ACUTE-2007 EVALUATOR WORKBOOK

REVISED 2019

Andrew E. Brankley, Kelly M. Babchishin, Lea Chankin, Ian Barsetti, & R. Karl Hanson

October 28, 2019

For more information, contact

Andrew E. Brankley, Ph.D., C.Psych. (Supervised Practice)	Kelly M. Babchishin, Ph.D.	Lea Chankin, Psy.D.	Ian Barsetti, Psy.D.	R. Karl Hanson, Ph.D., C.Psych.
(647) 444-7078	(613) 957-0021		(514) 283-1424 ext. 2297	
Andrew.Brankley@Psych.Ryerson.ca	Kelly.Babchishin@theroyal.ca	Lea.Chankin@cdcr.ca.gov	Ian.Barsetti@csc-scc.gc.ca	RKarlHanson@gmail.com
Carleton University 1125 Colonel By Dr. Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1S 5B6	Royal Ottawa Hospital 1145 Carling Ave. Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1Z 7K4	SARATSO 1515 S Street Sacramento, CA United States 95811	Correctional Services Canada 2030, boul Pie-IX, suite 420 Montréal, QC Canada H1V 2C8	Carleton University 1125 Colonel By Dr. Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1S 5B6

Author note: We would like to thank Marie-Hélène Dufresne, Yolanda Fernandez, Katie Gotch, Andrew J. R. Harris, Maaike Helmus, Anton Schweighofer, and Pamela Yates for helpful comments on earlier versions of this workbook.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

Overview

This document is the first technical and interpretative workbook for evaluators using ACUTE-2007. It updates and replaces the appendices and supplementary materials found in the July 2015 version of the ACUTE-2007 Coding Manual (Fernandez, Gotch, Hanson, & Harris, 2015) and all other previous versions.

ACUTE-2007 is a measure of recent, risk-relevant behaviours and circumstances of adult males under community supervision for a sexually motivated offence against an identifiable person (i.e., same inclusion criteria as STABLE-2007; Fernandez, Harris, Hanson, & Sparks, 2014). It was developed for use with individuals who have access or opportunities to reoffend in the community. ACUTE-2007 was first described in a government report (Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007).

This workbook should be used in conjunction with the 2015 Revised ACUTE-2007 Coding Manual (Fernandez et al., 2015). Evaluators interested in using ACUTE-2007 must receive training from a certified trainer. For a list of certified Static/STABLE/ACUTE trainers contact Dr. Dana Anderson at dana.anderson@rogers.com. For a list of certified STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 trainers contact Dr. Maaike Helmus at Lmaaikehelmus@gmail.com.

Why have an Evaluator Workbook for ACUTE-2007?

This document contains updated psychometric information on ACUTE-2007 (i.e., percentiles, distributions), and rules for interpreting ACUTE-2007 scores using the five Standardized Risk Levels (Hanson, Babchishin, Helmus, Thornton, & Phenix, 2017; Hanson, Bourgon, et al., 2017).

The purpose of using the Standardized Risk Levels in this workbook is part of a larger movement to improve risk communication. Advances in risk assessment have led to a variety of risk tools, each with different sets of items and scoring rules. The convention of using nominal risk levels (e.g., "low," "high") to interpret scores inhibits comparisons across scales. The standardized risk framework is a non-arbitrary method for defining levels of risk based upon thresholds relevant for decision making (i.e., absolute risk and relative risk), provides guidance on the dosage of intervention efforts, and is independent of any single tool. For more information on the Standardized Risk Levels see Appendix A, "Standardized Risk Levels for Sexual Offending."

This document provides guidance on combining ACUTE-2007 with the Standardized Risk Levels estimated by Static-99R/STABLE-2007. Guidance on combining ACUTE-2007 with Static-2002R/STABLE-2007 and Risk Matrix 2000/STABLE-2007 will be provided in future documents once the necessary data is available.

This workbook contains several useful resources for evaluators, including an updated ACUTE-2007 Tally Sheet, an updated ACUTE-2007 Tally Sheet (with Example Questions), a new ACUTE-2007 Summary Sheet, and a variety of new ACUTE-2007 report writing templates.

For a video overview of this workbook, please go to http://youtube.com/c/AndrewBrankley.

Overview of ACUTE-2007 Development and Normative Data

How was ACUTE-2007 developed?

ACUTE-2007 was developed in Canada as part of the Dynamic Supervision Project. The Dynamic Supervision Project was a federal/provincial/territorial research collaboration initiated in 2000 by Public Safety Canada (then Solicitor General Canada) and was intended to improve risk assessment for adult males convicted of a sexual offence and on community supervision. For more information, please see the government report (Hanson et al., 2007).

Static/STABLE/ACUTE scores were collected by 149 probation or parole officers during routine community supervision of adult males recently convicted of sexual offences in Canada, and two U.S. states (Alaska and Iowa) (n = 739). The majority of supervising officers attended a two-day training session, although, in rare cases, some officers submitting data had been trained by apprenticing with other local officers. Officers were instructed to score ACUTE-2000 every supervision visit (but not more than once a week). The results of the study were used to refine ACUTE-2000, producing ACUTE-2007. The interpretation of ACUTE-2007 was subsequently updated based on new analyses (Babchishin, 2013).

Collection of Additional Normative Data

A second sample (n = 4,161) from British Columbia, Canada, was added to the data collected from the Dynamic Supervision Project for the normative data (Hanson, Helmus, Babchishin, & Zabarauckas, 2017). Beginning in 2005, British Columbia's community supervision officers began using ACUTE with all adult males who had a sexually motivated offence. This included convictions and charges that did not result in convictions. Although the inclusion of individuals with charges is a deviation from the inclusion rules, they represent a small percentage of this sample. Individuals had either provincial sentences or federal sentences (incarceration for two years or more) during the study period. We consider this additional sample to be fairly representative of the overall/routine population of adult males convicted of sexual offences in the province of British Columbia as it represents all such individuals who had received such an assessment until June 4, 2013. Based on self-report, individuals were grouped into one of six ethnic groups: Caucasian (n = 2,524; 60.7%), East Asian, including China, Japan, and Korea (n = 110, 2.6%), South Asian, including all of the Indian sub-continent (n = 153, 3.7%), Black (n = 61, 1.5%), Latino (n = 58, 1.4%), and Indigenous Canadians, including Inuit and Métis (n = 879, 21.1%). The ethnicity of a small group of individuals (n = 220, 5.3%) were classified as "other"; they represented ethnic groups such as Middle Eastern, Pacific Asian, or those who chose not to respond. Data on ethnicity were not available for a small number of individuals (n = 141, 3.4%).

Timing of the Assessment

In both samples, individuals were scored multiple times on ACUTE-2007. The timing of the assessments varied within and between samples. In the British Columbia sample, officers were mandated to complete ACUTE-2007 assessments as part of policy and the data was automatically recorded within the system. Use of ACUTE-2007 in the Dynamic Supervision Project was voluntary and required officers to send data. The timing between successive assessments (i.e., first, second, third...) was highly variable as a result of these different procedures. The first assessment provided in the first 30 days of community release provided a consistent point to generate normative data for interpretation. No missing items in ACUTE-2007 were permitted.

Interpretation of ACUTE-2007 Scores

What do ACUTE-2007 scores mean and how do I communicate that to others?

ACUTE-2007 is designed to assess recent, risk-relevant behaviour and circumstances of adult males convicted of sexual offences in the community (i.e., those who have access or opportunities to re-offend). Acute risk factors are those that change in the short term (days, weeks, or months). These factors are current expressions of chronic risk-relevant propensities or circumstances (e.g., loss of a loved one). We recommend that ACUTE-2007 be used in conjunction with a structured method of risk/needs assessment and case formulation (e.g., with Static 99R/2002R and STABLE-2007). Interpretation is most accurate when based on the most recent scoring of ACUTE-2007 (Babchishin, 2013).

ACUTE-2007 Items

ACUTE-2007 is composed of seven items: Victim Access, Hostility, Sexual Preoccupation, Rejection of Supervision, Emotional Collapse, Change in Social Supports, and Substance Abuse. Each item is scored on a four-level rating system described below in Table 1. The interpretations of these scores are intended to support decision making, not to overrule local or jurisdictional procedures or guidelines.

Table 1. ACUTE-2007 Item Scores and their Interpretations

Score	Interpretation
0	Not present, not a problem, not an ongoing topic of supervision
1	Maybe present, unsure, a minor problem, a secondary topic of attention during supervision
2	Present, a concern, a problem worthy of sustained attention, a regular topic in supervision sessions
3	Intervene now, immediate attention and timely response are indicated based upon the current evidence

ACUTE-2007 Total Scores

ACUTE-2007 items are summed together to produce a total score ranging from 0 to 21. Previous materials described this as the "Total/General Recidivism Score" and instructed evaluators to sum four items to create a "Sex/Violence Score". Based on further research, using two separate scores for interpretation is no longer recommended. Instead, we recommend using all seven items for assessing the risk of both sexual and general (any) offending.

Interpreting ACUTE-2007 scores within the Standardized Risk Level framework

ACUTE-2007 should not be interpreted alone. The distribution of ACUTE-2007 items and total scores vary greatly based upon the individual's risk level (as determined by Static-99R and STABLE-2007). Consequently, Evaluators should interpret ACUTE-2007 items in the context of the individual's overall risk formulation and standardized risk level. See the next section for more information on "Combining ACUTE-2007 with Static-99R/STABLE-2007."

Evaluators may be forced to interpret ACUTE-2007 alone, potentially because they are required to score risk tools other than Static-99R and STABLE-2007. For these situations, percentile tables that are not stratified by Standardized Risk Level have been created and included in Appendix E. This table provides a less precise estimate of relative risk as the density of ACUTE-2007 scores vary significantly by Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level. Evaluators should note this limitation of using ACUTE-2007 alone in their documentation.

Combining ACUTE-2007 with Static-99R/STABLE-2007

Why are there new combination rules and how do I use them?

Static-99R, STABLE-2007, and ACUTE-2007 provide non-redundant empirically-supported information about an individual's risk to sexually reoffend. This section provides mechanical rules for combining the most recent ACUTE-2007 score with information from Static-99R and STABLE-2007 for a comprehensive appraisal of risk. For more information of the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 combination rules, please see the 2017 Revised STABLE-2007 Evaluator Workbook (Brankley, Helmus, & Hanson, 2017; see Appendix C: "Rules for Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R"). See Appendix D for information on the development of the Static-99R/STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 combination rules.

Conceptually, individuals are initially placed in the Standardized Risk Levels using information from criminal history and demographics (i.e., the STATIC tools). Individuals may move up or down a risk level if an interview and file review indicate the presence of more (or less) risk-relevant problems than expected (i.e., STABLE-2007, see Appendix C). Information about day-to-day functioning can provide initial evidence of improvement or deterioration (i.e., ACUTE-2007). Someone at a higher risk level is, however, expected to be more problematic than someone at a lower risk level. To capture variations in the density of risk-relevant problems, an individual's ACUTE-2007 should be compared with others within their own risk level. Current risk may be a) typical of others at that risk level, b) less than others at the same risk level, or c) greater than others at the same risk level. The rules for combining ACUTE-2007 with Static-99R/STABLE-2007 can be found in Table 2. A three-step approach for using Table 2 is described below:

A Three-Step Approach	Example	
(1) Identify the **row** with the **S99R/S07 Standardized Risk Level**	Standardized Risk Level	II
(2) Identify the **column** with the **ACUTE-2007** total score	ACUTE-2007	5
(3) Find the cell where the **RISK LEVEL row** and **ACUTE column** intersect	Higher Than Expected	↑

Using Percentile Rankings for Interpretation and Communication of Relative Risk

ACUTE-2007 is a measure of *relative* risk for sexual offending. In other words, how unusual is an individual's current functioning *as compared to* the average person at the same risk level. The comparison point is the first ACUTE-2007 scores from the overall/routine population of adult males convicted of a sexually motivated offence (N = 4,043). First assessment scores were used to create a common point of comparison throughout an individual's reassessments.

We recommend using percentile ranks to compare an individual's ACUTE-2007 scores to the normative sample. Percentile ranks help evaluators describe what percentage of the normative group had higher or lower risk. The unusualness of an individual's ACUTE-2007 score varies significantly by Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level (see Table 3); this is why we do not recommend interpreting ACUTE-2007 item or total scores on their own.

Tables 4 through 13 present the distribution of ACUTE-2007 item and total scores for Levels I through IVb respectively. Interpretative information includes the observed percentage of individuals who obtained a similar, lower, or higher score, and the same percentages centered on the midpoint of the interval (to account for ties; see Crawford, Garthwaite, & Slick, 2009). Crawford and colleagues (2009) expressed a preference for percentiles centered on the midpoint. Evaluators are encouraged to choose the format that best suits their risk communication needs.

Table 2. Rules for Interpreting ACUTE-2007 scores with combined Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Levels

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels	ACUTE-2007 Score: 0	1	2	3	4	5	6 +
Level I	—	—	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Level II	—	—	—	—	↑	↑	↑
Level III	—	—	—	—	—	↑	↑
Level IVa	↓	—	—	—	—	—	↑
Level IVb	↓	↓	—	—	—	—	—

Legend

↑	Higher Than Expected
—	As Expected
↓	Lower Than Expected

Table 3. Percentiles for ACUTE-2007 scores combined with Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Levels at First Assessment (*n* = 4,043)

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels	ACUTE-2007 Scores						
	0	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6 +**
Level Ia	25.0	63.0	85.0	96.3	≥ 99.2	-	-
Level II	21.0	57.0	78.0	90.0	95.5	98.0	≥ 99.3
Level III	15.0	44.0	67.0	82.0	90.0	95.1	≥ 97.7
Level IVa	8.0	24.0	44.0	61.0	74.0	83.0	≥ 89.0
Level IVbb	3.1	11.0	22.0	34.0	46.0	59.0	> 69.0

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 571) and BC Corrections (*n* = 3,472). Midpoint averages were computed using the method described in Hanson, Lloyd, Helmus, & Thornton, 2012. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release. Cases were included if there were no missing items in their ACUTE-2007. a No one scored above a score 4 on ACUTE-2007 at Level 1 of the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 combination. b Additional percentiles for Level IVb: score of 7: 77.0, score of 8: 84.0, score of 9: 89.0, score of 10+: >93.0.

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Level I - "Very Low Risk"

Table 4. Percentiles for ACUTE-2007 Total Scores at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level I (*n* = 256)

Density of Risk-Relevant Behaviour	Score	Frequency	Defined as Midpoint Average			Observed Percentages		
			Percentile Rank	95% CI		Below	Same	Higher
				LL	UL			
As Expected	0	126	25.0	1.1	49.4	0	49.2	50.8
	1	70	63.0	47.7	77.6	49.2	27.3	23.4
Higher Than Expected	2	45	85.0	74.7	94.6	76.6	17.6	5.8
	3	11	96.3	92.2	99.0	94.1	4.3	1.6
	4+	4	≥ 99.2	97.0	100.0	98.4	1.6	0.0

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 29) and BC Corrections (*n* = 227). Average score was 0.8, with a standard deviation of 1.0; Median of 1. No individuals placed in Level 1 scored 5 or higher on ACUTE-2007. Midpoint averages were computed using the method described in Hanson et al., 2012. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in their ACUTE-2007.

Table 5. Distribution of ACUTE-2007 Items at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level I (*n* = 256)

ACUTE-2007 Items	% (*n*) With Same Score			
	0 "No"	1 "Maybe"	2 "Yes"	3 "Intervene Now"
1) Victim Access	79.7 (204)	19.5 (50)	0.8 (2)	0.0 (0)
2) Hostility	93.8 (240)	5.9 (15)	0.4 (1)	0.0 (0)
3) Sexual Drive/ Preoccupation	92.2 (236)	7.8 (20)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
4) Rejection of Supervision	97.7 (250)	2.3 (6)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
5) Emotional Collapse	82.8 (212)	17.2 (44)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
6) Change in Social Supports	88.3 (226)	10.9 (28)	0.8 (2)	0.0 (0)
7) Substance Abuse	87.5 (224)	10.9 (28)	1.6 (4)	0.0 (0)

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 29) and BC Corrections (*n* = 227). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007.

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Level II - "Below Average Risk"

Table 6. Percentiles for ACUTE-2007 Total Scores at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level II (*n* = 826)

Density of Risk-Relevant Behaviour	Score	Frequency	Defined as Midpoint Average			Observed Percentages		
			Percentile Rank	95% CI		Below	Same	Higher
				LL	UL			
As Expected	0	352	21.0	1.0	42.0	0.0	42.6	57.4
	1	233	57.0	42.6	70.7	42.6	28.2	29.2
	2	122	78.0	70.1	85.9	70.8	14.8	14.4
	3	68	90.0	84.8	94.2	85.6	8.2	6.2
Higher Than Expected	4	27	95.5	93.0	97.5	93.8	3.3	2.9
	5	15	98.0	96.4	99.2	97.1	1.8	1.1
	6+	9	≥ 99.3	98.3	99.8	98.9	0.7	0.4

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 103) and BC Corrections (*n* = 723). Average score was 1.1, with a standard deviation of 1.3; Median of 1. No individuals placed in Level II scored above 6 on the ACUTE-2007. Midpoint averages were computed using the method described in Hanson et al., 2012. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007. Percentiles and observed percentages were computed based on all available data but interpretative information was truncated when scores had *n* < 10.

Table 7. Distribution of ACUTE-2007 Items at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level II (*n* = 826)

ACUTE-2007 Items	% (*n*) With Same Score			
	0 "No"	1 "Maybe"	2 "Yes"	3 "Intervene Now"
1) Victim Access	78.8 (651)	19.5 (161)	1.5 (12)	0.2 (2)
2) Hostility	91.5 (756)	8.1 (67)	0.4 (3)	0.0 (0)
3) Sexual Drive/ Preoccupation	86.4 (714)	12.8 (106)	0.7 (6)	0.0 (0)
4) Rejection of Supervision	92.3 (762)	7.3 (60)	0.5 (4)	0.0 (0)
5) Emotional Collapse	78.6 (649)	20.8 (172)	0.5 (4)	0.1 (1)
6) Change in Social Supports	84.9 (701)	14.3 (118)	0.7 (6)	0.1 (1)
7) Substance Abuse	82.9 (685)	15.3 (126)	1.8 (15)	0.0 (0)

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 103) and BC Corrections (*n* = 723). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007.

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Level III - "Average Risk"

Table 8. Percentiles for ACUTE-2007 Total Scores at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level III (*n* = 1,613)

Density of Risk-Relevant Behaviour	Score	Frequency	Defined as Midpoint Average			Observed Percentages		
			Percentile Rank	95% CI		Below	Same	Higher
				LL	UL			
As Expected	0	480	15.0	0.7	29.3	0.0	29.8	70.2
	1	446	44.0	30.1	57.1	29.8	27.6	42.6
	2	316	67.0	57.4	76.9	57.4	19.6	23.0
	3	160	82.0	76.6	87.1	77.0	9.9	13.1
	4	103	90.0	86.4	93.5	86.9	6.4	6.7
Higher Than Expected	5	59	95.1	92.8	97.2	93.3	3.6	3.0
	6	25	97.7	96.5	98.7	97.0	1.5	1.5
	7	11	98.9	98.1	99.4	98.5	0.7	0.8
	8+	13	≥ 99.4	98.8	99.8	99.2	0.4	0.4

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 247) and BC Corrections (*n* = 1,366). Average score was 1.6, with a standard deviation of 1.7; Median of 1. No individuals placed in Level III scored 9 or higher on the ACUTE-2007. Midpoint averages were computed using the method described in Hanson et al., 2012. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007. Percentiles and observed percentages were computed based on all available data but interpretative information was truncated when scores had *n* < 10.

Table 9. Distribution of ACUTE-2007 Items at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level III (*n* = 1,613)

ACUTE-2007 Items	% (*n*) With Same Score			
	0 "No"	1 "Maybe"	2 "Yes"	3 "Intervene Now"
1) Victim Access	72.0 (1,161)	26.2 (422)	1.7 (27)	0.2 (3)
2) Hostility	84.5 (1,363)	14.1 (227)	1.4 (22)	0.1 (1)
3) Sexual Drive/ Preoccupation	82.4 (1,329)	16.1 (259)	1.5 (24)	0.1 (1)
4) Rejection of Supervision	85.2 (1,375)	13.7 (221)	0.8 (13)	0.2 (4)
5) Emotional Collapse	75.3 (1,215)	22.3 (360)	2.1 (34)	0.2 (4)
6) Change in Social Supports	82.4 (1,329)	16.6 (267)	1.1 (17)	0.0 (0)
7) Substance Abuse	72.8 (1,174)	21.4 (345)	5.3 (85)	0.6 (9)

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 247) and BC Corrections (*n* = 1,366). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007.

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Level IVa - "Above Average Risk"

Table 10. Percentiles for ACUTE-2007 Total Scores at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level IVa (*n* = 779)

Density of Risk-Relevant Behaviour	Score	Frequency	Defined as Midpoint Average			Observed Percentages		
			Percentile Rank	95% CI		Below	Same	Higher
				LL	UL			
Lower than Expected	0	123	8.0	0.3	16.1	0.0	15.8	84.2
As Expected	1	133	24.0	15.5	33.5	15.8	17.1	67.1
	2	167	44.0	32.5	54.7	32.9	21.4	45.7
	3	108	61.0	53.3	69.0	54.3	13.9	31.8
	4	87	74.0	67.1	80.1	68.2	11.2	20.7
	5	55	83.0	78.1	87.3	79.3	7.1	13.6
Higher than Expected	6	48	89.0	85.4	93.2	86.4	6.2	7.4
	7	20	94.0	91.4	95.9	92.6	2.6	4.9
	8	19	96.3	94.2	98.0	95.1	2.4	2.4
	9+	19	≥ 97.9	96.6	98.9	97.6	0.8	1.7

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 125) and BC Corrections (*n* = 654). Average score was 2.8, with a standard deviation of 2.4; Median of 2. No individuals placed in Level IVa scored above 9 on the ACUTE-2007. Midpoint averages were computed using the method described in Hanson et al., 2012. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007. Percentiles and observed percentages were computed based on all available data but interpretative information was truncated when scores had *n* < 10.

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Level IVa - "Above Average Risk"

Table 11. Distribution of ACUTE-2007 Items at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level IVa (*n* = 779)

ACUTE-2007 Items	% (*n*) With Same Score			
	0 "No"	1 "Maybe"	2 "Yes"	3 "Intervene Now"
1) Victim Access	60.3 (470)	34.0 (265)	5.1 (40)	0.5 (4)
2) Hostility	69.8 (544)	25.8 (201)	4.1 (32)	0.3 (2)
3) Sexual Drive/ Preoccupation	70.0 (545)	26.8 (209	3.0 (23)	0.3 (2)
4) Rejection of Supervision	69.8 (544)	23.2 (181)	5.9 (46)	1.0 (8)
5) Emotional Collapse	65.0 (506)	31.3 (244)	3.2 (25)	0.5 (4)
6) Change in Social Supports	71.0 (553)	25.2 (196)	3.6 (28)	0.3 (2)
7) Substance Abuse	57.3 (446)	28.5 (222)	13.4 (104)	0.9 (7)

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 125) and BC Corrections (*n* = 654). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007.

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Level IVb - "Well Above Average Risk"

Table 12. Percentiles for ACUTE-2007 Total Scores at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level IVb (*n* = 569)

Density of Risk-Relevant Behaviour	Score	Frequency	Defined as Midpoint Average			Observed Percentages		
			Percentile Rank	95% CI		Below	Same	Higher
				LL	UL			
Lower Than Expected	0	35	3.1	0.1	6.9	0.0	6.2	93.8
	1	52	11.0	5.7	26.4	6.2	9.1	84.7
As Expected	2	72	22.0	14.5	29.2	15.3	12.6	72.0
	3	64	34.0	26.6	40.8	27.9	11.2	60.8
	4	81	46.0	37.9	54.7	39.2	14.2	46..6
	5	64	59.0	51.8	66.2	53.4	11.2	35.3
	6	48	69.0	62.8	74.7	64.7	8.4	26.9
	7	46	77.0	71.4	82.5	73.1	8.1	18.8
	8	28	84.0	79.3	87.5	81.2	4.9	13.9
	9	31	89.0	84.6	92.5	86.1	5.4	8.4
	10	14	93.0	90.0	95.1	91.6	2.5	6.0
	11	11	95.0	92.6	96.9	94.0	1.9	4.0
	12+	23	≥96.7	94.7	98.1	96.0	1.4	2.6

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 67) and BC Corrections (*n* = 502). Average score was 4.8, with a standard deviation of 3.3; Median of 4. No individuals placed in Level IVb scored above a score of 18 on the ACUTE-2007. Midpoint averages were computed using the method described in Hanson et al., 2012. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007. Percentiles and observed percentages were computed based on all available data but interpretative information was truncated when scores had *n* < 10. There are no ACUTE-2007 scores that are higher than expected for Level IVb offenders.

Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Risk Level IVb - "Well Above Average Risk"

Table 13. Distribution of ACUTE-2007 Items at First Assessment for Individuals in Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Level IVb (*n* = 569)

ACUTE-2007 Items	**% (*n*) With Same Score**			
	0 "No"	1 "Maybe"	2 "Yes"	3 "Intervene Now"
1) Victim Access	43.2 (246)	40.1 (228)	14.8 (84)	1.9 (11)
2) Hostility	48.7 (277)	36.2 (206)	14.2 (81)	0.9 (5)
3) Sexual Drive/ Preoccupation	46.2 (263)	39.7 (226)	12.8 (73)	0.9 (5)
4) Rejection of Supervision	46.7 (266)	38.0 (216)	13.0 (74)	2.3 (13)
5) Emotional Collapse	51.7 (294)	36.6 (208)	10.7 (61)	1.1 (6)
6) Change in Social Supports	56.4 (321)	32.7 (186)	10.2 (58)	0.7 (4)
7) Substance Abuse	48.0 (273)	28.6 (163)	20.2 (115)	3.2 (18)

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 67) and BC Corrections (*n* = 502). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in the ACUTE-2007.

ACUTE-2007 Resources

Video Resources (Available from Andrew Brankley's YouTube Channel)
- Overview of the workbook: https://youtu.be/T8stKnPzYtw
- Explaination of combination rules: https://youtu.be/bw6boACnBMs
- Standardized Risk Levels
  - Part 1, Why Standardize Risk Communication: https://youtu.be/5DT6Juw0Epk
  - Part 2, What is the Standardized Risk Language: https://youtu.be/xrH0Qzc6GWI

ACUTE-2007 Tally Sheet

Evaluee: _____ Date: _____

Context: _____ Period: _____

ACUTE-2007 Items	Not Present	Maybe Present	Present	Intervene Now
1. Victim Access	0	1	2	3
Notes				
2. Hostility	0	1	2	3
Notes				
3. Sexual Preoccupation	0	1	2	3
Notes				
4. Rejection of Supervision	0	1	2	3
Notes				
5. Emotional Collapse	0	1	2	3
Notes				
6. Change in Social Supports	0	1	2	3
Notes				
7. Substance Abuse	0	1	2	3
Notes				
ACUTE-2007 Total Score:			Any 3s/ Intervene Now: ☐ Yes ☐ No	

Static 99R/STABLE-07 Standardized Risk Level	ACUTE-2007 Scores 0	1	2	3	4	5	6 +
☐ Level I	—	—	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
☐ Level II	—	—	—	—	↑	↑	↑
☐ Level III	—	—	—	—	—	↑	↑
☐ Level IVa	↓	—	—	—	—	—	↑
☐ Level IVb	↓	↓	—	—	—	—	—

Note: "Lower than Expected" ↓, "As Expected" —, "Higher Than Expected" ↑

Overall Interpretation: _____ expected for a Level _____

Risk Management Response: _____

Evaluator Name:_____ Evaluator Signature: _____

ACUTE-2007 Tally Sheet

Evaluee: Joe Smith Date: February 17, 2018

Context: Parole (Toronto Parole Office) Period: Past two weeks (since February 2)

ACUTE-2007 Items	Not Present	Maybe Present	Present	Intervene Now
1. Victim Access	0	**1**	2	3
Notes Contact with adult female dancer—not a former intimate partner, possible vulnerable female				
2. Hostility	**0**	1	2	3
Notes No evidence				
3. Sexual Preoccupation	0	1	**2**	3
Notes Went to strip club, "hooked up" with a dancer—possible indicators of sex as coping				
4. Rejection of Supervision	0	1	**2**	3
Notes Violated conditions by going to a strip club & alcohol use				
5. Emotional Collapse	0	1	**2**	3
Notes Expresses hopelessness, breaks down, uncertain of what to do, panic				
6. Change in Social Supports	**0**	1	2	3
Notes No evidence				
7. Substance Abuse	0	1	**2**	3
Notes Alcohol use at strip club, intoxicated				
ACUTE-2007 Total Score: 9			Any 3s/ Intervene Now: ☐ Yes ☑ No	

Static 99R/STABLE-07 Standardized Risk Level	ACUTE-2007 Scores 0	1	2	3	4	5	6 +
☐ Level I	—	—	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
☑ Level II	—	—	—	—	↑	↑	**↑**
☐ Level III	—	—	—	—	—	↑	↑
☐ Level IVa	↓	—	—	—	—	—	↑
☐ Level IVb	↓	↓	—	—	—	—	—

Note: "Lower than Expected" ↓, "As Expected" —, "Higher Than Expected" ↑

Overall Interpretation: Higher than expected for a Level II

Risk Management Response: Meet weekly instead of bi-weekly, consult with treatment providers

Evaluator Name: Helen Li Evaluator Signature: H Li

ACUTE-2007 Tally Sheet (with Example Questions)

Evaluee: _____ Date: _____

Context: _____ Period: _____

ACUTE-2007 Items	Not Present	Maybe Present	Present	Intervene Now
1. Victim Access	0	1	2	3
How have you been spending your time since we last met? What have you been doing for fun? Who have you been spending your time with since we last met? Are there any new people in your life? Has anyone expressed concern about anything you've done or any place you have been since we last met? Is there anyone you have come into contact with since we last met that I would be concerned about or that someone else might be concerned about? Are there any behaviours, contacts, or situations you need to or should report to me or that someone else might think you need to or should report? You went to group/doctor's office/support meeting/etc. – how did you get there and how did you get back? *Notes:*				
2. Hostility	0	1	2	3
Tell me about your recent interactions with other people. Describe the most positive interaction. Describe the most negative interaction. Do you feel like you are generally being treated fairly? If not, in what ways do you feel people are being unfair to you? What is the most irritated you have been since the last time I saw you? How did you handle it? How is your relationship going with your girlfriend/wife/partner? How do you feel that your girlfriend/wife/partner is treating you? How are you dealing with problems in your relationship? What about other women in your life? (ask about female probation/parole officers, lawyers, judges, psychologists, program staff, family members, etc.) *Notes:*				

3. Sexual Preoccupation	0	1	2	3

Tell me how and where you access the internet? How much time do you spend on the internet each day? How often do you view any type of erotica or sexual content on the internet? How much have you been thinking about sex since we last met? More or less than usual? What do you think about? How many times have you masturbated since we last met? Is that more or less than usual? How many times have you had sex with someone else? With whom? How many times have you looked at pornography? Attended a strip club? Massage parlour? Had phone sex? Been in a sexually oriented chat room on the internet? How often do you talk about sex with your friends on average? How important is sex to you on a day to day basis? Does this vary depending upon stress or how busy you are or how bored you are? Are there times when you think more about sex? Sometimes when people are having problems they think about sex more or have more sex in order to feel better - does that happen to you? Has it lately? What do you typically do to cope with problems? Do you ever feel sexual tension build up in you? What do you do to deal with it? Since we last met have you noticed any changes in your sexual drive, thoughts or behaviour?

Notes:

4. Rejection of Supervision	0	1	2	3

Is there something I could do to help you comply with your conditions? How have you been spending your time since we last met? Any behaviour or activities since our last meeting you need to discuss with me? Have you found it difficult to comply with all the requirements/conditions since your release? How do you feel about living with these requirements/conditions? Do you have any concerns about your ability to follow (or abide by) your conditions and other directions between now and our next meeting? Is there something else you could do that would help you comply with your conditions?

Notes:

5. Emotional Collapse	0	1	2	3

How have you been spending your time since we last met? What have you been doing for fun? How are you feeling today? How have you been feeling since we last met? Have there been any significant changes in your life since we last met? What is the worst you have felt since we last met? What happened? How did you handle the situation? Have you felt like you were going to "lose it" since we last met? How do you feel you are coping with daily problems? What are you doing to cope? How are you getting along with people in your life?

Notes:

6. Change in Social Supports	0	1	2	3

When you think about the people who are important to you, have there been any changes in your relationship with them since we last met? How are you getting along with your friends these days? Are you worried about any of your relationships? Have there been any conflicts? Have you made any new friends or associates since we last met? Have you re-connected with anyone from your past lately? What are you doing in your spare time socially? Are you part of any teams, groups or organizations? Have there been any changes to how you are spending your social time?

Notes:

7. Substance Abuse	0	1	2	3
Have you used alcohol and/or drugs since we last met? Do you have friends who are currently drinking or using drugs? How often do you spend time with them? Are you on any medication prescribed by a doctor? What medication and how much? Do you ever forget to take your medication? Do you ever take more of your medication than prescribed? Do you ever feel like taking more of your medication than prescribed? What do you do when you feel like taking more than you should? How much have you had to drink/use since our last appointment? How were you feeling before drinking/using? Did your substance use have any consequences for you? Do you feel you are struggling not to drink or use drugs? *Notes:*				
ACUTE-2007 Total Score:			Any 3s/ Intervene Now: ☐ Yes ☐ No	

Static 99R/STABLE-07 Standardized Risk Level	ACUTE-2007 Scores 0	1	2	3	4	5	6 +
☐ Level I	—	—	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
☐ Level II	—	—	—	—	↑	↑	↑
☐ Level III	—	—	—	—	—	↑	↑
☐ Level IVa	↓	—	—	—	—	—	↑
☐ Level IVb	↓	↓	—	—	—	—	—

Note: "Lower than Expected" ↓, "As Expected" —, "Higher Than Expected" ↑

Overall Interpretation: _____ expected for a Level _____

Risk Management Response: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Evaluator Name:_____ Evaluator Signature: _____

ACUTE-2007 Summary Sheet

Evaluee: _____ **Context of Evaluation: _____**

ACUTE-2007 Items 0 "Not Present" 1 "Maybe Present" 2 "Present" 3 "Intervene Now"																				
	Year																			
	Month																			
	Day																			
1) Victim Access																				
2) Hostility																				
3) Sexual Preoccupation																				
4) Rejection of Supervision																				
5) Emotional Collapse																				
6) Change in Social Supports																				
7) Substance Abuse																				
ACUTE-2007 Total Score																				

Static-99R Score:																				
STABLE-2007 Score																				
Standardized Risk Level																				

Interpretation of Current Risk

↑ "Higher Than Expected"																				
— "As Expected"																				
↓ "Lower Than Expected"																				

Evaluator Name: _____ Evaluator Signature:_____

ACUTE-2007 Summary Sheet

Evaluee: Joe Smith **Context of Evaluation:** Parole

ACUTE-2007 Items 0 "Not Present" 1 "Maybe Present" 2 "Present" 3 "Intervene Now"																				
	Year	18	18	18	18															
	Month	2	2	2	3															
	Day	16	20	26	9															
1) Victim Access		1	0	0	0															
2) Hostility		0	0	0	0															
3) Sexual Preoccupation		2	1	1	1															
4) Rejection of Supervision		2	0	0	0															
5) Emotional Collapse		2	1	1	1															
6) Change in Social Supports		0	0	0	0															
7) Substance Abuse		2	1	0	0															
ACUTE-2007 Total Score		9	3	2	2															

Static-99R Score: 0																				
STABLE-2007 Score	4	4	4	4																
Standardized Risk Level	II	II	II	II																

Interpretation of Current Risk

↑ "Higher Than Expected"	✓																			
— "As Expected"		✓	✓	✓																
↓ "Lower Than Expected"																				

Evaluator Name: Helen Li Evaluator Signature: H Li

Report Writing Templates for ACUTE-2007

This section of the Evaluator's Workbook provides examples of how to communicate results from ACUTE-2007. Templates have been divided into three broad sections based upon the anticipated needs of evaluators.

> *Brief Templates* are designed for quick documentation of ACUTE-2007 results in day-to-day supervision or clinical notes. See page 27.
>
> *Moderate Templates* are useful for concisely capturing specific details from ACUTE-2007 for internal decision-making and non-adversarial settings (e.g., treatment planning or case summaries). See page 28.
>
> *Detailed Templates* are useful for thorough documentation of ACUTE-2007 scores, such as completing risk assessments in adversarial settings. See page 32.

All templates are broken down into "Descriptive" and "Interpretive" parts. The "Descriptive" part provides information on ACUTE-2007 and the individual's raw score. The "Interpretive" part helps readers understand what the raw score means about the individual's risk and how it informed the proposed risk management response. Evaluators should always include the Descriptive part in their reports and then select **at least one** Interpretive part; they are welcome to choose more.

These templates are examples only and evaluators are free to revise the wording as they see fit.

It is strongly recommended that ACUTE-2007 be interpreted and reported in combination with results from Static-99R and STABLE-2007. For details on reporting Static-99R/STABLE-2007 see the STABLE-2007 Evaluator Workbook (Brankley et al., 2017).

Brief Templates for use in Routine Documentation

Documentation and record keeping are a necessary part of day-to-day professional activities (e.g., session notes, case management notes). The following templates are as brief as possible to help busy evaluators record and interpret ACUTE-2007 scores. To use these templates, report the "Descriptive" part below and **at least one** "Interpretive" part.

Descriptive Part

Mr. [X] was scored on ACUTE-2007, a measure of recent behaviours and circumstances relevant to sexual offending. Mr. [X] scored [X] out of a possible 21 points on ACUTE-2007.

Interpretive Parts

- This score represents the [#]th/st/rd percentile[1] of adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb].
- This score is ["lower than expected", "within the expected range", "higher than expected"] for adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb].
- Mr. [X] exhibited clinically significant problems related to [list those scored as a "2" on the most recent tally sheet – *Victim Access, Emotional Collapse, Change in Social Supports, Hostility, Substance Abuse, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Rejection of Supervision*].
- Immediate intervention was required to reduce the imminent risk related to [list items scored as a "3"]. [Provide detail on what led to the score of 3 and what specific steps were taken].
- [Describe the risk management response]

Examples:

1. Mr. Smith was scored on ACUTE-2007, a measure of recent behaviours and circumstances relevant to sexual offending. Mr. Smith scored 9 out of a possible 21 points on ACUTE-2007. This score is higher than the 99.9th percentile of adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level II. Mr. Smith will be seen weekly to better manage his current risk.
2. Mr. Bartholomew was scored on ACUTE-2007, a measure of recent behaviours and circumstances relevant to sexual offending. Mr. Bartholomew scored 1 out of a possible 21 points on ACUTE-2007. This score is lower than expected for adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level IVb. No changes in supervision are suggested at this time.
3. Mr. Antar was scored on ACUTE-2007, a measure of recent behaviours and circumstances relevant to sexual offending. Mr. Antar scored 3 out of a possible 21 points on ACUTE-2007. This score is within the expected range for adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level IVb. He continues to exhibit clinically significant problems related to *Hostility*. No changes in supervision are suggested at this time.

---

[1] Defined as a mid-point average

Moderate Templates for use in Case Management

The length and detail of *Moderate Templates* are somewhere between the *Brief* and *Detailed* templates. They are intended to communicate more than the minimal amount of information, but still be as concise as possible. To use these templates, report the "Descriptive" part below and **at least one** "Interpretive" part.

Descriptive Part

Mr. [X] was scored on ACUTE-2007. ACUTE-2007 measures recent, risk-relevant behaviours and circumstances of adult males under community supervision for a sexually motivated offence. It consists of 7 items related to psychological, interpersonal, and sexual functioning, which are added together to create a total score. Mr. [X] was evaluated on ACUTE-2007 [#] times during [describe context, e.g., his community supervision]. Mr. [X] most recently scored [X] out of a possible 21 points on ACUTE-2007.

Interpretive Parts

- This score represents the [#]th/st/rd percentile[2] of adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb].
- This score is ["lower than expected", "within the expected range", "higher than expected"] for adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb].
- Mr. [X] exhibited clinically significant problems related to [list those scored as a "2" on the most recent tally sheet – *Victim Access, Emotional Collapse, Change in Social Supports, Hostility, Substance Abuse, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Rejection of Supervision*].
- Immediate intervention was required to reduce the imminent risk related to [list items scored as a "3"]. [Provide detail on what led to the score of 3 and what specific steps were taken].
- [Describe the risk management response]
- [add one of the following tables if you want to make comparisons to normative sample] The following table presents Mr. [X]'s ACUTE-2007 item scores from his most recent assessment. The timeframe of the assessment is included in the date range, with the percentage of adult males in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb] at their first assessment in the normative sample who had similar scores [Add further description as relevant].

[2] Defined as a mid-point average

[Optional Tables for *Moderate Template*]

ACUTE-2007 Score Summary reflecting [DATE] to [DATE]

Item	Score	Distribution for Static-99R/STABLE-2007 **Level I**			
		% scored 0	% scored 1	% scored 2	% scored 3
Victim Access		79.7	19.5	0.8	0.0
Emotional Collapse		93.8	5.9	0.4	0.0
Change in Social Supports		92.2	7.8	0.0	0.0
Hostility		97.7	2.3	0.0	0.0
Substance Abuse		82.8	17.2	0.0	0.0
Sexual Drive/Preoccupation		88.3	10.9	0.8	0.0
Rejection of Supervision		87.5	10.9	1.6	0.0

ACUTE-2007 Score Summary reflecting [DATE] to [DATE]

Item	Score	Distribution for Static-99R/STABLE-2007 **Level II**			
		% scored 0	% scored 1	% scored 2	% scored 3
Victim Access		78.8	19.5	1.5	0.2
Emotional Collapse		91.5	8.1	0.4	0.0
Change in Social Supports		86.4	12.8	0.7	0.0
Hostility		92.3	7.3	0.5	0.0
Substance Abuse		78.6	20.8	0.5	0.1
Sexual Drive/Preoccupation		84.9	14.3	0.7	0.1
Rejection of Supervision		82.9	15.3	1.8	0.0

[Optional Tables for *Moderate Template*...Continued]

ACUTE-2007 Score Summary reflecting [DATE] to [DATE]

Item	Score	Distribution for Static-99R/STABLE-2007 **Level III**			
		% scored 0	% scored 1	% scored 2	% scored 3
Victim Access		72.0	26.2	1.7	0.2
Emotional Collapse		84.5	14.1	1.4	0.1
Change in Social Supports		82.4	16.1	1.5	0.1
Hostility		85.2	13.7	0.8	0.2
Substance Abuse		75.3	22.3	2.1	0.2
Sexual Drive/Preoccupation		82.4	16.6	1.1	0.0
Rejection of Supervision		72.8	21.4	5.3	0.6

ACUTE-2007 Score Summary reflecting [DATE] to [DATE]

Item	Score	Distribution for Static-99R/STABLE-2007 **Level IVa**			
		% scored 0	% scored 1	% scored 2	% scored 3
Victim Access		60.3	34.0	5.1	0.5
Emotional Collapse		69.8	25.8	4.1	0.3
Change in Social Supports		70.0	26.8	3.0	0.3
Hostility		69.8	23.2	5.9	1.0
Substance Abuse		65.0	31.3	3.2	0.5
Sexual Drive/Preoccupation		71.0	25.2	3.6	0.3
Rejection of Supervision		57.3	28.5	13.4	0.9

ACUTE-2007 Score Summary reflecting [DATE] to [DATE]

Item	Score	Distribution for Static-99R/STABLE-2007 **Level IVb**			
		% scored 0	% scored 1	% scored 2	% scored 3
Victim Access		43.2	40.1	14.8	1.9
Emotional Collapse		48.7	36.2	14.2	0.9
Change in Social Supports		46.2	39.7	12.8	0.9
Hostility		46.7	38.0	13.0	2.3
Substance Abuse		51.7	36.6	10.7	1.1
Sexual Drive/Preoccupation		56.4	32.7	10.2	0.7
Rejection of Supervision		48.0	28.6	20.2	3.2

Example of *Moderate Template*

- Mr. González was scored on ACUTE-2007. ACUTE-2007 measures recent, risk-relevant behaviours and circumstances of adult males under community supervision for a sexually motivated offence. It consists of 7 items related to psychological, interpersonal, and sexual functioning, which are added together to create a total score. Mr. González was evaluated on ACUTE-2007 four times since he began community supervision on July 13, 2018.

  Mr. González most recently scored 4 out of a possible 21 points on ACUTE-2007. This score represents the 90.0th percentile[3] of adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level III. This score is within the expected range of individuals at this risk level.

  The following table presents Mr. González's ACUTE-2007 item scores from his most recent assessment with the percentage of adult males in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level III at their first assessment in the normative sample who had similar scores.

ACUTE-2007 Score Summary Reflecting Aug 4, 2018 to Aug 10, 2018

Item	Score	Distribution for Static-99R/STABLE-2007 **Level III**			
		% scored 0	% scored 1	% scored 2	% scored 3
Victim Access	0	72.0	26.2	1.7	0.2
Emotional Collapse	0	84.5	14.1	1.4	0.1
Change in Social Supports	0	82.4	16.1	1.5	0.1
Hostility	1	85.2	13.7	0.8	0.2
Substance Abuse	1	75.3	22.3	2.1	0.2
Sexual Drive/Preoccupation	0	82.4	16.6	1.1	0.0
Rejection of Supervision	2	72.8	21.4	5.3	0.6

Mr. González exhibited clinically significant problems related to *Rejection of Supervision*. Only 5.3% of adult males in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level III had similar scores. Motivational Interviewing techniques (e.g., rolling with resistance, pro/con) will be used in the short-term to address concerns. Long term solutions will be discussed at his upcoming case conference.

[3] Defined as a mid-point average

Detailed Templates for use in Reports

Sometimes being thorough is more important than being concise. The depth of information in the *Detailed Templates* is in excess of the average reader's interest and is provided to support careful decision making that often occurs in adversarial settings (e.g., parole decisions, revocation hearings).

The first paragraph of the "Description" section provides detailed background information on ACUTE-2007 (footnoted references will usually transfer to a new document if evaluators copy and paste the paragraph). Readers will notice that the paragraph is italicized; this is a stylistic preference to distinguish it from the case-specific material that follows. To use these templates, report the "Description" part below and **at least one** "Interpretive" part.

Descriptive Part

ACUTE-2007[4,5] measures recent behaviours and circumstances that are empirically associated with sexual offending in adult males already convicted of a sexually motivated offence. ACUTE-2007 consists of 7 items related to psychological, interpersonal, and sexual functioning. Item scores reflect the degree of clinical impairment from 0 "Not a problem" to 3 "Intervene now". Item scores are added together to create a total score that ranges from 0 to 21. ACUTE-2007 was constructed using a sample of 571 adult males across Canada, as well as the states of Alaska and Iowa, who were convicted of a sexually motivated offence who were under community supervision. An additional 3,472 individuals from the province of British Columbia were added to create normative data.

Mr. [X]'s ACUTE-2007 score(s) were based on the [year] version of the coding manual, [year] evaluator workbook, [add in other sources of information, for example individual meetings with Mr. X, feedback from group facilitators]. Mr. X was evaluated [#] times on ACUTE-2007 during [describe context, e.g., his community supervision]. Mr. [X] scored [X] out of a possible 21 points on his most recent ACUTE-2007 reflecting the period of [DATE] to [DATE].

---

4 Fernandez, Y., Gotch, K., Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2015). *ACUTE-2007 coding manual, Revised 2015*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

5 Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T.-L., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project.* User Report 2007- 05. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada. Available from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/_fl/crp2007-05-en.pdf

[Optional Descriptive Part for *Detailed Template*]

- [add following section to make statements about individuals' progress throughout the evaluation period] The following table summarizes Mr. [X]'s ACUTE-2007 item and total scores for the following dates. [Add further description as relevant].

ACUTE-2007 Items 0 "Not Present" 1 "Maybe Present" 2 "Present" 3 "Intervene Now"	Year																		
	Month																		
	Day																		
1. Victim Access																			
2. Hostility																			
3. Sexual Preoccupation																			
4. Rejection of Supervision																			
5. Emotional Collapse																			
6. Change in Social Supports																			
7. Substance Abuse																			
ACUTE-2007 Total Score																			

Interpretive Parts

- ACUTE-2007 total scores can be interpreted in the context of Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels[6,7]. Mr. [X]'s score represents the [#]$_{th/st/rd}$ percentile[8] of adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb] ([#]% have a lower score, [#]% have the same score, and [#]% have a higher score). In other words, out of 100 individuals convicted of a sexually motivated offence and sharing the same Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level, [#] would have a lower score, [#] would have the same score, and [#] would have a higher score. With a 95% confidence interval, Mr. [X]'s score could range from the [LL_{CI}] to the [UL_{CI}] percentile.
- This score is ["lower than expected", "within the expected range", "higher than expected"] for adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb].

---

6 Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Helmus, L. M., Thornton, D., & Phenix, A. (2017). Communicating the results of criterion referenced prediction measures: Risk categories for the Static-99R and Static-2002R sexual offender risk assessment tools. *Psychological Assessment*, 29, 582-597. doi:10.1037/pas0000371

7 Brankley, A. E., Helmus, L.-M., & Hanson, R. K. (2017). *STABLE-2007 evaluator workbook – revised 2017*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

8 defined as a mid-point average

- [add one of the ACUTE-2007 item tables from pp. 29 to 30 if you want distribution of item scores in normative sample] The following table presents Mr. [X]'s ACUTE-2007 item scores from his most recent assessment alongside the distribution of item scores in the normative sample. [Add further description as relevant].

- [add following table if you want to make comparisons to normative sample] The following table presents Mr. [X]'s ACUTE-2007 item scores from his most recent assessment with the percentage of adult males in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level [I/II/III/IVa/IVb] at their first assessment in the normative sample who had similar scores [Add further description as relevant].

ACUTE-2007 Score Summary reflecting [DATE] to [DATE]

Item	Individual's Score	% with Same Score
Victim Access		
Emotional Collapse		
Change in Social Supports		
Hostility		
Substance Abuse		
Sexual Drive/Preoccupation		
Rejection of Supervision		

- Mr. [X] exhibited clinically significant problems related to [list those scored as a "2" on the most recent tally sheet – *Victim Access, Emotional Collapse, Change in Social Supports, Hostility, Substance Abuse, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Rejection of Supervision*].
- Immediate intervention was required to reduce the imminent risk related to [list items scored as a "3" *Victim Access, Emotional Collapse, Change in Social Supports, Hostility, Substance Abuse, Sex Drive/Preoccupation, Rejection of Supervision*]. [Provide detail on what led to the score of 3 and what specific steps were taken].
- [Describe the risk management response]

Example of *Detailed Template* Used in a Report

ACUTE-2007

ACUTE-2007[9,10] measures recent behaviours and circumstances that are empirically associated with sexual offending in adult males already convicted of a sexually motivated offence. ACUTE-2007 consists of 7 items related to psychological, interpersonal, and sexual functioning. Item scores reflect the degree of clinical impairment from 0 "Not a problem" to 3 "Intervene now". Item scores are added together to create a total score that ranges from 0 to 21. ACUTE-2007 was constructed using a sample of 571 adult males across Canada, as well as the states of Alaska and Iowa, who were convicted of a sexually motivated offence who were under community supervision. An additional 3,472 individuals from the province of British Columbia were added to create normative data.

Mr. Chan's ACUTE-2007 scores were based on the 2015 version of the coding manual, 2019 evaluator workbook, weekly community supervision meetings, feedback from employer and therapist, and his criminal history records. Mr. Chan was evaluated nine times on ACUTE-2007 since he began community supervision on July 13, 2018 (summarized in the table below). He scored 1 out of a possible 21 points on his most recent ACUTE-2007 reflecting the period of November 22, 2018 to December 14, 2018.

ACUTE-2007 Items 0 "Not Present" 1 "Maybe Present" 2 "Present" 3 "Intervene Now"	Year	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
	Month	7	7	8	8	9	9	10	11	12
	Day	16	23	6	20	10	24	17	21	14
1. Victim Access		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Hostility		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Sexual Preoccupation		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Rejection of Supervision		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Emotional Collapse		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6. Change in Social Supports		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Substance Abuse		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ACUTE-2007 Total Score		3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1

9 Fernandez, Y., Gotch, K., Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2015). *ACUTE-2007 coding manual, Revised 2015*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

10 Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T.-L., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project.* User Report 2007- 05. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada. Available from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/_fl/crp2007-05-en.pdf

ACUTE-2007 total scores can be interpreted in the context of Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels[11,12]. Mr. Chan's current score represents the 11.0th percentile[13] of adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level IVb (6.2% have a lower score, 9.1% have the same score, and 84.7% have a higher score). In other words, out of 100 individuals convicted of a sexual offence in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level IVb, 6 would have a lower score, 9 would have the same score, and 85 would have a higher score. With a 95% confidence interval, Mr. Chan's score could range from the 5.7th to the 26.4th percentile.

Mr. Chan's ACUTE-2007 continues to be "lower than expected" for adult males at their first assessment in the instrument's standardization sample in the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level IVb. This suggests that he is at the lower end of the Level IVb range.

11 Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Helmus, L. M., Thornton, D., & Phenix, A. (2017). Communicating the results of criterion referenced prediction measures: Risk categories for the Static-99R and Static-2002R sexual offender risk assessment tools. *Psychological Assessment*, 29, 582-597. doi:10.1037/pas0000371

12 Brankley, A. E., Helmus, L.-M., & Hanson, R. K. (2017). *STABLE-2007 evaluator workbook – revised 2017*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

13 Defined as a mid-point average

References

Babchishin, K. M. (2013). *Sex offenders do change on risk-relevant propensities: Evidence from a longitudinal study of the ACUTE-2007* (Doctoral dissertation). Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada. Retrieved from https://curve.carleton.ca/system/files/etd/a2b3031c-5d35-4327-bf5f-2593192233af/etd_pdf/20b32613ab41e21d9330be1962cd58ed/babchishin-sexoffendersdochangeonriskrelevantpropensities.pdf

Brankley, A. E., Babchishin, K. M., & Hanson, R. K. (2019). STABLE-2007 demonstrates predictive and incremental validity in assessing risk-relevant propensities for sexual offending: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse.* Advanced online publication. doi:10.1177/1079063219871572

Brankley, A. E., Helmus, L.-M., & Hanson, R. K. (2017). *STABLE-2007 evaluator workbook – revised 2017*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

Crawford, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., & Slick, D. J. (2009). On percentile norms in neuropsychology: Proposed reporting standards and methods for quantifying the uncertainty over the percentile ranks of test scores. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 23,* 1173-1195. doi:10.1080/13854040902795018

Fernandez, Y., Gotch, K., Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2015). *ACUTE-2007 coding manual – revised 2015*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

Fernandez, Y., Harris, A. J. R., Hanson, R. K., & Sparks, J. (2014). *STABLE-2007 coding manual – revised 2014*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Helmus, L.-M., Thornton, D., & Phenix, A. (2017). Communicating the results of criterion referenced prediction measures: Risk categories for the Static-99R and Static-2002R sexual offender risk assessment tools. *Psychological Assessment,* 29, 582-597. doi:10.1037/pas0000371

Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., Helmus, L., & Hodgson, S. (2009). The principles of effective correctional treatment also apply to sexual offenders: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36,* 865-891. doi:10.1177/0093854809338545

Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., McGrath, R. J., Kroner, D., D'Amora, D. A., Thomas, S. S., & Tavarez, L. P. (2017). *A five-level risk and needs system: Maximizing assessment results in corrections through the development of a common language.* New York, NY: Justice Centre.

Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Letourneau, E., Helmus, L. M., & Thornton, D. (2018). Reductions in risk based on time offense-free in the community: Once a sexual offender, not always a sexual offender. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 24,* 48–63. doi:10.1037/law0000135

Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T.-L., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The dynamic supervision project* (User Report No. 2007-05). Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada. Available from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/_fl/crp2007-05-en.pdf

Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2014). High risk sex offenders may not be high risk forever. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29,* 2792-2813. doi:10.1177/0886260514526062

Hanson, R. K., Helmus, L. M., Babchishin, K. M., & Zabarauckas, C. L. (2017). *Risk assessment and recidivism information of sex offenders in the Province of British Columbia.* [Data file]

Hanson, R. K., Helmus, L.-M., & Harris, A. J. R. (2015). Assessing the risk and needs of supervised sexual offenders: A prospective study using STABLE-2007, Static-99R, and Static-2002R. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 42,* 1205–1224. doi:10.1177/0093854815602094

Hanson, R. K., Lloyd, C. D., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2012). Developing non-arbitrary metrics for risk communication: Percentile ranks for the Static-99/R and Static-2002/R sexual offender risk tools. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 11*, 9-23. doi:10.1080/14999013.2012.667511

Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (1999). *Static-99: Improving actuarial risk assessments for individuals convicted of sexual offences.* User Report 99-02. Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.

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

Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., Thornton, D., Babchishin, K. M., & Harris, A. J. R. (2012). Absolute recidivism rates predicted by Static-99R and Static-2002R sex offender risk assessment tools vary across samples: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 39, 1148-1171. doi:10.1177/0093854812443648

Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R.K., & Babchishin, K.M. (2011). *Assessing the risk of older individuals convicted of sexual offences: Developing the Static-99R and Static-2002R.* Corrections User Report 2011-01. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada.

Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., & Babchishin, K. M. (2012). Improving the predictive accuracy of Static-99 and Static-2002 with older individuals convicted of sexual offences: Revised age weights. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 24*, 64-101. doi:10.1177/1079063211409951

Justice Center. (2014). *A common language for risk assessment: Experts convene in Washington*. Retrieved from https://csgjusticecenter.org/reentry/posts/a-common-language-for-risk-assessments-experts-convene-in-washington/

Justice Center. (2016). *A five-level risk and needs system: Maximizing assessment results through the development of a common language*. New York, NY: Author.

Kahn, R. E., Ambroziak, G., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2017). Release from the sex offender label. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 46*, 861–864. doi:10.1007/s10508-017-0972-y

Schmucker, M., & Lösel, F. (2015). The effects of sexual offender treatment on recidivism: An international meta-analysis of sound quality evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 11*, 597-630. doi:10.1007/s11292-015-9241-z

Singh, J. P., Fazel, S., Gueorguieva, R., & Buchanan, A. (2014). Rates of violence in patients classified as high risk by structured risk assessment instruments. *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 204*, 180–187. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.131938

Appendix A. Standardized Risk Levels for Sexual Offending

How do we compare the results of risk assessments conducted with different instruments?

There are currently hundreds of different risk assessment tools used worldwide (Singh, Fazel, Gueorguieva, & Buchanan, 2014), each with its own interpretive levels. Although all these tools are designed to measure risk and needs, each instrument is unique in that it may comprise varying factors and weight those factors differently from other tools. Furthermore, the field is just beginning to set standards or specifications about the terminology used to describe risk and needs levels.

The Standardized Risk framework (Hanson, Bourgon, et al., 2017; based on proposals by Justice Centre 2014, 2016) is a method for quantifying risk in criterion referenced tools that is independent of the characteristics of any single tool. This framework aims to improve consistency in understanding and interpreting risk assessment results across different tools. Information in scales can be matched to five broad levels of riskiness defined by the following principles:

> **Rater reliability** refers to consistency in measurement and is improved when fewer individuals are placed near the boundaries and many cases are placed in the middle of the risk levels.
>
> **Percentile ranks** measure the unusualness of scores. They are useful for prediction tools because they are easily calculated, easily understood, and may be sufficient for resource allocation decisions. In a system comprised of five levels, Risk Level III is centered on a tool's median score.
>
> **Absolute risk** is central to decisions based on the absolute (not relative) likelihood of an outcome. A threshold for defining Level I, the lowest level, would be those whose risk for a new offence is no different than spontaneous rates of first time offending in the general population—or for sexual offending risk, that the risk is no different than that of individuals with a non-sexual criminal history (i.e., 1% to 2% within the first 5 years; Kahn, Ambroziak, Hanson, & Thornton, 2017). Level V, the highest risk level, includes individuals virtually certain to reoffend (i.e., greater than 85%).
>
> **Risk ratios** compare the recidivism rate of individuals with a particular score to the recidivism rate of a reference group (e.g., the average score on a tool). The upper and lower boundaries of Level III can be defined by a meaningful difference in risk (e.g., the reduction in reoffending after the successful completion of an evidence-based treatment program) from the average absolute recidivism rate.

The five standardized risk levels were designed to inform case planning, guide how corrections and criminal justice professionals conceptualize risk and needs, and help identify people who can benefit most from intervention. Additionally, it is designed to facilitate consistency in definitions across contexts or jurisdictions where different risk tools are used.

The interpretations of the five levels were based on risk-relevant characteristics related to offending in general (e.g., antisocial attitudes, poor problem solving). Risk for sexual offending is related to both general criminality and sexual criminality (e.g., atypical sexual preferences, emotional identification with children). Table 14 provides a summary of Hanson and colleagues' (Hanson, Babchishin, et al., 2017) adaptation of the five standardized risk levels for individuals convicted of sexual offending. A reader-friendly summary is also available here.

The prognosis associated with each risk level is based on meta-analyses of the typical effect of specialized treatment programs for individuals with a history of sexual crime (Hanson, Bourgon, Helmus, & Hodgson, 2009; Schmucker & Lösel, 2015) as well as on long term recidivism studies examining desistance and the effects of years offence free in the community (Hanson, Harris, Helmus, & Thornton, 2014; Hanson, Harris, Letourneau, Helmus, & Thornton, 2018). The standardized risk levels are intended to be theoretically meaningful constructs supported by evidence. Consequently, the inferences that can be supported by risk level membership will evolve as research advances.

Table 14. Descriptions of the Standardized Risk Levels for Sexual Offending

Level		Risk Profile	Criminogenic Needs	Correctional Treatment Dose	Potential Treatment Effect on Risk	Prognosis Following Intervention
I		***Very Low Risk***— similar to people with non-sexual criminal histories, < 2% after 5 years	***None or few*—**if any, mild and/or transitory; clear resources and strengths. Generally prosocial	***None***—if needed, refer to community services	***None***—risk so low that it will not be reduced further	***Excellent***—individuals will stay in Level I
II		***Below Average Risk***— higher than very low (I) risk profile but lower than average (III)	***A few***—some mild, transitory, or possibly acute; clear resources and strengths. Vulnerable prosocial	***Minimal***—if any, very short term, refer to community services if needed	***Minor*—**risk so low that intervention can only have a minor impact	***Very good***—most individuals move from Level II to I
III		***Average Risk***— the middle of the risk distribution	***Multiple***— some severe, several domains; Some resources/strengths	***Significant***— treatment programs, and change-focused supervision activities	***Significant*—**intervention impact can meaningfully reduce reoffending	***Good*—**many individuals will move from Level III to II
IV	**a**	***Above Average Risk***— approximately 2x the average risk (III)	***Multiple, persistent***— some chronic and severe, problems cover all/most domains; few resources/strengths if any	***Intensive***—high intensity treatment programs	***Beneficial***—significant reduction in risk, although residual risk still above the lowest levels	***Improvement***—some individuals will move to IVa, III, and as low as II after several years
	b	***Well Above Average Risk*—**3 to 4x the average risk (III)				
V*		***Virtually Certain to Reoffend*—**entrenched criminal profile: virtually certain to sexually reoffend, >85% after 5 years	***Multiple, entrenched***— chronic, severe, and entrenched, likely across most or all domains; no resources/strengths	***Extensive***—high intensity treatment programs provided over several years.	***Potential*—**intervention can have an impact but initial risk so high that emphasis is on treatment readiness and behavioural management	***Poor*—**risk likely to continue to be above average despite reductions; expected to move to III and II with age-related desistence

* Individuals at this level are not presently identified using Static-99R/2002R, STABLE-2007, or ACUTE-2007

Appendix B. Static-99R and STABLE-2007 Tool Descriptions

Static-99R (Hanson & Thornton, 1999, 2000; Helmus, Thornton, Hanson, & Babchishin, 2011, 2012). Static-99R is an empirically derived actuarial risk assessment tool designed to assess the likelihood of sexual recidivism in adult male individuals charged or convicted of sexually motivated offences (see also www.static99.org). Static-99R items are identical to Static-99 with the exception of updated age weights. The scale has ten items assessing criminal history, victim characteristics, and relationship history. For each item, one point is awarded for higher risk (with the exception of two items which are worth more than one point: prior sex offences and age). The total score (ranging from -3 to 12) is calculated by summing all item points and can be used to place the individual in one of five standardized risk levels: Level I "Very Low Risk" (-3, -2), Level II "Below Average" (-1, 0), Level III "Average Risk" (1, 2, 3), Level IVa "Above Average" (4, 5), and Level IVb "Well Above Average" (6 through 12). Static-99R has been found to have moderate predictive accuracy for sexual recidivism (Helmus, Hanson, Thornton, Babchishin, & Harris, 2012). For more information about Static-99R and Static-2002R, see www.static99.org.

STABLE-2007 (Hanson et al., 2007; Hanson, Helmus, & Harris, 2015). STABLE-2007 measures empirical risk factors that are routinely addressed as part of correctional rehabilitation (i.e., criminogenic needs) for adult males convicted of sexually motivated offences against a child or non-consenting adult. The tool was developed by revising STABLE-2000 based on preliminary results from the Dynamic Supervision Project (Hanson et al., 2007; Hanson et al., 2015), a study using 795 adult males across Canada, as well as the states of Alaska and Iowa, who were convicted of a sexual offence who were under community supervision. An additional 4,292 individuals were added to create normative data (Brankley, Helmus, & Hanson, 2017). STABLE-2007's predictive and incremental validity to Static-99R for sexual recidivism, non-sexually violent recidivism, and any new crime has been demonstrated amongst multiple new datasets (k = 12, N = 6,955; Brankley, Babchishin, & Hanson, 2019). STABLE-2007 consists of 13 items related to psychological, interpersonal, and sexual functioning, which are added together to create a total score. For individuals who did not offend against a child under 14 years old, there are only 12 items. Based on the total score, individuals can be assigned to one of three density ranges of criminogenic needs: low density (0-3), moderate density (4-11), and high density (12+).

Appendix C. Rules for Combining STABLE-2007 with Static-99R

Static-99R Scores \ STABLE-2007 Scores	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20+
-3	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	II	II	II	II	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
-2	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	II	II	II	II	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
-1	I	I	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	III	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa
0	I	I	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	III	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa
1	II	II	II	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
2	II	II	II	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
3	II	II	II	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
4	III	III	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
5	III	III	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
6	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
7	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
8	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
9	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb
10+	III	III	III	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVa	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb	IVb

Note: Table taken from “The 2017 Revised STABLE-2007 Evaluator Workbook” (Brankley et al., 2017).

Appendix D. Further Optimizing Standardized Risk Levels through Combining ACUTE-2007 with Static-99R/STABLE-2007

The following section contains a summary of the steps used to improve interpretation within the standardized risk levels by using information from Static-99R/STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007.

Previous Method for Combining STATIC/STABLE/ACUTE to produce Nominal Risk Levels

Appendix B of the 2015 Revised ACUTE-2007 coding manual described a method for combining Static/STABLE/ACUTE by using ACUTE-2007 to adjust the STATIC/STABLE priority level. Individuals would stay at their priority level if they were in the "moderate" ACUTE level. If they were "low" on ACUTE they would go down one nominal level, or go up one nominal level if their ACUTE level was "high."

Current Method for Combining STATIC/STABLE/ACUTE to produce Standardized Risk Levels

The development team tested a series of theoretically and empirically driven strategies to see how information from ACUTE-2007 could optimize the interpretation of the Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels. The current Static/STABLE/ACUTE combination method is based on two premises:

(1) ACUTE-2007 is correlated with Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Levels. In other words, individuals in higher Risk Levels (based on the Static/STABLE combination) are expected to have higher scores on ACUTE-2007. This relationship can be articulated using linear regression; the average ACUTE-2007 score for each Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level is as follows[14]: Level I = ACUTE-2007 score of 0; II = 1; III = 2; IVa = 3; and IVb = 4. In other words, these five ACUTE-2007 scores represent the average or expected score of individuals placed in each Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk level.

(2) ACUTE-2007 provides novel information to inform case management when scores are higher or lower than expected based on their Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level. If an individual's ACUTE score is higher/lower than what would be expected beyond measurement error[15] at their Standardized Risk Level (see Premise 1) then their current behaviour is reflecting a risk-relevant change from their expected risk level[16].

The final version of the decision rules was based on both statistical model fit in a validation sample (n > 4,000) as well as utility perceived by experienced STABLE-2007 and ACUTE-2007 users and trainers.

---

[14] Specifically, predicted ACUTE-2007 scores were calculated for each Static-99R/STABLE-2007 Standardized Risk Level using the data from the Dynamic Supervision Project. Average scores per category were calculated based on a weighted average of the scorewise predicted values.

[15] This was defined as the standard error of the predicted ACUTE-2007 score, 2 ACUTE units.

[16] If their observed ACUTE-2007 score is approximately beyond two standard errors of their predicted ACUTE-2007 score, the individual's current risk-relevant behaviour is incongruent with their Risk Level.

Appendix E. Table 15. Percentiles for ACUTE-2007 Total Scores for Males at First Assessment (*n* = 4,043)

Score	Frequency	Defined as Midpoint Average			Observed Percentages		
		Percentile Rank	95% CI		Below	Same	Higher
			LL	UL			
0	1116	14.0	0.7	27.0	0	27.6	72.4
1	934	39.0	28.1	50.3	27.6	23.1	49.3
2	722	60.0	50.9	68.3	50.7	17.9	31.4
3	411	74.0	68.5	78.7	68.6	10.2	21.2
4	302	82.0	78.6	86.3	78.7	7.5	13.8
5	193	89.0	86.0	91.1	86.2	4.8	9.0
6	127	93.0	90.7	94.3	91.0	3.1	5.9
7	79	95.1	93.8	96.3	94.1	2.0	3.9
8	55	96.7	95.8	97.6	96.1	1.4	2.5
9	40	97.9	97.2	98.6	97.4	1.0	1.6
10	20	98.7	98.2	99.1	98.4	0.5	1.1
11	15	99.1	98.7	99.4	98.4	0.4	1.2
12	9	99.4	98.1	99.6	99.5	0.2	0.3
13	8	99.6	98.3	99.8	99.7	0.2	0.1
14+	6	≥99.8	99.6	99.9	99.9	0.1	0

Note: Data are from DSP (n = 571) and BC Corrections (n = 3,472). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Average score was 2.1, with a standard deviation of 2.4; Median of 1. Six participants scored between 15 and 19 and no individual scored above a score of 19. Midpoint averages were computed using the method described in Hanson et al., 2012. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in their ACUTE-2007.

Table 16. Distribution of ACUTE-2007 Items at First Assessment (*n* = 4,043)

ACUTE-2007 Items	**% (*n*) With Same Score**			
	0 "No"	1 "Maybe"	2 "Yes"	3 "Intervene Now"
1) Victim Access	67.6 (2,732)	27.9 (1,126)	4.1 (165)	0.5 (20)
2) Hostility	78.7 (3,180)	17.7 (716)	3.4 (139)	0.2 (8)
3) Sexual Drive/ Preoccupation	76.4 (3,087)	20.3 (820)	3.1 (126)	0.2 (10)
4) Rejection of Supervision	79.1 (3,197)	16.9 (684)	3.4 (137)	0.6 (25)
5) Emotional Collapse	71.1 (2,876)	25.4 (1,028)	3.1 (124)	0.4 (15)
6) Change in Social Supports	77.4 (3,130)	19.7 (795)	2.7 (111)	0.2 (7)
7) Substance Abuse	69.3 (2,802)	21.9 (884)	8.0 (323)	0.8 (34)

Note: Data are from DSP (*n* = 571) and BC Corrections (*n* = 3,472). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Participants were included if first assessment was within first 30 days of community release and there were no missing items in their ACUTE-2007.