



User Guide for the Brief Assessment for Recidivism Risk – 2002R (BARR-2002R)

Kelly M. Babchishin, R. Karl Hanson, & Julie Blais

January, 2024

For questions on the BARR-2002R, please contact Kelly Babchishin
(Kelly_Babchishin@carleton.ca) or [SAARNA](#) (staticquestions@gmail.com)

© SAARNA 2024
303 Bagot Street, Suite 306
Kingston, Ontario K7K 5W7
info@saarna.org

This version updates and replaces the December 2013 BARR-2002R User Guide. From the 2013 version, hazard ratios for recidivism were recomputed such that they represent the risk of recidivism relative to someone with an average risk score and the two-year observed and estimated general recidivism rates were added. In addition, standardized risk levels have been added to the coding form, Lastly, more information about the development of the BARR-2002R and updated research related to the BARR-2002R have been included. All other normative data (e.g., 5-year estimates; percentiles) remain unchanged from the 2013 version.

Brief Assessment for Recidivism Risk (BARR-2002R)

Description and Purpose

Given that those who have been adjudicated for a sexual offence are more likely to reoffend with a non-sexual crime than a sexual crime (Hanson & Bussière, 1998), risk assessments for this population (i.e., men adjudicated for a sexual offence) should also consider the risk for general and violent recidivism. Violent recidivism includes sexual offences, and general recidivism includes all types of recidivism. Even when the focus is exclusively on the risk for sexual recidivism, it is useful to understand the source of the recidivism risk. This handout summarizes the development and empirical support for the Brief Assessment for Recidivism Risk-2002R (BARR-2002R) and presents the coding sheet for the BARR-2002R and norms for its use. We recommend evaluators use the BARR-2002R for assessing the likelihood of violent and general recidivism among men who have been adjudicated for a sexually motivated offence, instead of using the Static-99R or Static-2002R total scores for this purpose. The BARR-2002R differs from these scales in that it does not include items pertaining to the characteristics of a sexual offence; the BARR-2002R was not designed to assess the likelihood of sexual recidivism. In contrast, the Static-2002R and the Static-99R include sexual criminality items, which dilute the assessment of general criminality. Although some studies have found that the BARR-2002R predicts sexual recidivism as well as other risk assessment scales (Jung & Wielinga, 2019; Jung, Wielinga et al., 2018), the BARR-2002R is not recommended for this use. Instead, use the total scores from Static-2002R, or another validated sexual recidivism risk scales.

The BARR-2002R is an actuarial risk scale for assessing the risk of general and violent (including sexual) recidivism among men adjudicated for a sexually motivated offence. The BARR-2002R is comprised of a measure of general criminality from Static-2002R (Helmus et al., 2012) and age at release. The development analyses for the BARR-2002R were conducted on a large sample of individuals with sexual offences (Babchishin et al., 2016), using samples drawn from the STATIC re-norming project (Helmus et al., 2012). Compared to the Static-2002R total score, the BARR-2002R was more strongly associated with violent and general recidivism (Babchishin et al., 2016). The BARR-2002R also predicted general and violent recidivism just as well as more complicated measures specifically designed for these outcomes (Level of Service/Case Management Inventory [LS/CMI; Andrews et al., 2004]; Statistical Information on Recidivism [SIR; Nafekh & Motiuk, 2002) and predicted nonsexual violent recidivism significantly better than the Static-2002R and Static-99R (Babchishin et al., 2016).

Independent replication studies found that the BARR-2002R strongly discriminates between individuals who reoffend with a general or violent offence and those who do not (Jung & Wielinga, 2019; Jung, Wielinga et al., 2018). The predictive accuracy of the BARR-2002R for these outcomes was as good or better than for other risk scales, such as the Sex Offender Risk Appraisal Guide (SORAG; Rice et al., 2013), Static-99R, and Static-2002R total scores (Jung et al., 2017; Jung et al., 2018). When used in conjunction with the Static-99R, the BARR-2002R improved the prediction of general and violent recidivism above that of the Static-99R when used alone (Jung et al., 2018). In addition to predicting recidivism, Jung and Wielinga (2019) found that higher BARR-2002R scores were associated with more frequent and faster general recidivism.

The available research supports the convergent validity of the BARR-2002R with other risk scales for general and violent recidivism. BARR-2002R correlates with the PCL-R, SIR-R1 (Babchishin et al., 2016), LS/CMI total scores, and LS/CMI Criminal History subscore (Babchishin et al., 2016; Bertsch et al., 2023). Jung et al. (2018) found that the BARR-2002R correlated with general antisociality as assessed by the Personality Assessment Inventory (Morey & Ambwani, 2008). Bertsch et al. (2023) also found that the inter-rater reliability for the BARR-2002R was high (ICC = .97).

BARR-2002R total scores can be interpreted in terms of the Five-Level Risk and Needs system - a standardized system for communicating general recidivism risk (see below for details; Blais et al., 2022; Hanson et al., 2017). Given that the BARR-2002R is a measure of general criminality, the center of the BARR-2002R risk distribution was set at the median 2-year general recidivism rates for the full sample of individuals in the criminal justice system, not the rate for the subset of individuals with a history of sexual offending (Blais et al., 2022). Individuals with a history of sexual offending tend to score lower on general criminality than those with no history of sexual offending. As such, the average risk for general recidivism is defined in terms of the general population of individuals in the legal system, not just individuals with a history of sexual crime. BARR-2002R scores can be used to place individuals into 4 of the 5 possible risk levels of the Five-Level Risk and Needs system (Very Low risk, Below Average risk, Average risk, and Above Average risk). The BARR-2002R could not place individuals in the highest risk level (Level V; “virtually certain to reoffend”). Another limitation in the application of the Five-Level System is that Blais et al. (2022) found that individuals within the ‘Very low’ risk level displayed more than trivial amounts of psychologically meaningful risk factors, despite showing a very low likelihood of recidivism.

Summary of the Five-Level Risk and Needs System

Risk Level	Identifiable Needs/ Strengths	Correctional Response	Prognosis
Level I	Few needs; clear identifiable strengths Low risk of reoffending (less than 5%)	Prison would be counterproductive Expected to comply with conditions/ supervision	Offending risk is already so low, expect no change; expect to desist from crime completely
Level II	1 or 2 needs (low severity); some identifiable strengths Low rate of reoffending (average of 19% at two years)	Long-term custody would be counterproductive Expected to comply with conditions Short-term interventions	With proper response, will transition to Level I; desistance is likely
Level III	Multiple needs (varying severity); have resources, but needs impede utilizing them Moderate reoffending (average of 40%)	Custody appropriate for short-term Require more dosage of treatment (100-200 hours)	With proper intervention, expected to reduce reoffending Risk of reoffending will be higher than general population
Level IV	Many needs (chronic and severe); some resources but chronic barriers to access them Higher risk of reoffending (average of 65%)	Have a history of incarceration; require intensive community supervision; intensive and lengthy programming (200-300 hours)	-With appropriate strategies, significant reductions in reoffending expected; even so, rate of reoffending likely to remain around Level III
Level V	-Most, if not all, of need areas present (chronic, severe, and longstanding); limited strengths/resources -High reoffending (average of 85%)	Custody is appropriate Highly structured, intensive, lengthy treatment (over 300 hours); occur in facilities prior to release	Reductions in reoffending slow and gradual (over decades) Reoffending expected to remain high regardless

Note. Copied from Blais et al. (2022), adapted from Hanson et al. (2017)

Target Population

The BARR-2002R is intended for men who have been adjudicated for a sexually motivated offence and fit the sampling frame for Static-2002R. It is not recommended for young persons, women, or for men whose only adjudications are for non-sexual offences (i.e., offences that lack a sexual motivation).

- (a) Men who have been convicted of a sexual offence (or received an equivalent sanction that qualifies as a sentencing occasion in Item 2 of Static-2002 Coding Rules 2009, pages 15-17).
- (b) Men who committed their most recent sexual offence after their 18th birthday.
- (c) With caution, men who committed their most recent sexual offence between their 17th and 18th birthday, provided that their release date is when they are at least 18. The release date is either the date of release from a closed custody sentence (in Canada, closed custody is analogous to prison) or the date of sentence for a community sentence or open custody sentence (in Canada, open custody is analogous to a halfway house).
- (d) The cautionary note for (c) does not change even if the juvenile was “waived into adult court,” a procedure allowed in some jurisdictions on some occasions.
- (e) BARR-2002R is not recommended for use with men who committed all of their sexual offences under the age of 17 no matter how old they are at the time of assessment.
- (f) BARR-2002R is not recommended for use with individuals whose only sexual “crime” involves consenting sexual activity with a similar age peer (e.g., Statutory Rape [a U.S. charge]) where the ages of the perpetrator and the victim are close and the sexual activity was consensual (see page 49 of Static-2002 Coding Rules 2009, for specific rules to make this determination).
- (g) BARR-2002R is not recommended for men whose only sexual offences are Category “B” offences (e.g., possession of child pornography, prostitution offences). It has yet to be validated on these populations.
- (h) BARR-2002R estimates risk at time of release for the index sexual offence. Time free adjustments should be used to reduce risk levels for individuals who have spent time sexual offence-free in the community (Hanson et al., 2018; Thornton et al., 2021).

For examples on how to present percentiles, hazard ratios, and expected recidivism rates in your risk communication, see Report Writing Templates included in the Static-99R and Static-2002R Evaluator workbook (available at saarna.org; Helmus et al., 2021). A copy of the scoring form is at the end of this document. Additional resources are available at saarna.org.

Samples for BARR-2002R Norms

For all samples, the BARR-2002R was coded retrospectively by summing the general criminality subscale of the Static-2002 and the revised age weight from the Static-2002R. The percentiles and expected and observed recidivism rates were based on three Canadian samples of routine, relatively unselected men who had committed a sexual offence. Hazard ratios were derived from the Canadian and German routine samples of individuals adjudicated for a sexual offence ($k = 4$).

Canadian Samples

- 1) *Canadian federal offenders: Quebec* (Bigras, 2007). This study included 94% of all men adjudicated for a sexual offence receiving a federal sentence in Quebec between 1995-2000 (6% refused participation in the research or were unable to provide consent).
- 2) *Canadian federal offenders: B.C.* (Boer, 2003). Archival data from the Offender Management System maintained by Correctional Service Canada were used to identify all men serving a federal sentence for a sexual offence in British Columbia whose Warrant Expiry Date (WED; the end of their sentence) was between January 1990 and May 1994. Many were granted conditional release before their WED; thus, individuals in this sample were released as early as 1986 ($n = 296$).
- 3) *Dynamic Supervision Project* (Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007). This prospective study followed men adjudicated for a sexual offence on community supervision between 2001- 2005 in all Canadian provinces and territories, and two U.S. states. For the current study, only the data from Canadians were considered. Participating probation officers ($n = 137$) were requested to submit demographic, offence history, and risk assessment information (Static-99, STABLE-2007, ACUTE-2007) on men who had committed a sexual offence consecutively entering their caseload. The sample can be considered representative of the diverse group of men adjudicated for a sexual offence who are on community supervision.

German Sample

- 4) *German offenders reported to police* (Lehmann et al., 2013). This study included 87% of all individuals reported to the Berlin state police during the years 1994-2001 for a violent or abusive sexual offence ($n = 940$). Individuals were excluded if they did not meet the Static-99 intended population (i.e., were female [$n = 3$] or were under age 18 years at release), had insufficient information regarding their behaviour at the index offence ($n = 54$), or had insufficient time-at-risk ($n = 71$).

Hazard Ratios of the BARR-2002R

BARR-2002R Score	Risk Level	Frequency (n)	Hazard Ratios		
			General Recidivism	Any Violent Recidivism	Average
-2	I – Very Low	91	0.09	0.10	0.10
-1	I – Very Low	37	0.14	0.14	0.14
0	I – Very Low	228	0.20	0.21	0.20
1	II – Below Average	354	0.30	0.31	0.30
2	II – Below Average	408	0.45	0.46	0.46
3	III - Average	402	0.67	0.68	0.68
4	III - Average	322	1.00	1.00	1.00
5	III - Average	249	1.48	1.47	1.48
6	IV – Above Average	177	2.21	2.17	2.19
7	IV – Above Average	116	3.28	3.20	3.24
8	IV – Above Average	6	-	-	-

Note. We recommend using the average hazard ratios in risk communication. Hazard ratios based on Cox regression coefficients derived from entering the continuous *BARR-2002R* scores centered on a score of 4, with sample as strata ($k = 4$); for general recidivism $\beta = .396535$ (SE = .016692, N = 2,389) and for any violent recidivism $\beta = .387306$ (SE = .021935, N = 2,388). Hazard ratios not presented for a BARR-2002R score of 8 due to the low number of individuals populating this score.

Percentiles for the BARR-2002R

Score	Observed Percentages			Percentile Rank Defined as Mid-Point Average	
	Below	Same	Higher	Percentile	[95% CI]
-2	0	7.0	93.0	3.5	[0.3, 6.8]
-1	7.0	1.4	91.6	7.6	[6.3, 9.1]
0	8.4	14.0	77.6	15.3	[8.9, 21.9]
1	22.4	14.0	63.6	29.3	[22.7, 36.0]
2	36.4	20.8	42.8	46.7	[37.1, 56.3]
3	57.2	9.4	33.4	61.8	[56.9, 66.7]
4	66.6	10.4	23.0	71.8	[66.6, 76.9]
5	77.0	9.6	13.4	81.8	[77.0, 86.4]
6	86.6	7.8	5.6	90.5	[86.6, 94.1]
7+	94.4	5.6	0.0	97.1	[94.4, 99.8]

Note. Score on the General Criminality scale with age. Distribution based on a weighted average of 3 samples ($n = 1,343$, weighted $M = 2.44$, weighted $SD = 2.40$). Scores of 7 and 8 were collapsed because only one individual had a score of 8.

Two-Year Observed and Estimated General Recidivism Rates for BARR-2002R

(based on fixed-effect meta-analysis results)

Score	Fixed Follow-up		Logistic Regression Estimates		
	Recidivists/ total	Observed Recidivism Rate (%)	Predicted Recidivism Rate (%)	95% CI	
-2	1/82	1.2	1.3	0.8	2.2
-1	0/17	0.0	2.2	1.4	3.3
0	6/179	3.4	3.5	2.5	5.0
1	10/179	5.6	5.7	4.3	7.5
2	27/251	10.8	9.0	7.3	11.1
3	15/156	9.6	14.0	12.0	16.3
4	33/174	19.0	21.2	18.9	23.6
5	39/153	25.5	30.6	27.8	33.6
6	54/150	36.0	42.0	37.8	46.4
7	59/111	53.2	54.4	48.6	60.1
8	3/6	50.0	-	-	-
Total	247/1,458	19.5			

Note. From Blais et al. (2022). Recidivism estimates based on routine Canadian samples ($N = 1,458$, $n_{\text{recidivists}} = 247$, $k = 3$) and a weighted fixed-effect B_1 of .4971 ($SE = .0388$), a weighted fixed-effect B_0 of -2.3094 ($SE = .1182$), and a median correlation of the estimates of -.818. Recidivism estimates are not presented for a score of 8 ($n = 6$).

Five-Year Observed and Estimated General Recidivism Rates for

BARR-2002R

Fixed Follow-up			Logistic Regression Estimates		
Score	Recidivists/total	Observed Recidivism Rate (%)	Predicted Recidivism Rate (%)	95% CI	
-2	1/64	1.6	2.3	1.5	3.7
-1	1/15	6.7	4.0	2.7	5.8
0	8/124	6.5	6.8	5.0	9.2
1	13/129	10.1	11.3	9.0	14.2
2	39/195	20.0	18.2	15.4	21.4
3	28/117	23.9	28.0	25.1	31.1
4	59/138	42.8	40.4	37.3	43.6
5	52/112	46.4	54.2	50.5	57.9
6	86/119	72.3	67.4	63.0	71.6
7	72/95	75.8	78.3	73.6	82.4
8	3/4	75.0	-	-	-
Total	362/1,112	32.6			

Note. From Babchishin et al. (2016). Recidivism estimates based on routine Canadian samples ($N = 1,112$, $n_{\text{recidivists}} = 362$, $k = 3$) and a weighted B_1 of .5575 ($SE = .0380$), a B_0 of -1.5021 ($SE = .1014$), and a median correlation of the estimates of -.754. Recidivism estimates are not presented for a score of 8 ($n = 4$).

Five-Year Observed and Estimated Violent (including Sexual)

Recidivism Rates for BARR-2002R

Fixed Follow-up			Logistic Regression Estimates		
Score	Recidivists/total	Observed Recidivism Rate (%)	Predicted Recidivism Rate (%)	95% CI	
-2	1/64	1.6	2.5	1.5	4.0
-1	1/15	6.7	3.8	2.5	5.7
0	7/124	5.6	5.6	4.0	7.9
1	8/129	6.2	8.4	6.4	10.9
2	23/195	11.8	12.3	10.1	15.0
3	20/118	16.9	17.8	15.4	20.4
4	40/138	29.0	24.9	22.4	27.6
5	31/112	27.7	33.7	30.5	37.0
6	43/119	36.1	43.8	39.3	48.4
7	47/96	49.0	54.5	48.4	60.5
8	3/4	75.0	-	-	-
Total	224/1,114	20.1			

Note. From Babchishin et al. (2016). Recidivism estimates based on routine Canadian samples ($n = 1,114$, $n_{\text{recidivists}} = 224$, $k = 3$) and a weighted B_1 of .4282 (.0391), a B_0 of -1.9604 (.1160), and a median correlation of the estimates of -.797. Recidivism estimates are not presented for a score of 8 ($n = 4$).

Percentiles for the General Criminality Factor

The General Criminality subscale of the Static-2002R (BARR-2002R without the age item) can be used as a measure of general criminality. Although not a comprehensive measure of antisociality, separately considering general criminality from the total Static-2002R score could support inferences concerning appropriate options for supervision and treatment (e.g., Because this individual is high on general criminality, he is likely at risk for treatment drop-out and noncompliance with community supervision). Percentiles for its use are presented below.

Score	Observed Percentages			Percentile Rank	
	Below	Same	Higher	Percentile	Defined as Mid-Point Average [95% CI]
0	0	38.1	61.9	19.1	[1.9, 36.3]
1	38.1	14.5	47.4	45.4	[38.4, 52.3]
2	52.6	11.6	35.8	58.4	[52.7, 64.2]
3	64.2	11.4	24.4	70.0	[64.3, 75.5]
4	75.6	11.7	12.7	81.5	[75.8, 87.0]
5	87.3	10.6	2.1	92.6	[87.6, 97.4]
6	97.9	2.1	0	99.0	[97.8, 99.9]

Note. Score on the General Criminality scale without age. Distribution based on a weighted average of 3 Canadian samples ($n = 1,343$; weighted $M = 1.84$, weighted $SD = 1.88$)

References

- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, S. J. (2004). *Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI): An offender assessment system. User's guide*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Babchishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & Blais, J. (2016). Less is more: Using Static-2002R subscales to predict violent and general recidivism among sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse*, 28(3), 187–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063215569544>
- Bertsch, I., Guay, J. P., Réveillère, C., Telle, E., Douceron, H., Dubuisson, M., Courtois, R., & Pham, T. (2023). An investigation of reliability and validity of the LS/CMI with French offenders. *L'Encephale*, 49(5), 460–465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.encep.2022.05.003>
- Bigras, J. (2007). La prédiction de la récidive chez les délinquants sexuels [Prediction of recidivism among sex offenders]. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 68 (09). (UMI No. NR30941).

- Blais, J., Babchishin, K. M., & Hanson, R. K. (2022). Improving our risk communication: Standardized risk levels for Brief Assessment of Recidivism Risk-2002R. *Sexual Abuse*, 34(6), 667–698. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10790632211047185>
- Boer, A. (2003). *Evaluating the Static-99 and Static-2002 risk scales using Canadian sexual offenders*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom.
- 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 Center Council of State Governments. http://saratso.org/pdf/A_Five_Level_Risk_and_Needs_System_Report.pdf
- 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(1), 48-63. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000135>
- Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2007-05). Public Safety Canada.
- Helmus, L., Lee, S. C., Phenix, A., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2021). *Static-99R & Static-2002R evaluators' workbook*. SAARNA: The Society for the Advancement of Actuarial Risk Needs Assessment. Available at <https://saarna.org/>.
- Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., & Babchishin, K. M. (2012). Improving the predictive accuracy of Static-99 and Static-2002 with older sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse*, 24(1), 64-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107906321140995>
- Lehmann, R. J. B., Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K., Gallasch-Nemitz, F., Biedermann, J., & Dahle, K.-P. (2013). Interpreting multiple risk scales for sex offenders: Evidence for averaging. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(3), 1019-1024. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033098>
- Morey, L. C., & Ambwani, S. (2008). The Personality Assessment Inventory. In G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment, Vol. 2. Personality measurement and testing* (pp. 626–645). Sage Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849200479.n30>
- Nafekh, M., & Motiuk, L. L. (2002). *The Statistical Information on Recidivism, Revised 1 (SIR-R1) Scale: A psychometric examination*. Correctional Service of Canada.
- Jung, S., Toop, C., & Ennis, L. (2018). Identifying criminogenic needs using the Personality Assessment Inventory with males who have sexually offended. *Sexual Abuse*, 30(8), 992–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063217715018>
- Jung, S., & Wielinga, F. (2019). Simplifying the estimation of violence risk by police among individuals charged for sexual assault. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, 6(1), 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000116>
- Jung, S., Wielinga, F., & Ennis, L. (2018). Can we keep it simple? Using the BARR-2002R with a community-based sex offender sample. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 24(1), 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2017.1388643>

- Rice, M. E., Harris, G. T., & Lang, C. (2013). Validation of and revision to the VRAG and SORAG: The Violence Risk Appraisal Guide—Revised (VRAG-R). *Psychological Assessment*, 25(3), 951-965. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032878>
- Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., Kelley, S. M., & Mundt, J. C. (2021). Estimating lifetime and residual risk for individuals who remain sexual offense free in the community: Practical applications. *Sexual Abuse*, 33(1), 3-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063219871573>

Name: _____

At-Risk Date: _____ Date of Assessment: _____

Brief Assessment for Recidivism Risk (BARR-2002R)

<u>AGE</u> 1. Age at Release 18 to 34.9 = 2 35 to 39.9 = 1 40 to 59.9 = 0 60 or older = -2		
<u>GENERAL CRIMINALITY</u> 2. Any Prior Involvement with the Criminal Justice System No = 0 Yes = 1		
3. Prior Sentencing Occasions For Anything: 0-2 prior sentencing occasions for anything = 0 3-13 prior sentencing occasions = 1 14 or more prior sentencing occasions = 2		
4. Any Community Supervision Violation: No = 0 Yes = 1		
5. Years Free Prior to Index Sex Offence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 36 months free prior to committing the sexual offence that resulted in the index conviction AND more than 48 months free prior to index conviction = 0 • Less than 36 months free prior to committing the sexual offence that resulted in the index conviction OR less than 48 months free prior to conviction for index sex offence = 1 		
6. Any Prior Non-sexual Violence Sentencing Occasion: No = 0 Yes = 1		
<u>Score</u>	<u>Standardized Risk Level</u>	
-2, -1, 0	I – Very low risk	
1, 2	II – Below average risk	
3, 4, 5	III – Average risk	
6, 7+	IV – Above average risk	

Note. Coding rules for the Static-2002R items are available at <https://saarna.org/>.