failing to consider protective factors or any others related to desistance.

**Contribution to Risk Practice**

- The RM2000 is able to provide a brief scan of some static risk factors pertinent to the risk of sexual and violent recidivism and can highlight the need for further assessment of the individual's risk of recidivism. RM2000 should be one component of a comprehensive and appropriate assessment package ([Grubin, 2011](#)).
- The RM2000 is a useful tool to assign resources by predicting reconviction. It is used by the prisons, probation and the police in England and Wales ([Smid et al., 2014](#)).

**Other Considerations**

- [Tully and Browne \(2015\)](#) argue that adding dynamic risk items would fit better with a rehabilitative approach to risk management and assessment for sexual offending. This would also provide a means by which to effectively plan treatment and evaluate individuals' progress in treatment; however, difficulties remain in identifying and assessing dynamic risk factors of sexual offending.

- [Helmus et al. \(2015\)](#) found that the addition of Stable-2007 added incremental predictive validity to the RM2000. Internet offences are not counted as non-contact offences if they are the only sexual offence.
- The tool may be of limited use with first-time offenders whose current offence may be unusual or contain sadistic elements ([Beech et al., 2003](#); [Craig, Browne and Stringer, 2004](#)).
- The instrument itself is normed on adult males with a previous sex offence history and is inappropriate for use with females, juveniles, and mentally disordered individuals.
- An unpublished revision to the RM2000 scoring manual has made several changes that include, but are not limited to, the assessment of risk in older groups (aged 60 and over) and individuals who have committed non-contact sexual offences (Thornton, 2010).
- The RM2000 is static in nature meaning in theory the final risk categories should remain the same over time and items cannot be targeted for change. The completion of the tool should be repeated when an individual moves between age categories, is convicted or cautioned due to a further offence or maintains a two year cohabiting relationship for the first time ([Smid et al., 2014](#)).
- Studies have found that it overestimates the risks posed by those who had committed internet offences. A more accurate predictor of risk was found to be a revised version of the tool, RM2000R, which omits two aggravating factors: stranger victim and non-contact offences ([Osborn et al., 2010](#); [Wakeling, Howard and Barnett, 2011](#)).
- In 2014, National Offender Management Services advised of a revision to scoring. Data indicated that risk halves for five years in the community free of sexual offences (Thornton and Helmus, 2015). It is, therefore, recommended that those convicted of sexual offences who remain offence free in the community for five years or more should have their risk level reduced by one category. The term 'offence free' refers to no known criminal activity taking place, no convictions, no warnings or reprimands or breaches. It was also recommended that those age 60 and over should be put one level of risk on the RM2000 due to a decreased level of risk (Thornton and Helmus, 2015).
- An unpublished report by Howard and Wakeling (2019) examined whether the length of time without offending in the community affected contact sexual reoffending rates. Findings gave tentative support to reducing the risk by one category for every five years that an individual has been offence-free in the community: for instance, if an individual was assessed as medium risk and upon release from prison into the community remained offence-free for the next five years, it would be reasonable to reduce him to low risk.
- It is recommended by [Bryboda, Tully and Browne \(2015\)](#) that the RM2000 should be used on conjunction with other validated assessment methods/ The authors also highlighted the importance of considering protective factors in relation to intellectual disabled individuals who commit sexual offences, something which the RM2000 does not currently do.
- For access to the manual, please visit the following website:  
[www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-les/psych/RM2000scoringinstructions.pdf](http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-les/psych/RM2000scoringinstructions.pdf)

Name of Tool	Rapid Risk Assessment for Sex Offence Recidivism (RRASOR)
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Hanson
Year	1997

**Description**

- The RRASOR is a 4-item screening instrument for risk of sexual offence recidivism among males who have been convicted of at least one sexual offence.
- The instrument relies on information obtained in files and has been tested extensively on Canadian and British forensic populations.

**Age Appropriateness**

18+

**Assessor Qualifications**


Expertise in assessing sexual violence risk and training on instrument.

Can be administered by a trained non-clinician ([Yates, 2005](#)).

**Strengths**

- Empirically based on the 4 most robust risk factors found in the research about sexual offending. The developmental study found the RRASOR to have an ROC ranging between .62 and .77 ([Hanson, 1997](#)).
- It is easy to score and interpret as it is quick and uses available and basic file information ([Yates, 2005](#)).
- Easily coded with or without psychological tests/clinical assessment and does not require the individual's participation.

**Empirical Grounding**



The author of this tool selected variables that have been found in previous meta-analyses to have a minimum correlation of .10 with sexual recidivism in order to generate the four items ([Hanson, 1997](#)). These particular items are also loaded highest in Knight and Thornton's (2007) Sexual Persistence and Male-Victim Choice Factors.

**Inter-Rater Reliability**



a) UK Research	None available at present.
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Rettenberger et al. (2010)</a> – excellent inter-rater reliability was found for the RRASOR with an ICC of .90.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Langton et al. (2007)</a> found excellent inter-rater reliability for the RRASOR (r = .94).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Knight and Thornton (2007)</a> - RRASOR generated an ICC of .82.</li> </ul>

Validation History	
General Predictive Accuracy	
a) UK Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Hanson (1997)</a> - the measure had been validated with a UK prison population in which the RRASOR attained moderate to strong AUC values (.61 - .71).</li> </ul>
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Parent, Guay and Knight (2011)</a> - the RRASOR achieved moderate accuracy in predicting sexual recidivism in a sample of 590 individuals who had committed sexual offences (AUC = .70).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Rettenberger et al. (2010)</a> - the RRASOR attained fair to acceptable predictive values for subgroups of sexual offences. For the rapist subgroup, the RRASOR attained moderate AUCs of .70 for general violent recidivism and .69 for general criminal recidivism. For the incest group, fair AUCs of .67 and .65 were generated for general violent and general criminal recidivism respectively. For the extra-familial molest offending group, fair AUCs were generated of .64, .61 and .60 for sexual, general violent and general criminal recidivism respectively. Predictive accuracy was not predicted for sexual violent recidivism in this offending group, generated an AUC of .53.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2009)</a> - a meta-analysis study found the RRASOR to be an adequate predictor of sexual recidivism (average Cohen d = .60).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Looman and Abracen (2010)</a> found the RRASOR generated a moderate AUC score of .62 for sexual recidivism.</li> </ul>

**Validation History**

<b>Applicability: Females</b>									
No empirical evidence at present.									

<b>Validation History</b>									
<b>Applicability: Ethnic Minorities</b>									
a) UK Research	No empirical evidence at present.								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Långström (2004)</a> - the RRASOR attained good AUCs for individuals of Nordic (.76) and European (.77) ethnic origin for sexual recidivism. Despite this, it was unable to significantly predict recidivism in individuals of African Asian origin (.48).</li> </ul>								

<b>Validation History</b>									
<b>Applicability: Mental Disorders</b>									
a) UK Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Blacker et al. (2011)</a> - the tool's accuracy in predicting recidivism in a sample of individuals with learning disabilities who had committed sexual offences was below chance (AUC = .47).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Craig, Browne and Stringer (2004)</a> - RRASOR was able to distinguish between individuals residing in community settings to those in regional secure psychiatric settings with higher mean scores observed for the latter group.</li> </ul>								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Sjöstedt and Långström (2002)</a> - in a sample of individuals diagnosed with personality disorder who had committed sexual offences, the RRASOR demonstrated good predictive accuracy in relation to sexual recidivism (.73) and moderate accuracy in violent non-sexual recidivism (.62).</li> </ul>								

<b>Contribution to Risk Practice</b>									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RRASOR can provide a brief scan of the risk of sexual recidivism. It is an actuarial scale which can create awareness of some static risk factors related to the individual's risk of sexual reoffending.</li> </ul>									

<b>Other Considerations</b>									
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



- The RRASOR is normed on adult males with a previous offence history and is deemed inappropriate for the use with females, juveniles and individuals who are mentally ill.
- The author advises that the RRASOR should only be used to screen individuals who have committed sexual offences.
- The tool may be of limited use with first-time offenders whose current offence may be unusual or contain sadistic elements ([Beech, Fisher and Thornton, 2003](#); [Craig, Browne and Stringer, 2004](#)).
- The authors recommend the use of the Static-2002 over the use of the RRASOR as the aforementioned tool includes more items, has been extensively cross-validated and has a higher predictive accuracy than the RRASOR (see [www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org) for more information).

Name of Tool	Risk for Sexual Violence Protocol (RSVP)
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Hart and Colleagues
Year	2003

### Description

- The RSVP produces a structured professional judgement assessment which has been guided by psychological theory. It is intended to help evaluators conduct comprehensive assessments of risk of sexual violence in clinical and forensic settings.
- The RSVP is a 22-item structured guide for the assessment of those who have committed sexual offences, divided into five domains: sexual violence history, psychological adjustment, mental disorder, social adjustment and manageability.
- It can be used to identify the nature of risk for sexual violence and to develop and inform risk management strategies. It defines sexual violence as the “actual, attempted or threatened sexual contact with another person that is non-consensual” (Hart et al., 2003).
- The instrument does not employ actuarial or statistical methods to support decision-making about risk, but instead offers guidelines for collecting relevant information and making structured decisions. The manual recommends that identified scenarios should discuss the nature, severity, imminence and likelihood of future sexual violence.
- It is aimed at evaluating men aged 18 and over and may also be used with older male adolescents aged 16 and 17 and adult women with a degree of caution. It is not to be used with children aged 15 and younger ([Hart and Boer, 2010](#)).

### Age Appropriateness

18+

### Assessor Qualifications

The manual prescribes that training may be completed via self-study or attending lectures and workshops. The authors recommend 16 to 32 hours of training covering the following areas: Knowledge of sexual violence; Expertise in individual assessment; Expertise in mental disorder ([Hart and Boer, 2010](#)).

### Strengths

- Provides a means to measure the presence of risk factors
- Identifies factors for treatment
- Provides a checklist for ensuring relevant factors have been considered.
- The primary intended use of the instrument is to allow for forward planning in individual cases, guiding clinical decisions about risk assessment and management. A secondary use is ‘backward-

looking evaluations' to be used as a basis to evaluate the quality of risk assessments completed by other people ([Hart and Boer, 2010](#)).

- The RSVP can be used at various stages of the legal process from sentencing through to parole and in both inpatient and outpatient settings ([Jackson, 2016](#)).

### Empirical Grounding



The instrument was developed through literature review, revising guidance and feedback from users. It also underwent field testing of improvements in Canada and the UK ([Hart and Boer, 2010](#)).

### Inter-Rater Reliability



#### a) UK Research

- [Sutherland et al. \(2012\)](#) found fair to moderate levels of agreement in relation to the summary judgement risk ratings and supervision recommendations in a sample of professionals within forensic mental health and learning disability settings. The highest inter-rater reliability (IRR) was observed for professionals who were highly trained in forensic risk assessment. Other factors such as the complexity of the case and the number of training days attended for the RSVP also affected the IRR.

- [Sutherland \(2010\)](#) - for steps 2-3 ('Identification of risk item presence and relevance) and 6 ('Summary Judgements'), the level of overall agreement was .53 (ICC2) amongst multi-disciplinary forensic mental health clinicians.

#### b) International Research

- [Watt and Jackson \(2008\)](#) - Excellent intra-class correlation (ICC) obtained for 'Presence-Past Ratings' (.95), 'Present-Recent Ratings' (.85), 'Case Prioritisation' (.75) and 'Risk of Harm' (.81).

- [Hart, Michie and Cooke \(2007\)](#) - moderate predictive validity between the 'Case Prioritisation' scores and recidivism ( $r = .31$ ) in a sample of adult males.

- [Watt and colleagues \(2006\)](#) found similar ICCs within the .90s for 'Presence-Past Ratings' (.96), 'Present-Recent Ratings' (.96) and 'Conclusory Opinions' (.92).

- An unpublished doctoral thesis found the IRR of the RSVP was excellent for individual risk factors, summary risk ratings and total scores, ranging from .85 to .96 ([Jackson, 2016](#)).

### Validation History

General Predictive Accuracy									
a) UK Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Darjee et al. (2016)</a> found that in a population that were likely to pose a higher risk of harm than a general sex offending population, they reported case prioritisation was significantly associated with time to sexual offending and time to breach but not time to violent offending. They also indicate that predictive validity is influenced by the level of case management. A decision on predictive validity for sexual offending or other offending is, therefore, unrealistic.</li> </ul>								
b) International Research	None available at present.								

Validation History									
Applicability: Females									
No empirical evidence at present.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Ethnic Minorities									
No empirical evidence at present.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Mental Disorders									
There is a specific section in the evaluation that addresses mental disorder as relate to Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) or International Statistical Classifications of Diseases (ICD-10) diagnoses.									

Contribution to Risk Practice									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Darjee et al. (2016)</a> argued that "tools such as the RSVP are good for identifying low risk individuals who do not require risk management".</li> <li>• The RSVP produces explicit guidelines for risk formulation centring on risk scenarios and management strategies (<a href="#">Hart and Boer, 2010</a>).</li> <li>• The instrument showed good concurrent validity with the SVR-20, Static-2002R and the SORAG (<a href="#">Jackson, 2016</a>).</li> </ul>									

Other Considerations									
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- The RSVP is a derivative of the SVR-20 (Hart et al., 2003: 50), with a greater emphasis on psychological risk factors and developing case management plans. It is based on the sexual offending literature.
- The instrument should not be used to determine whether someone who committed acts of sexual violence in the past nor to estimate the probability that sexual violence acts will be committed in future ([Hart and Boer, 2010](#)).
- [Darjee et al. \(2016\)](#) suggested that the RSVP may be a better tool for assessing the risk of serious harm in individuals who commit sexual offences rather than assessing their risk of sex offending. Findings of their study support the use of the instrument for the minority of those who pose a risk of serious harm. The authors related these findings to the Scottish criminal justice process, findings that the RSVP may be suitable for those being managed at MAPPA levels 2 and 3 and under consideration for an Order of Lifelong Restriction.

Name of Tool	Stable 2007 and Acute 2007 (SA07)
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Hanson, Harris, Scott and Helmus
Year	2007

### Description

- The Stable-2007 and Acute-2007 (SA07) is a two-part actuarial risk assessment instrument designed to assist with the community supervision of individuals who have committed sexual offences.
- The Stable-2007 measures ‘stable dynamic’ risk factors which are potentially changeable but may endure for months or years. The instrument incorporates a guided interview schedule which covers 13 major risk areas: significant social influences, capacity for relationship stability, emotional identification with children, hostility toward women, general social rejection, lack of concern for others, impulsivity, poor problem-solving skills, negative emotionality, sex drive and preoccupation, sex as coping, deviant sexual preferences and cooperation with supervision. Items are scored on a 3-point scale of 0 to 2 from no problem, some problem and significant ([Smid et al., 2014](#)).
- The Acute-2007 measures ‘acute dynamic’ risk factors defined as highly transient conditions which can change over a period of weeks, days or even hours. The instrument assesses 7 areas of risk: victim access, hostility, sexual preoccupation, rejection of supervision, collapse of social support, emotional collapse and substance abuse. These items are scored on a 4-point scale from 0 for no problem, 1 for some problem, 2 for a significant problem and IN for intervene now ([Smid et al., 2014](#)).

### Age Appropriateness

18+

### Assessor Qualifications

Assessors must possess the relevant training and experience in conducting sexual violence risk assessments.

### Strengths

- These specialised tools aid the assessment of and track changes in an individual’s risk or motivation to change ([Hanson et al., 2007](#)).
- The tools can be used to inform assessors with regard to level of priority and inform decisions on community treatment and supervision.
- The tools are easier to score than their predecessors, the Stable and Acute 2000 ([Hanson et al., 2007](#)).
- The Stable and Acute 2007 instruments have risk factors potentially aligned with pervasive developmental disorders: emotional identification with children, lack of concern for others, poor

problem-solving skills, sex as a coping mechanism, capacity for relationship stability, negative emotionality and sexual preoccupations (Fabian, 2011: 77).

Empirical Grounding	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both instruments are grounded in the risk factors identified from the SONAR (Sex Offender Need Assessment Rating), STEP (Sex Offender Treatment Evaluation Project) Deviance (Beech et al., 2002) and Structured Risk Assessment (SRA) (<a href="#">Thornton, 2002</a>), all of which were used in the prospective research design of the SA07.</li> <li>• The SA07 was based on the database compiled by the Dynamic Supervision Project (see <a href="http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/sum/cprs200709-eng.aspx">http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/sum/cprs200709-eng.aspx</a> for further details on this project).</li> </ul>									

Inter-Rater Reliability	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
a) UK Research									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">McNaughton Nicholls et al. (2010)</a> - both the Stable 2007 and Acute 2007 obtained poor to moderate ICCs ranging from .04 to .59 for all raters.</li> </ul>
b) International Research									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eher et al. (<a href="#">2010</a>; <a href="#">2011</a>) found an excellent ICC value of .90 for the Stable-2007 composite score.</li> <li>• Fernandez (2008) found an overall ICC of .92 for Stable-2007. Individual item ICCs ranged between .56 and .91.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Hanson et al. (2007)</a> - ICCs for the individual Acute-2007 items ranged from .64 to .95, with a median of .90; although no ICC was reported for the composite score.</li> </ul>

Validation History										
General Predictive Accuracy	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
a) UK Research										No empirical evidence at present.
b) International Research										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Eher et al. (2011)</a> - the Stable-2007 attained moderate AUC values in predicting sexual reoffence (.71), violent reoffence (.67) and custodial sentence following violent offence (.69).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Eher et al. (2010)</a> found that the Stable-2007 was a strong predictor of sexual recidivism (AUC = .77) in a sample of Austrian child molesters.</li> <li>• The Stable-2007 may not be entirely appropriate for those who have committed paedophilic sex offences. ROC</li> </ul>

	<p>analyses and Cox Regressions were carried out on 189 prison-released individuals who had committed paedophilic sex offences using a variety of instruments. It was found that the VRS:SO predicted sexual recidivism in this sample significantly better than the Stable-2007 and the Stable-2007/Static-99 combined score (<a href="#">Eher et al., 2015</a>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Hanson et al. (2007)</a> - using 3 items from the Stable-2007, the authors found low to moderate ROC values for sexual (.52 - .68) and violent (.51-.59) recidivism and any criminal offence (.50-.61).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Hanson, Helmus and Harris (2015)</a> found the STABLE-2007 scores added incrementally over STATIC scores in a sample of 768 Canadian individuals for all recidivism outcomes, but only for complete cases.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Tamatea (2014)</a> applied the STABLE-2007 to 245 males in New Zealand, finding that an AUC of 0.78 was yielded for reimprisonment. Over time, the STABLE-2007 was found to discriminate between higher and lower rate offending, albeit not for individuals with mid-range scores.</li> <li>• In a Canadian sample of 180 individuals convicted of sexual offences, it was found that the STABLE-2007 pre and post treatment scores were associated with sexual, non-sexual violent and any violent recidivism (<a href="#">Sowden and Olver, 2017</a>).</li> </ul>
--	---

Validation History									
Applicability: Females									
No empirical evidence at present.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Ethnic Minorities									
No empirical evidence at present.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Mental Disorders									



No empirical evidence at present.

### Contribution to Risk Practice

- The SA07 can contribute to an awareness of risk factors that may contribute to offending behaviour, examining stable dynamic risk factors that can be changed through treatment or supervision such as learned behaviours and personal skills deficits.
- The SA07 is useful in identifying risk and responsivity factors pertinent to the individual's risk of sexual recidivism.
- The tool can inform the levels of monitoring and rehabilitation efforts needed to manage the case.
- The tool is used in the UK, Ireland, Canada, Germany and the United States for individuals convicted of sexual offences who are in community and prison settings.
- Interviews with 24 probation service staff members in Ireland found that SA07 is perceived to be a practical risk assessment, directing supervision work and interventions ([Walker and O'Rourke, 2013](#)).
- The [Risk Management Authority \(2013\)](#) has carried out research into practitioners involved in the implementation of SA07 in Scotland. This report highlighted potential learning points and support for training.

### Other Considerations

- Limited validation research on the Acute-2007 tool.
- No option to omit items within both tools in the instance where there is little to no information to score items.
- Previous concerns regarding the 'Access to Victims' item ([Mann, Hanson and Thornton, 2010](#); [McNaughton Nicholls et al., 2010: 18](#)) have been addressed in a draft Acute-2007 manual in which the scoring makes a distinction between chance events and deliberate actions that would otherwise increase the individual's likelihood of recidivism (e.g. victim moving to house next door versus the perpetrator deliberately engaging in behaviours that would encourage the contact between themselves and potential victims). Fernandez and colleagues (2012: 19) advise that the SA07 is unsuitable for individuals whose only sexual offences are Category 'B' offences. These include offences where the "...participants were consenting (e.g., prostitution), the offence lacked a sexual motive (e.g., urinating in public), or there was no identifiable victim (e.g. possession of indecent materials)..."
- In their meta-analysis of recidivism rates of females, [Cortoni, Hanson and Coache \(2010\)](#) concluded that risk assessment tools developed specifically for males who have committed sexual offences would be expected to substantially overestimate the recidivism risk of sexual offending.
- New revisions of the Stable- and Acute-2007 manuals were published in 2012 with comprehensive Acute scoring guidance planned by the authors.
- Assessors should note that the SA07 have been designed to aid the supervision of individuals who have committed sexual offences within community settings.
- The implementation of the SA07 was evaluated in Scotland. Please refer to the RMA website for updates (<https://www.rma.scot/>)

Name of Tool	Sex Offender Risk Appraisal Guide (SORAG)
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Quinsey, Harris, Rice and Cormier
Year	1998

### Description

- The SORAG is a 14-item actuarial scale designed principally to assess risk for violent recidivism (including sexually violent recidivism) among adults released into the community. Items on the scale are: living with biological parents until age 16; elementary school maladjustment; history of alcohol problems; never been married at time of index offence; criminal history scores for nonviolent and violent offences; number of convictions for previous sexual offences; history of sexual offences (for girls under the age of 14); failure on prior conditional release; age at index offence; diagnosis of schizophrenia or any other personality disorder; phallometric test; psychopathy checklist ([Rice and Harris, 2016](#)).
- The total risk score is used to classify individuals who have committed sexual offences into nine risk categories known as 'bins' ([Rossegger et al., 2013](#)).
- The SORAG is an extension of the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG) and shares ten items with it ([Parent, Guay and Knight, 2011](#); Quinsey et al., 2006).
- The PCL:R (Hare, 2003) score features as an item within the SORAG. It uses clinical records as a basis for scoring and incorporates PCL:R scores.
- The intended and recommended purpose of the SORAG is to render an estimate of the long-term risk of criminal violence in general.

### Age Appropriateness

18+

### Assessor Qualifications

Expertise in risk assessment for sexual offending. Assessors must also undergo the relevant training on the instrument.

### Strengths

- The SORAG generally appears to exhibit higher correlations with violent recidivism in comparison to other instruments (e.g. Static-99 and SVR-20) developed for use with individuals who have committed sexual offences. ([Rettenberger and Eher, 2007](#)).

### Empirical Grounding



The SORAG draws on the empirical literature in relation to sexual recidivism and that related to the VRAG. Ten of the items are derived from the VRAG ([Rettenberger and Eher, 2007](#)).

Inter-Rater Reliability	
a) UK Research	None available at present.
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Walters, Knight and Thornton (2009)</a> – the SORAG generated a high ICC score of .89.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Langton et al. (2007)</a> - large correlation coefficient of .90 observed for inter-rater reliability of the SORAG.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Rettenberger and Eher (2007)</a> – the SORAG achieved an ICC value of .93 in a German sample of individuals committed of sexual offences.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Ducro and Pham (2006)</a> - excellent ICC of .92 attained for the SORAG.</li> </ul>

Validation History	
General Predictive Accuracy	
a) UK Research	None available at present.
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Rettenberger et al. (2017)</a> examined the German version of the SORAG in a sample of 1104 individuals in Austria. The SORAG was found to have a small but significant predictive validity over the VRAG and PCL-R, yielding a moderate AUC of 0.74.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Parent, Guay and Knight (2011)</a> found the SORAG had a moderate AUC of .69 for predicting recidivism in a group of 590 individuals who had committed sexual offences.</li> <li>• A study of 137 individuals in Switzerland gave moderate AUC scores of 0.69 and 0.67 for total risk scores and risk bins respectively (<a href="#">Rossegger et al., 2013</a>).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Rice and Harris (2016)</a> found the SORAG yielded high predictive accuracy for general and violent recidivism, with the AUC giving a score of 0.73.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Rettenberger et al. (2010)</a> – the SORAG generated an AUC value of .68 for general violent recidivism and .72 for general criminal recidivism within a subgroup of rapists.</li> </ul>

	<p>Within the extra-familial molestation subgroup, the SORAG exhibited moderate to high accuracy in predicting sexual recidivism (.71), sexual violent recidivism (.62), general violent recidivism (.81) and general criminal recidivism (.77).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Eher et al. (2008)</a> – the SORAG was found to be a highly predictive accurate tool, particularly with a subgroup of individuals who had committed child sexual offences (AUC = .82).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Pham and Ducro (2008)</a> found moderate AUCs for prediction of general recidivism (.69), violent recidivism (.71) and sexual recidivism (.62).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Langton et al. (2007)</a> – the SORAG demonstrated moderate accuracy in predicting serious violent offending (.71).</li> <li>• The predictive validity of the SORAG was tested in 258 adult males. Sexual recidivism yielded an AUC of .65; this was in spite of a relatively low risk in the sample, given 53.5% had committed incest offences. The AUC generated for violent recidivism was .69 (<a href="#">Nunes et al., 2002</a>).</li> </ul>
--	---

Validation History									
Applicability: Females									
No empirical evidence at present.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Ethnic Minorities									
No empirical evidence at present.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Mental Disorders									
a) UK Research	None available at present.								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Looman (2006)</a> - moderate AUC scores attained for the SORAG (.69).</li> </ul>								

- [Ducro and Pham \(2006\)](#) – the SORAG achieved moderate AUC values ranging from .64 to .65 in a sample of those convicted of child abuse and rape from a high secure hospital.

### Contribution to Risk Practice

- The SORAG provides a brief assessment of the risk of sexual recidivism and can prompt further analysis of the identified risk.
- The SORAG shows some consideration for responsivity issues (e.g. psychopathy).

### Other Considerations

- The SORAG is a risk assessment tool comprised solely of static variables and therefore it is not possible to select treatment targets, measure change or progress in treatment or predict the time frame in which an individual is likely to re-offend ([Yates, 2005](#)).
- The tool is time-consuming to administer and is more difficult to score as some of the items are taken from the VRAG.
- The tool relies on PCL:R rating scores as part of the predictive measurement.
- It has been found that the SORAG has better accuracy in predicting violent rather than sexual recidivism (see [Rettenberger and Eher, 2007](#)).
- Other investigations have found that this instrument has better predictive accuracy with different sub-groups of individuals who committed sexual offences ([Ducro and Pham, 2006](#)).

Name of Tool	Static-2002R
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Helmus and Colleagues
Year	2012

### Description

- It is a 14-item actuarial risk measure designed to predict sexual recidivism in adult males who have committed sex offences.
- The items presented in this measure are identical to those in the Static-2002 with the exception of the updated age weights (see [Helmus et al., 2012](#)). The revision was to improve consistency across scoring categories, conceptual clarity and predictive accuracy. These items are grouped into five categories: age at release, persistence of sex offending, sexual deviance, relationship to victims and general criminality ([Brouillette-Alarie, Prolux and Hanson, 2017](#)).
- Individuals can be placed into one of five categories based on their total score which range from low, low-moderate, moderate, moderate-high to high risk ([Babchishin, Hanson and Helmus, 2012](#)).
- The authors of the instrument recommend that the revised version of the scale (Static-2002R) replace the Static-2002 and the Static-99/Static-99R in all contexts where it is used ([Phenix et al., 2009](#)).

### Age Appropriateness

18+

### Assessor Qualifications

Experience in assessing sexual violence risk. Training on the instrument is highly recommended. Note that Static-99/R training is not sufficient to score Static-2002/R. The authors recommend that evaluators obtain Static-2002/R training before using the scale. <http://www.static99.org>

### Strengths

- Can be used by a variety of professionals such as psychologists, police officers and probation officers.
- The convergent validity of the Static-99R with the Static-2002R was found to be almost perfect, with a mean Cohen's Kappa of .86 (standard deviation=.18) ([Brouillette-Alarie, Prolux and Hanson, 2017](#)).

### Empirical Grounding



This tool is derived from the Static-99 and is grounded in research literature relating to sexual offending, as well as specific literature regarding the Static-99 ([Helmus, 2009](#)).

Inter-Rater Reliability									
a) UK Research	None available at present.								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Jung et al. (2017)</a> found that 4 of the Static-2002R items demonstrated relatively poor IRR limits; although this may be due to shortcomings in training for three out of the four.</li> </ul>								

Validation History									
General Predictive Accuracy									
a) UK Research	None available at present.								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AUC of the Static-2002R was .69 in a sample of 590 individuals who had committed sexual offences (<a href="#">Parent, Guay and Knight, 2011</a>).</li> <li>• In a sample of 342 individuals who had committed sexual offences, ROC analyses demonstrated an AUC of .769 (<a href="#">Jung et al., 2017</a>).</li> <li>• The AUC scores for 5, 10 and 15 year follow-ups in a sample of 621 Australian individuals convicted of sexual offences were .68, .67 and .69 (<a href="#">Reeves, Ogloff and Simmons, 2017</a>).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Babchishin, Hanson and Helmus (2012)</a> - the Static-2002R demonstrated accuracy in predicting sexual recidivism (AUC = .76).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Helmus et al. (2012)</a> observed a slight increase in the predictive accuracy of the Static-2002R compared to the Static-2002 for sexual recidivism at the 5-year follow-up period (AUCs = .713 and .709 respectively). For violent recidivism, however, there were no observed differences in the AUC values. None of the differences between the two scales were significant.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Babchishin, Hanson and Helmus (2011)</a> - the Static-2002R showed moderate accuracy in predicting sexual recidivism (AUC = .70).</li> </ul>								

## Validation History

<b>Applicability: Females</b>									
Not intended for use with females.									

<b>Validation History</b>									
<b>Applicability: Ethnic Minorities</b>									
a) UK Research	None available at present.								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Babchishin, Hanson and Helmus (2012)</a> – Aboriginal individuals had significantly higher composite scores than non-Aboriginals. The Static-2002R composite score did not significantly predict sexual recidivism for Aboriginal individuals.</li> <li>• In his doctoral thesis, <a href="#">Lee (2019)</a> conducted fixed-effect meta-analyses from five independent Canadian samples to test the predictive accuracy of the Static-2002R with White (n=1560) and Indigenous (n=653) groups. The Static-2002R was able to discriminate recidivists from non-recidivists in the group of White individuals (AUCs&gt;.69). For the Indigenous group, however, the predictive accuracy was not statistically significant (AUC&lt;.61). Consequently, extreme caution is urged when using Static-2002R with individuals of Indigenous heritage.</li> </ul>								

<b>Validation History</b>									
<b>Applicability: Mental Disorders</b>									
No empirical evidence available.									

<b>Contribution to Risk Practice</b>									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Static-2002R provides a brief scan of the risk of sexual recidivism and can prompt further assessment of identified risk factors.</li> </ul>									

<b>Other Considerations</b>									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited studies conducted by independent researchers.</li> <li>• Assessors are encouraged to use the BARR-2002R over the Static-2002R or the Static-99 when predicting violent or any recidivism (Babchishin 2019, personal communication).</li> </ul>									



- In a Master's thesis, [Rohrer \(2019\)](#) carried out factor analyses with a sample of individuals who had committed sexual offences (n=533). A potential new factor structure was proposed for the Static instruments: paedophilia factor, young antisociality factor, general criminality factor and agonistic continuum factor.
- [Hanson and colleagues \(2017\)](#) created five new risk categories for the Static instruments and found that this increased the concordance of risk classification from 51% to 72. It is theorised that the new common STATIC risk categories could inform intervention strategies.
- It is recommended that those in the community who are offence free for five years should have their risk category reduced by one level. The term 'offence free' is interpreted as no known criminal activity taking place, no convictions, no warnings, reprimands or breaches ([Hanson et al., 2014](#); [Hanson et al. \(2018\)](#)).
- For further information, please visit the following website; [www.static99.org](http://www.static99.org)

Name of Tool	Sexual Violence Risk-20 Version 2 (SVR-20 V2)
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Boer, Hart, Kropp and Webster
Year	2018

### Description

- SVR-20 is a 20-item structured framework published in 1998 intended to evaluate risk of sexual violence and informing risk management. A second version was published in 2018.
- The 20 items are organised under three subsections: (1) Psychosocial Adjustment, (2) Sexual Offences, and (3) Future Plans. The items covered in each subsection are: 1) psychological adjustment, sexual deviance, victim of child abuse, cognitive impairment, suicidal/homicidal ideation, relationship/employment problems, previous offence history (non-sexual violent, non-violent), psychopathy substance use problems and past supervision failure; 2) sexual offending – high density offences, multiple offences, physical harm to victims, use of weapons, escalation and cognitive distortions; 3) Future plans – lacks future (realistic plans) and has negative attitudes towards instruction. The items are coded as absent, possibly or partially present and present ([Hart and Boer, 2010](#)).
- The SVR-20 is based on structured clinical judgment and was developed for use with forensic mental health populations ([Parent, Guay and Knight, 2011](#)).

### Age Appropriateness

18+

### Assessor Qualifications

Assessors must possess the relevant training and experience in conducting sexual violence risk assessments. Certified workshops are available through the Global Institute of Forensic Research: <https://www.gifrinc.com/course/svr-20-demand-training/>

### Strengths

- The SVR-20 is useful in assisting the structuring of clinical assessments and also incorporates a 'recent change' score.

### Empirical Grounding



The SVR-20 was developed from a thorough consideration of the empirical literature concerning factors that relate to sexual violence. The twenty items found in the SVR-20 have appeared to exhibit a relevant association with sexual recidivism and appear to be relevant in regard to clinician experience ([Knight and Thornton, 2007](#)). The SVR-20 manual serves as an organised literature

review for sexual violence risk, simply listing research supporting each item found on this assessment (Witte, 2001).

Inter-Rater Reliability	
a) UK Research	None available at present.
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Knight and Thornton (2007)</a> - ICCs were below .70.</li> <li>• <a href="#">de Vogel et al. (2004)</a> - large ICC value of .75 observed for the SVR-20.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Sjöstedt and Långström (2002)</a> - Kappa values ranged from .60 and ICCs were also moderate (.62).</li> </ul>

Validation History	
General Predictive Accuracy	
a) UK Research	None available at present.
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Parent, Guay and Knight (2011)</a> found the SVR-20 yielded a moderate AUC of .66 for sexual recidivism in a sample of 590 sex offenders.</li> <li>• The SVR-20 was tested on 493 sex offenders from the Austrian prison system. It showed good predictive accuracy for the prediction of sexual recidivism for the entire sample (AUC=.72); although some inconsistencies were present based on recidivism criterion and offender subgroup (<a href="#">Rettenberger, Boer and Eher, 2011</a>).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Rettenberger et al. (2010)</a> - the SVR-20 scores were found to be highly associated with most types of recidivism for a subgroup of Extra-Familial Molest Offenders for a range of offences: sexual recidivism (r =.75), sexual violent recidivism = .51, general violent recidivism = .81 and general criminal recidivism = .77.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Hill et al. (2008)</a> - higher scores on the SVR-20 predicted higher recidivism rates within the sample of non-sexually violent (previous convictions) offenders.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Ramirez et al. (2008)</a> - ROC curve analysis demonstrated discriminate capacity for the SVR-20 with an AUC value of .83.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Knight and Thornton (2007)</a> - at the 3-, 10- and 15-year follow-up, the SVR-20 demonstrated moderate AUC values for serious sexual charges (.66, .68, and .68 respectively).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Kanters and colleagues (2017)</a> tested the SVR-20 on 639 sex offenders in a forensic psychiatrist centre. The pre-treatment SPJ score significantly predicted general recidivism (AUC=.71); whilst the post-treatment score significantly predicted sexual, violent and general recidivism with AUCs of .76, .75 and .70 respectively.</li> </ul>
--	---

Validation History									
Applicability: Females									
Not intended for use with female offenders.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Ethnic Minorities									
No empirical evidence at present.									

Validation History									
Applicability: Mental Disorders									
a) UK Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Craig et al. (2006a)</a> - the SVR-20 was only able to moderately predict offence reconviction for 'any offence' at the 5- and 10-year follow-up points in a sample of offenders referred to a regional secure unit (.61 and .60 respectively). It did not, however, significantly predict sexual and violent recidivism.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Craig et al. (2006b)</a> - the SVR-20 scores had small correlations with general recidivism in the follow-up 2-, 5- and 10-year periods which ranged between .18 to .24.</li> </ul>								
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Dietiker, Dittmann and Graf (2007)</a> - the SVR-20 was found to have good predictive capacity within hospital settings (AUC = .88).</li> <li>• <a href="#">Sjöstedt and Långström (2002)</a> - the SVR-20 did not significantly predict recidivism in a sample of personality disordered offenders.</li> </ul>								

### Contribution to Risk Practice

- The SVR-20 can aid detailed assessment of the risk of sexual recidivism.
- The SVR-20 can aid assessors in identifying risk and responsivity factors specific to the individual (e.g. criminal lifestyle, presence of mental health problems). The factors identified can also act as targets for change.
- The tool can contribute to the formulation of offence analyses and risk management strategies.

### Other Considerations

- The instrument itself is normed on adult males with a previous offence history and is deemed inappropriate for use with females or juveniles.
- [Blacker et al. \(2011\)](#) found the composite score achieved low to high AUC values in predicting sexual (.45), violent (.80) and general (.50) recidivism in a sample of offenders with learning disabilities.
- SVR-20 V2 is available through its publisher: <https://www.parinc.com/Products/Pkey/4534>

Name of Tool	Violence Risk Scale: Sexual Offenders (VRS:SO)
Category	Sexual Offending (Validated)
Author / Publisher	Wong, Olver. Nicholaichuk and Gordon
Year	2003

### Description

- The VRS:SO is a 24-item assessment derived from the original Violence Risk Scale (VRS).
- The VRS:SO is designed to assess risk of sexual recidivism in forensic populations.
- The tool is designed to measure change in the level of risk before and after treatment/intervention. The VRS:SO scores are used to inform case conceptualisation and treatment planning ([Olver et al., 2018b](#)).
- The measure is comprised of 7 static and 17 dynamic items which are empirically, theoretically or conceptually linked to sexual recidivism. It is measured on a 4-point scale from 0-3.
- The measure generates pre and post-treatment composite scores related to therapeutic change and risk change.

### Age Appropriateness

18+

### Assessor Qualifications

Assessors must possess the relevant training and experience in conducting sexual violence risk assessments. Assessors should also undergo the relevant training for this tool.


### Strengths


- The tool is deemed advantageous in regard to assessing risk and identifying an individual's motivation for change based on dynamic risk factors over the course of a period of time or treatment ([Maltais and Sribney, 2018](#)).
- [Olver et al. \(2016\)](#) found that the VRS-SO test scores demonstrated construct validity risk in those who committed sexual offences.
- The sexual deviance, criminality and treatment responsivity factors of the VRS:SO were found to correlate in significantly meaningful ways with the Stable 2000; thus, indicating its psychological constructs relate to risks and needs in terms of sexual offending ([Olver et al., 2018b](#)).
- The CPORT risk tool and CASIC scale ([Seto and Eke, 2015](#)) found that there were moderate positive correlations between the VRS:SO's criminality and sexual deviance scores respectively. This indicates an underlying construct for measuring risk in those who have committed only internet offences ([Maltais and Sribney, 2018](#)).

### Empirical Grounding



The Manual states that each of the static and dynamic items found in the tool are grounded in empirical research drawn from risk assessment literature, with theoretical underpinnings from Andrews and Bonta's (2010) Psychology of Criminal Conduct, advances in relapse prevention theory, and the 'Stages of Change' model ([Olver et al., 2014](#); [Prochaska and DiClemente, 1992](#)).

Inter-Rater Reliability	
a) UK Research	None available at present.
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Sowden (2013)</a> reported ICCs of .90 and .86 for pre-treatment and post-treatment total scores in a randomly selected subsample of treated high risk Canadian adult males.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Beggs and Grace (2010)</a> found excellent ICCs of .90 and .92 for the pre- and post-treatment dynamic total scores on the VRS:SO.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Olver et al. (2007)</a> - the VRS:SO also achieved high ICC values for the composite pre and post-treatment scores (.74 and .79 respectively).</li> </ul>

Validation History	
General Predictive Accuracy	
a) UK Research	None available at present.
b) International Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Eher and colleagues (2015)</a> administered a number of risk assessment tools to a sample of paedophilic individuals and carried out ROC and Cox Regression analyses to test predictive accuracy. The VRS:SO significantly predict sexual recidivism, more so than the PCL:R, Stable-2007 and Static-99/Stable-2007 combined score. Moreover, it was found that when this was combined with an exclusive diagnosis of paedophilia incremental validity was added.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Sowden (2013)</a> - pre and post-treatment scores on the VRS:SO were found to have moderate accuracy in predicting sexual (AUCs = .61 and .62, respectively) and violent (AUC = .63 and .66, respectively) recidivism in a sample of high risk Canadian males who had received treatment for their sexual offending.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Olver et al. (2012)</a> - pre and post-treatment scores were found to significantly predict sexual and violent recidivism (AUCs = .65 and .67 for pre and post- respectively across</li> </ul>

	<p>both outcomes) in a prospective multisite Canadian study of 571 individuals who had committed sexual offences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Beggs and Grace (2010)</a> found large AUCs of .78 for pre and .81 for post-treatment scores in relation to sexual recidivism.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Olver et al. (2007)</a> - the composite pre and post-treatment scores generated AUCs of .71 and .72 respectively.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Sowden and Olver (2017)</a> assessed a sample of 180 Canadian individuals who had committed sexual offences. VRS: SO scores were found to predict sexual, non-sexual violence, any violence (including sexual) and general recidivism.</li> <li>• In a sample of 539 individuals convicted of sexual offences in New Zealand and Canada, <a href="#">Olver et al. (2014)</a> found there was moderate to high predictive accuracy for a follow up average of fifteen and a half years.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Sowden and Olver (2017)</a> administered the VRS:SO to a Canadian sample of individuals who had committed sexual offences (n=180). Significant predictive accuracy was demonstrated for various types of recidivism: sexual, non-sexual violent, any violent and general. A reduction in all types of recidivism was evident in VRS:SO change scores.</li> <li>• A study by <a href="#">Olver and colleagues (2016)</a> of those who had committed sexual offences (n=668) found the VRS:SO items and total scores predicted sexual, violent and general recidivism for five and ten year follow-up periods.</li> </ul>
--	---

Validation History								
Applicability: Females								
No empirical evidence available.								

Validation History								
Applicability: Ethnic Minorities								
No empirical evidence available.								



## Validation History

Applicability: Mental Disorders

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

No empirical evidence available.

## Contribution to Risk Practice

- The VRS:SO can enable assessors to identify static and dynamic factors relevant to the risk of sexual reoffending.
- Many of the factors included in the VRS:SO can be used to identify treatment needs and for treatment planning.
- The tool can contribute towards the measurement of progress or deterioration in factors related to the individual's level of risk.
- The tool can aid assessors in the development of offence analyses and risk management strategies.
- Some VRS:SO items (e.g. community support, release to high risk situations) specifically address risk management responses of the individual in the community.
- [Olver \(2004\)](#) maintained "The use of logistic regression demonstrated a clinically useful and systematic means of combining risk and change information into post-treatment risk appraisals."
- Based on an initial investigation conducted by [Maltais and Sribney \(2018\)](#), there is evidence to suggest that the VRS:SO could be used with those who have only committed internet offences; although caution should be exercised until further research is conducted.

## Other Considerations

- The risk categories and recidivism estimates for the VRS:SO were recently updated by [Olver and colleagues \(2018a\)](#).