

# Coding Form Preamble

In some situations an item score may be tentative due to uncertainty about a decision (e.g., anticipated age at release) or insufficient or conflicting information (e.g., victim information) and it may make sense to complete separate coding sheets for both alternatives and clearly discuss the reason for the different scores and the associated impact on Static-99R results in all reports.

During audits of Static-99R scoring sheets the most commonly identified error is mechanical (e.g., incorrect summing of item scores). Consequently it is strongly recommended that evaluators sum the item scores and check the total at least twice. A mechanized process, such as specialized scoring software or an excel spreadsheet into which item scores may be entered and then summed electronically can be helpful to minimize mathematical errors.

Interestingly, Hanson, Helmus, and Harris (2015) found a meaningful difference between those community supervision officers who completed all the assessments requested of them and those officers who sent incomplete information (e.g., a STABLE score without a Static score). Among officers who completed all assessments, the predictive accuracy of Static-99R was very high (AUC = .80) and significantly higher than the Static-99R assessment of officers with incomplete assessment packages (AUC = .68). The lesson here is clear - commitment to the assessment can greatly improve your ability to predict sexual recidivism. Consequently, we recommend requiring evaluators to attest to the completeness of their scoring by signing the score sheet. Organizations may want to consider including a standard statement such as the one at the bottom of the coding form on the following page.

# Static-99R – TALLY SHEET

Assessment date: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of release from index sex offence: \_\_\_\_\_

Item #	Risk Factor	Codes		Score
1	Age at release from index sex offence	Aged 18 to 34.9 Aged 35 to 39.9 Aged 40 to 59.9 Aged 60 or older		1 0 -1 -3
2	Ever lived with a lover	Ever lived with lover for at least two years? Yes No		0 1
3	Index non-sexual violence - Any convictions	No Yes		0 1
4	Prior non-sexual violence - Any convictions	No Yes		0 1
5	Prior sex offences	<u>Charges</u> 0 1,2 3-5 6+	<u>Convictions</u> 0 1 2,3 4+	0 1 2 3
6	Four or more prior sentencing dates (excluding index)	3 or less 4 or more		0 1
7	Any convictions for non-contact sex offences	No Yes		0 1
8	Any unrelated victims	No Yes		0 1
9	Any stranger victims	No Yes		0 1
10	Any male victims	No Yes		0 1
	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Add up scores from individual risk factors</b>		

Nominal Risk Levels (2016 version)	<u>Total</u>	<u>Risk Level</u>
	-3, -2,	I - Very Low Risk
	-1, 0,	II - Below Average Risk
	1, 2, 3	III - Average Risk
	4, 5	IVa - Above Average Risk
	6 and higher	IVb - Well Above Average Risk

*There [ was, was not] sufficient information available to complete the Static-99R score following the coding manual (2016 version). I believe that this score [ fairly represents, does not fairly represent] the risk presented by Mr. XXXX at this time. Comments/Explanation: \_\_\_\_\_*

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Evaluator name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Evaluator signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)