

\_\_\_\_\_ **Research Report** \_\_\_\_\_

**Static Factors Assessment (SFA) in the Offender  
Intake Assessment Process: Relationship to  
Release and Community Outcomes**

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.



**Static Factors Assessment (SFA) in the Offender Intake Assessment Process: Relationship  
to Release and Community Outcomes**

Leslie Helmus

&

Trina K. Forrester

Correctional Service of Canada

August 2014



## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank Collette Cousineau and Renée Gobeil with helping us pull the data (and also to Renée for her helpful comments). We also thank Sara Johnson, Philippe Bensimon, and Leslie Anne Keown for their feedback throughout this project and Sue Hazel for expertise from the front lines.



## Executive Summary

**Key words:** *risk assessment, Static Factors Assessment, Aboriginal offenders, women offenders, reoffending*

Risk assessment is an integral activity in corrections, informing decisions throughout sentence management. Given the profound implications of risk assessment for both public safety and the offender, assessment practices should be periodically evaluated and updated to reflect advances in knowledge and to ensure continual utility with changing offender populations. The Static Factors Assessment (SFA) is a criminal risk assessment component and was developed as part of the Offender Intake Assessment. It consists of 137 items grouped into three subcomponents: Criminal History Record (CHR), Offence Severity Record (OSR), and Sex Offence History Checklist (SOHC). The current report examines only the CHR and OSR, as the SOHC is only scored for a subset of offenders. A summary risk judgement (low risk, moderate risk, or high risk) is formed based upon some or all of these items and/or subcomponents.

The goal of the study was to examine whether the SFA overall summary ratings were related to first release type and to proportion of sentence served at first release. Furthermore, this study assessed if the SFA overall summary rating, item scores, and subcomponent scores were related to community outcomes.

All federal offenders who were granted their first release in two fiscal years (April 1, 2006 to March 31, 2008) were included in the study, provided that they also had SFA ratings and valid follow-up data. Analyses were examined for the total population, as well as disaggregated by gender and Aboriginal ancestry. Analyses examined whether the SFA was related to three community outcomes: revocations without an offence, readmissions with any offence, and readmissions with a violent offence.

The overall SFA ratings were related to first release. Offenders with higher risk ratings were less likely to be granted discretionary release and they served a higher proportion of their sentence at their first release. These findings also held true for the subgroups examined. The overall risk rating on the SFA and the CHR and OSR subcomponents were significantly related to all of the community outcomes assessed. Most of the individual items in the CHR were significantly related to the community outcomes, whereas the support for the OSR items was more mixed. Effect sizes tended to be lower for Aboriginal offenders (men or women) and similar or slightly higher for non-Aboriginal women.

The overall rating of the SFA demonstrates acceptable relationships with relevant outcomes, and a previous report found that it also has good construct validity (Helmus & Forrester, 2014). However, the scale may be improved by reducing its length (increasing efficiency for correctional staff) without reducing its utility. The OSR contained a number of items that did not show significant relationships with any of the outcomes examined.





## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	v
List of Appendices.....	v
List of Acronyms.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Structure of the SFA: Combining Factors into Global Assessments.....	2
Validation of the SFA.....	3
Content of the SFA: Risk Factors.....	4
Summary and Purpose of Current Study.....	5
Method.....	7
Participants.....	7
Measures.....	7
Static Factors Assessment.....	8
Outcome variables.....	8
Overview of Analyses.....	9
Results.....	11
Relationship to Release.....	11
Relationship to Community Outcomes.....	12
SFA overall risk rating.....	12
Subcomponent scores.....	13
Item scores.....	16
Limitations.....	19
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	20
References.....	23
Appendices.....	27



## List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Mean Age of Sample by Subgroup</i> .....	8
Table 2. <i>Relationship Between SFA Rating and First Release Type</i> .....	11
Table 3. <i>Relationship Between SFA Overall Rating and Community Outcomes</i> .....	12
Table 4. <i>Relationship Between SFA Criminal History Record Total Score and Community Outcomes</i> .....	14
Table 5. <i>Relationship Between SFA Offence Severity Record Total Scores and Community Outcomes</i> .....	14
Table 6. <i>Overview of Relationships Between SFA Items and Community Outcomes</i> .....	16

## List of Appendices

Appendix A: SFA Ratings and First Release Type .....	27
Appendix B: Relationship Between SFA Items and Community Outcomes .....	29
Appendix C: Community Outcome Analyses for Non-Aboriginal Men .....	34
Appendix D: Community Outcome Analyses for Aboriginal Men .....	35
Appendix E: Community Outcome Analyses for Non-Aboriginal Women .....	36
Appendix F: Community Outcome Analyses for Aboriginal Women .....	37
Appendix G: Items Not Significantly and Positively Related to Any Outcome.....	37



## **List of Acronyms**

AUC = Area Under the Curve

CSC = Correctional Service of Canada

CHR = Criminal History Record

LTSO = long term supervision order

OSR = Offence Severity Record

OIA = Offender Intake Assessment

OMS = Offender Management System

PBC = Parole Board of Canada

ROC = Receiver Operating Characteristic curve analyses

SOHC = Sex Offence History Checklist

SFA = Static Factors Assessment

SPJ = Structured Professional Judgement



## Introduction

Risk assessment is a method of evaluating the likelihood of future criminal behaviour by combining multiple risk factors into an overall assessment of reoffending risk (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009). In the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC), risk assessment informs many decisions, including security classification and intervention recommendations. The Parole Board of Canada (PBC) also relies heavily on risk assessment for both release decisions and recommended conditions of supervision (e.g., residency requirements). Risk assessment can incorporate risk factors (i.e., factors related to recidivism) that are either static in nature (i.e., historical information, such as criminal history, that the offender cannot change) or dynamic (i.e., features of the offender or his/her environment that can change, such as personality dispositions, interpersonal relationships, and environmental situations).

Given the pervasiveness of risk assessment in the criminal justice system (and particularly in sentence management) and its profound consequences for both the offender and for public safety, it is imperative that risk assessment practices are validated. Additionally, as empirical evidence accumulates, risk assessment scales should be continuously re-validated and revised to reflect these advances in knowledge (Dawes, Faust, & Meehl, 1989). Re-validations are also necessary given changing offender profiles (CSC, 2009a, 2009b). Assessing the empirical support of assessment practices is necessary to ensure good decisions are being made. Revising scales as needed (e.g., increasing readability of items or eliminating non-useful items) may not only improve correctional decision-making, but may also reduce the time required to complete the assessment, freeing up staff time for other tasks.

CSC relies on numerous assessment tools and periodically evaluates or updates the scales to ensure they continue to adequately address the needs of the Service and are applicable to changing offender populations. For example, the General Statistical Information on Recidivism scale was developed in the 1980s (Nuffield, 1982), modified in the 1990s to become the SIR-R1 (see Nafekh & Motiuk, 2002), and has been re-validated to ensure its continued utility and to explore possible application to new groups of offenders, such as Aboriginal or women offenders (e.g., Barnum & Gobeil, 2011; Nafekh & Motiuk, 2002). Similarly, the Custody Rating Scale (CRS; Luciani, Motiuk, & Nafekh, 1996; piloted by Porporino, Luciani, Motiuk, Johnston, & Mainwaring, 1989) and the Security Reclassification Scale (SRS; Luciani, Taylor, & Motiuk, 1998) have also been re-evaluated after their development (CRS: Blanchette, Verbrugge, &

Wichmann, 2002; Grant & Luciani, 1998; SRS: Gobeil, 2007, 2009). Also, the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) assessment underwent substantial empirical analysis, resulting in considerable revisions (Brown & Motiuk, 2005).

One scale that has not been recently re-evaluated is the Static Factors Assessment (SFA; CSC, 2012). The SFA was developed in 1989 by a national working group, with the goal of improving CSC's assessment of criminal risk and offender needs at admission (Motiuk, 1993). The SFA is included in the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA; CSC, 2012). The SFA is a criminal risk assessment scale designed to provide an overall appraisal of static factors that contribute to an offender's risk of recidivism. The SFA consists of three subcomponents. First, the Criminal History Record (CHR) includes 38 items examining the offender's current and previous criminal offences (e.g., youth and adult convictions and sentences). Second, the Offence Severity Record (OSR) includes 71 items examining the extent of harm from the offender's criminal activity (e.g., type of prior and current offences, victim information, harm to victims). Lastly, the Sex Offence History Checklist (SOHC) has 28 items examining the nature and extent of current and previous sex offending (this subcomponent will not be examined in this report). The SFA is scored by the parole officer or primary worker for all offenders (men and women, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal). After scoring the items of each of the three subcomponents, the parole officer forms a summary judgement of the offender's overall static risk (low, moderate, or high). The Static Factors Assessment report also provides the total score for each of the subcomponents (derived by mechanically summing the items in each subcomponent). Once completed, the overall static risk level is one component used in calculating an offender's Reintegration Potential rating (CSC, 2012).

### **Structure of the SFA: Combining Factors into Global Assessments**

The SFA is a Structured Professional Judgement (SPJ) risk scale with the overall assessment derived from the judgement of the Parole Officer or Primary Worker. In terms of historical context, the SFA was developed around the time that psychologists were growing dissatisfied with unstructured clinical judgement and were working towards more objective, transparent risk assessment procedures (see Bonta, 1996 for a description of generations of risk assessment). Unlike actuarial or mechanical risk scales (which compute a total score), SPJ is a method of risk assessment where explicit risk factors are scored, but the combination of these items into an overall evaluation of risk is left to the judgement of the clinician (Boer, Wilson,



Gauthier, & Hart, 1997). Proponents of SPJ argue that clinical judgement should be incorporated in risk assessment because the statistical approach of actuarial scales is not always appropriate in individual cases (Webster, Douglas, Eaves, & Hart, 1997). Other researchers, however, have been dismissive of SPJ (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Bonta, 2002; Quinsey et al., 2006) and classify it as a variation of the first generation of risk assessment (i.e., clinical judgement; Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2006).

In terms of predictive accuracy for the various methods of risk assessment, most research has focused on mechanical/actuarial scales compared to unstructured professional judgement, with mechanical/actuarial methods demonstrating greater accuracy (Bonta et al., 1998; Dawes et al., 1989; Grove, Zald, Lebow, Snitz, & Nelson, 2000; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009; Mossman, 1994). On average, SPJ scales are less related to recidivism than actuarial scales (Hanson, Helmus, & Bourgon, 2007; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009), although it is possible to find examples of SPJ scales which perform quite well in meta-analyses, such as the Historical, Clinical, Risk Management-20 (HCR-20; Campbell, French, & Gendreau, 2009) or the Sexual Violence Risk-20 (SVR-20; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009).

Complicating this issue, however, is that SPJ scales can also be used as a mechanical scale by examining a total score (i.e., summing the items) as opposed to forming a professional judgement. In a review and meta-analysis of the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA - a SPJ risk scale designed for domestic violence offenders), Helmus and Bourgon (2011) found that the scale predicted similarly regardless of whether it was used as an SPJ scale (as intended) or as a mechanical scale. However, there is greater variability in the predictive accuracy of SPJ scales used as intended (defined as the proportion of overall variability that exceeds what would be expected) compared to examining the total score (Hanson & Morgon-Bourgon, 2009; Helmus & Bourgon, 2011). In other words, actuarial scales tend to outperform SPJ scales on average. Although there are some SPJ scales that tend to perform quite well, there tends to be more variability in the findings for SPJ scales, suggesting that it is more difficult to use SPJ scales consistently and reliably.

### **Validation of the SFA**

The only information on the validity of the SFA that has been published was a brief study by Motiuk (1997) providing some preliminary data on convergent validity and profile information for selected items of the Criminal History Record. Aside from this report, there are

no major validation studies of the SFA published by CSC, and no examinations of the extent to which the scale is related to future outcomes, such as release decisions or reoffending. Given the role of the SFA in intake assessment and Reintegration Potential rating, a large validation study is needed. Such a validation study will help to assess whether the scale has similar empirical support as the other assessment tools utilized by CSC.

As the relationship between the SFA and other outcomes has not been examined, the review of the general research literature that follows will examine the extent to which the general content of the scale reflects empirically supported risk factors, and the extent to which we could expect it to be applicable to subgroups of offenders (e.g., Aboriginal offenders, women offenders). This is particularly important given that the scale was developed in 1989, at a time when an increase in research on risk assessment was beginning to occur (Hanson, 2005). The extensive gains in our understanding of risk assessment over the past 20 years may allow for the identification of refinements and improvements to the SFA.

### **Content of the SFA: Risk Factors**

The SFA is structured such that ratings on the individual items are intended to inform the evaluator's overall assessment of the offender's risk to reoffend. This structure implies that the individual items are risk factors (i.e., factors related to recidivism). Although scoring the items may serve other important purposes (e.g., general data collection to help inform case management), it is important to know whether the items are indeed valid risk factors. To the extent that the included items are not valid risk factors, then their inclusion in the scale (alongside validated risk factors) may misinform the evaluator, degrading the accuracy and utility of the overall risk rating.

The SFA includes two primary types of risk factors: criminal history and offence severity.<sup>1</sup> Criminal history is one of the most robust risk factors for reoffending (for a summary of meta-analyses, see Andrews & Bonta, 2010). This empirical support should not be surprising given that general research in psychology has yet to refute Thorndike's (1911) maxim that the best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour. Not surprisingly given the universality of this principle, meta-analyses have found that criminal history is also a risk factor for women offenders (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Interestingly, for Aboriginal offenders, a recent meta-

---

<sup>1</sup> The SFA also includes a section on sexual offence history for sex offenders. This section was not examined in this report.

analysis found that criminal history is significantly related to recidivism, though the effect sizes are significantly lower than for non-Aboriginal offenders (Gutierrez, Wilson, Rugge, & Bonta, 2013). In a meta-analysis of static risk assessment for Aboriginal sex offenders, criminal history (measured by the general criminality subcomponent of Static-2002R) was not significantly related to recidivism, although the sample size of Aboriginal sex offenders was fairly small ( $n = 209$ ; Babchishin, Blais, & Helmus, 2012). Overall, the empirical literature supports criminal history as a valid risk factor, though its accuracy may be reduced with Aboriginal offenders.

Offence severity, on the other hand, has not been identified as a major risk factor for recidivism. In a study of the recidivism rates of approximately 270,000 offenders from 15 U.S. states, Langan and Levin (2002) found more of an inverse relationship between offence severity and recidivism. The highest recidivism rates were found for property offenders, as well as robbery offenders. The lowest recidivism rates were found for offenders convicted of homicide, rape, and other sexual offences, who are generally considered more serious offenders. This pattern generally held true when the outcome was restricted to violent recidivism; property offenders had higher rates of violent recidivism than offenders who were released from a homicide or rape offence, but not from a robbery offence. Greater victim injury during the index offence has also been related to *reduced* violent recidivism (Quinsey, Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 2006). Among domestic violence offenders, a review found no support for a relationship between offence severity and recidivism (Bennett-Cattaneo & Goodman, 2005), and, in fact, one study of domestic violence offenders found that offence severity predicted significantly *less* recidivism (Grann & Wedin, 2002). Examinations of the relationship between offence severity and recidivism among other subgroups of offenders (e.g., Aboriginal offenders, women offenders) are lacking.

Although the SFA was developed in 1989 (prior to much of the current empirical research on factors related to recidivism), the Criminal History Record appears relatively consistent with current empirical knowledge. The Offence Severity Record, however, is less supported by current research.

### **Summary and Purpose of Current Study**

Since the implementation of the SFA in 1994, considerable research on evidence-based risk assessment has accumulated, yet the scale has not been re-evaluated. The purpose of this study was to validate the SFA to ensure the scale is working as intended, and investigate whether

findings would suggest recommended alterations (e.g., removal of some items) to improve correctional assessment practices. The following research questions will be addressed:

- 1) Is the SFA overall summary rating related to first release type and to proportion of sentence served at first release? Specifically, are offenders with higher risk ratings released later in their sentences?
- 2) Are the SFA overall summary rating, item scores, and subcomponent scores (Criminal History Record, Offence Severity Record) related to relevant outcomes, such as revocations without offence, readmissions with any offence, and readmissions with a new violent offence?
- 3) Is the SFA related to first release type and community outcomes for non-Aboriginal men, Aboriginal men, non-Aboriginal women, and Aboriginal women?

This study represents the second component of a recent attempt to validate the Static Factors Assessment. The first study (Helmus & Forrester, 2014) was designed to examine the construct validity of the SFA. The results of this study generally found that the Criminal History and Offence Severity subcomponents were largely functioning as intended. That is, ratings on the items from these scales were related to overall risk ratings with few exceptions (supporting face validity), and the subcomponents and summary risk ratings were related to other risk measures (supporting convergent validity). This was true of Aboriginal and women offenders as well, although findings tended to be not as strong for Aboriginal offenders compared to non-Aboriginal offenders. The conclusion was that construct validity was satisfactory for the CHR and OSR. Examining how the SFA is related to outcomes (the goal of the present study) will provide further information on the utility of this risk scale.

## Method

### Participants

This study included all federal offenders who were granted their first release between April 1, 2006 and March 31, 2008 who had commenced their sentence in 1997 or later<sup>2</sup>, had a SFA assessment completed, and had been in the community for five years after release (112 offenders who were deported or who died during follow-up were removed). This represented a total of 8,767 federal offenders: 534 women (6.1%) and 8,233 men (93.9%). Of these offenders, 1,649 (18.9%) self-reported Aboriginal ancestry and 7,061 (81.1%) were non-Aboriginal. As seen in Table 1, the mean age at admission was 34 years and the mean age at first release was 35 years. Aboriginal offenders, both men and women, tended to be younger than non-Aboriginal offenders.

Table 1

*Mean Age of Sample by Subgroup*

Offender subgroup	N	Age at admission		Age at first release	
		M	(SD)	M	(SD)
All offenders	8,767	33.7	(10.6)	35.3	(10.7)
Non-Aboriginal men	6,684	34.2	(10.8)	35.8	(10.9)
Aboriginal men	1,500	31.0	(9.9)	33.0	(9.9)
Non-Aboriginal women	377	34.5	(10.0)	35.5	(9.9)
Aboriginal women	149	31.6	(8.2)	32.8	(8.1)

*Note.* Information on Aboriginal ancestry was unavailable for 57 offenders.

### Measures

All data for this study were extracted from the Offender Management System (OMS), a computerized offender file management system maintained by CSC. The OMS contains information gathered from the time of admission to the federal system to the end of an offender's sentence, as well as during any subsequent readmissions to federal custody.

---

<sup>2</sup> Even though the SFA was implemented in 1994, data were only recorded consistently as of 1997. Given that this sampling period restricted the data to offenders who would have served 12 years or less in their sentence, the sample disproportionately excluded indeterminate offenders. Of the 190 indeterminate offenders who were granted first release between April 1, 2006 and March 31, 2008, only 30 had SFA assessments (excluding 2 offenders who had either died or been deported, and were removed from analyses).

**Static Factors Assessment.** As previously noted, the SFA (CSC, 2012a; Motiuk, 1993) is a 137-item structured professional judgement risk assessment tool with three subcomponents: Criminal History Record (38 items), Offence Severity Record (71 items), and Sex Offence History Checklist (28 items). Given that the latter subcomponent is only rated for a subset of offenders, it was not examined in this report. After rating the items (which are scored as a dichotomous yes/no), the parole officer or primary worker determines an overall rating of the offender's static risk level (i.e., low, moderate, or high). In addition to the overall static risk rating, we also computed total scores for each of the subcomponents.

It was not uncommon for parole officers to leave some items blank in their SFA rating. For item analyses, data were restricted to cases with information on that item. For subcomponent total scores, the total was not prorated (i.e., missing values for an item were treated as equivalent to zero). This was because preliminary data cleaning and consultations with CSC front-line staff indicated that some parole officers leave items blank as opposed to indicating "no". In other words, it is not possible to disentangle situations where the risk factor is absent from those where there is truly no available information to rate the item. Summing the number of "yes" ratings would underestimate total scores in some circumstances where there was genuine missing information; however, this is unlikely to make a substantial difference in the overall findings (i.e., it will have a greater distorting effect on attempts to estimate a total score on the scale, rather than effects to examine the relationship between total scores and recidivism).

In terms of the amount of missing information, 13.1% of offenders were missing scores for at least 1 of the 38 items of the CHR (2.7% had more than 5 items missing), and 19.5% of offenders were missing scores for at least 1 of the 71 items of the OSR (4.5% had more than 5 items missing). For more information on the amount of missing information for each item (from a larger sample), see Helmus and Forrester (2014).

**Outcome variables.** This study examined whether the SFA was related to release type, as well as community outcomes. The offender's first release from the federal sentence examined in this study was categorized as either day parole, full parole, statutory release, or other (which included offenders detained past their statutory release date and those released on a long-term supervision order). Time served on the current sentence was calculated as the length of time

between their actual admission date to CSC custody and the date of their first release. Proportion of sentence served was calculated as their time served divided by their sentence length among those with determinate sentences.

Community outcomes included revocations without a new offence, as well as readmissions with any offence, and readmissions with a violent offence. Readmissions for outstanding offences were excluded. Revocations without a new offence were calculated for a fixed eight-month follow-up period after release.<sup>3</sup> Offenders who reached their warrant expiry date before the end of follow-up were excluded from these analyses (of the 8,767 offenders in the sample, 8,400 had the requisite eight months of community supervision for analyses of this outcome). For the other outcomes, any readmission with a relevant offence was counted, including revocations with a new offence as well as a new Warrant of Committal. For these analyses, the follow-up period was five years post-release for all offenders. Violent offences included all offences in the following criminal code groups: homicide and related offences, attempted murder, robbery, kidnapping, abduction, weapons and explosives, major assault, common assault, arson, sexual assault, and sexual abuse.

### **Overview of Analyses**

In addition to descriptive statistics, analyses also included Cramer's  $v$  effect sizes for relationships between categorical variables, and Pearson's correlations for relationships between two continuous variables. Following Cohen (1992), correlations and Cramer's  $v$  values of .10, .30, and .50 were considered small, moderate, and large, respectively. The primary analyses, however, used the area under the curve (AUC) statistic from receiver operating characteristic curve analyses (ROC). The AUC is an effect size statistic appropriate when one variable is dichotomous and the other is at least ordinal (Swets, Dawes, & Monahan, 2000). AUC values can vary between 0 and 1, with .500 indicating no relationship between the two variables. An AUC value less than .500 indicates that higher ratings (i.e., on the SFA item, subcomponent, or overall risk rating) are associated with lower rates of the outcome (i.e., negative relationship), and AUC values between .500 and 1 indicate that higher SFA ratings are associated with higher rates of the outcome. As a heuristic, an AUC of .560 corresponds to a small effect size, while .640 reflects a moderate effect, and .710 reflects a large effect size, as these values roughly

---

<sup>3</sup> This timeframe was chosen because it provided the longest possible follow-up without meaningfully reducing the available sample size (i.e., only 5% of the sample did not have a minimum of eight months of supervision).

correspond to Cohen's *ds* of .20, .50, and .80 (see Rice & Harris, 2005). An AUC value is statistically significant if the 95% confidence interval does not include .500.

Finally, most analyses were completed for the overall sample as well as four offender subgroups: non-Aboriginal men, Aboriginal men, non-Aboriginal women, and Aboriginal women. Analyses comparing AUCs for offender subgroups examined the difference between the two AUC values.<sup>4</sup> If the 95% confidence interval for the difference between two AUCs did not include zero, then the difference was statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

---

<sup>4</sup> The *SE* for the difference was defined as  $\sqrt{SE^2(AUC_1) + SE^2(AUC_2)}$  (Hanley & McNeil, 1983).



## Results

This study aimed to assess the relationship between the SFA and release and community outcomes. To that end, the first portion of analyses focused on determining if the SFA overall summary rating was related to first release type and to proportion of sentence served at first release. The second portion of the analyses sought to assess if the SFA overall summary rating, item scores, and subcomponent scores (Criminal History Record and Offence Severity Record) were related to revocations without an offence, readmissions for any offence, and readmissions with a new violent offence.

### Relationship to Release

The SFA overall rating (low, moderate, or high) was compared to first release type. Table 4 presents the breakdown of offenders by first release and SFA rating. Risk ratings were moderately associated with first release type (Cramer's  $v = .36$ ), with a tendency for low risk offenders being most likely to receive discretionary releases (i.e., day and full parole) and high risk offenders most likely to be released at their Statutory Release Date or later. For example, among low risk offenders, 79% were first released on day parole, whereas for high risk offenders, only 20% were released on day parole. Similar comparisons between SFA overall rating and first release type by gender and Aboriginal ancestry are presented in Appendix A. Similar patterns were observed for these offender subgroups as well.

Additionally, the SFA overall rating was compared on the proportion of sentence served at first release. Offenders serving a determinate sentence ( $n = 8,737$ ) served an average of 48%

Table 2

*Relationship between SFA Rating and First Release Type*

Release type	SFA risk rating					
	Low risk		Moderate risk		High risk	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Day parole ( $n = 3,827$ )	79.4	(1,218)	50.5	(1,908)	20.3	(701)
Full parole ( $n = 254$ )	8.9	(136)	2.1	(80)	1.1	(38)
Statutory release ( $n = 4,374$ )	11.4	(175)	46.5	(1,757)	70.7	(2,442)
Other ( $n = 312$ )	0.3	(4)	0.9	(34)	7.9	(274)
Total ( $n = 8,767$ )	100.0	(1,533)	100.0	(3,779)	100.0	(3,455)

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment. Other release types include detained past statutory release but released prior to warrant expiry, released at warrant expiry and released at warrant expiry on a long term supervision order. Value in parenthesis is the sample size.

( $SD = 22$ ) of their full sentences prior to release. Overall risk ratings were significantly associated with the proportion of the sentence served,  $r = .50$ ,  $p < .001$ , with a large effect size. This means that offenders with high overall SFA risk ratings served a greater proportion of their sentence ( $M = 60\%$ ,  $SD = 18$ ) than those with medium risk ratings ( $M = 46\%$ ,  $SD = 20$ ) and those with low risk ratings ( $M = 29\%$ ,  $SD = 17$ ). A summary of the associations between the proportion of sentence served and the overall SFA risk ratings for each of the subgroups is presented in Appendix A. All associations were significant and were moderate to large in magnitude.

Given that offenders with an indeterminate sentence do not have a warrant expiry date, the proportion of the sentence served cannot be calculated. In total there were 30 offenders<sup>5</sup> serving indeterminate sentences, 15 of whom were identified as high risk, 11 as medium risk, and 4 as low risk on the overall SFA ratings. The mean number of years served for all indeterminate offenders was 5.7 ( $SD = 2.4$ ). The length of sentence served was not significantly associated with the SFA overall risk ratings for these offenders,  $r = .18$ ,  $p = .345$ .

### **Relationship to Community Outcomes**

**SFA overall risk rating.** Table 3 presents the relationship between SFA overall risk ratings and community outcomes (AUCs and confidence intervals). In the overall sample, 23% were revoked without a new offence, 26% were readmitted with a new offence, and 11% were readmitted with a violent offence. The overall SFA rating was significantly related to all the outcomes with small effect sizes (AUCs between .603 and .624). For all the outcome variables, the proportion of offenders with each outcome increased with risk level (i.e., fewer offenders with low risk ratings had the outcome compared to offenders with higher risk ratings). Specifically, for all outcomes, high risk offenders were at least three times as likely to have the outcome as low risk offenders (e.g., 33% of high risk offenders were readmitted for an offence, compared to 10% of low risk offenders).

Similar analyses are presented for each of the offender subgroups in Appendix C (for non-Aboriginal men see Table C1), Appendix D (for Aboriginal men see Table D1), Appendix E (for non-Aboriginal women see Table E1), and Appendix F (for Aboriginal women see Table F1). As seen with the overall sample, the proportion of offenders with a given outcome

---

<sup>5</sup> As discussed in the methods section, the sampling restrictions of the current study disproportionately excluded indeterminately sentenced offenders.

Table 3

*Relationship between SFA Overall Rating and Community Outcomes*

Overall SFA rating by outcome	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i> with outcome	% outcome	AUC	95% CI
<b>Revocations without Offence</b>					
Low risk	1,511	162	10.7		
Moderate risk	3,730	812	21.8		
High risk	3,159	985	31.2	.607	[.595 - .620]
Overall	8,400	1,959	23.3		
<b>Readmission: Any offence</b>					
Low risk	1,533	157	10.2		
Moderate risk	3,779	993	26.3		
High risk	3,455	1,148	33.2	.603	[.591 - .614]
Overall	8,767	2,298	26.2		
<b>Readmission: violent Offence</b>					
Low risk	1,533	44	2.9		
Moderate risk	3,779	382	10.1		
High risk	3,455	555	16.1	.624	[.609 - .639]
Overall	8,767	981	11.2		

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

generally increased with the risk ratings. Overall SFA ratings were significantly related to all community outcomes for all subgroups, with only one exception. The SFA ratings were not significantly related to revocations without an offence for Aboriginal women, although the small sample size (148 Aboriginal women) substantially reduced statistical power for this analysis.

Although the SFA was generally related to outcomes for all subgroups, there were patterns of lower AUCs among Aboriginal offenders and higher AUCs for women. Pairwise comparisons found that the relationship between the SFA and community outcomes was significantly lower for Aboriginal men compared to non-Aboriginal men (for all three outcomes), significantly higher for non-Aboriginal women for any readmission (compared to non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal men), significantly higher for non-Aboriginal women for violent readmissions (compared to Aboriginal men), and significantly higher for Aboriginal women for violent readmissions (compared to Aboriginal men).

**Subcomponent scores.** Relationships with outcomes for the two primary subcomponents of the SFA (Criminal History Record and Offence Severity Record) are presented in Tables 4

and 5. Given that these subcomponents are measured continuously (i.e., the total score summed across all items in that subcomponent), the means and standard deviations are presented in place of the sample sizes for each outcome category. Similar analyses are presented for each of the offender subgroups in Appendices C through G (Tables C2, D2, E2, F2, and G2).

As seen in Table 4, the Criminal History Record (CHR) was significantly related to all outcomes with moderate to large effect sizes. The strongest relationship was between the CHR and readmission with any offence (AUC = .717). Comparing the AUCs to Table 3, the CHR subscale had significantly higher effect sizes than the overall SFA rating for all outcomes ( $p < .01$ ; non-overlapping confidence intervals). The CHR also had notably higher effect sizes compared to the Offence Severity Record (OSR) subcomponent, which was significantly related to all three outcomes, but with small to moderate effect sizes (see Table 5).

Table 4

*Relationship between SFA Criminal History Record Total Score and Community Outcomes*

Outcome variables	N	CHR		AUC	95% CI
		M	(SD)		
Revocations without offence					
No revocations	6,441	13.5	(7.5)	.669	[.656 - .682]
Revocation	1,959	17.9	(6.6)		
Readmissions with any offence					
No readmission	6,469	13.1	(7.4)	.717	[.706 - .729]
Readmission	2,298	18.8	(6.4)		
Readmissions with violent offence					
No readmission	7,786	14.0	(7.5)	.705	[.690 - .721]
Readmission	981	19.4	(6.4)		

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; CHR = Criminal History Record; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

Relationships between SFA subcomponents and outcomes for offender subgroups are presented in Appendices C through F. For all subgroups, the highest effect sizes were consistently found for the CHR. Overall, findings for non-Aboriginal men closely resembled the trends observed for the full sample. For Aboriginal men, AUCs tended to be slightly lower, and the OSR was not significantly related to readmissions with any offence. In other words, the subscales (particularly the OSR) did not perform as well for Aboriginal men as it did for non-

Aboriginal men. As with the overall sample, the effect sizes for the CHR for all outcomes for non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal men were significantly higher than the comparable effect sizes for the overall SFA rating.

For non-Aboriginal women offenders, effect sizes for the CHR and OSR were notably larger for readmissions with any offence and with a violent offence, compared to the overall findings. In fact, the highest effect sizes observed in this study were for the CHR with non-Aboriginal women, which was related to any readmission (AUC = .785) and any violent readmission (AUC = .830) with particularly large effect sizes. The relationship between the OSR and revocations was small (similar to the overall findings), but only approached statistical significance, likely due to reduced statistical power. For Aboriginal women, effect sizes were generally comparable or larger than the overall findings, although statistical power was substantially reduced, and the OSR was subsequently not significantly related to revocations or readmissions for any offence. The CHR, however, was significantly related to all outcomes for Aboriginal women, with moderate to large effect sizes. Overall, the subcomponent analyses suggest that the CHR performs better than the OSR, and similar to the overall findings, the relationships to outcomes are generally lower for Aboriginal offenders and higher for women offenders.

Table 5

*Relationship Between SFA Offence Severity Record Total Scores and Community Outcomes*

Outcome Variables	N	OSR		AUC	95% CI
		M	(SD)		
Revocations Without Offence					
No Revocations	6,441	13.4	(8.0)	.597	[.583 - .612]
Revocation	1,959	16.0	(8.0)		
Readmissions with Any Offence					
No Readmissions	6,469	14.0	(8.2)	.551	[.538 - .565]
Readmission	2,298	15.4	(8.3)		
Readmissions with Violent Offence					
No Readmission	7,786	13.9	(8.2)	.639	[.621 - .621]
Readmission	981	17.9	(7.9)		

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; OSR = Offence Severity Record; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

**Item scores.** In addition to examining the overall SFA risk ratings and the subcomponents, the relationship between individual SFA items and community outcomes were also explored (analyses presented in Appendix B). There were several instances where a series of dichotomous items together formed an overall scale (e.g., there are five items to capture the number of prior convictions, clumped as 1, 2-4, 5-9, 10-14, and 15+); for these, results are presented for the dichotomous items, as well as for a single composite item capturing the ordinal construct.<sup>6</sup> Generally, the strength of the association between the items and the outcome tended to be small with a few being moderately associated. Table 6 summarizes the results for the items, using the composite items for ordinal constructs as applicable. Depending on the outcome examined, between 24% to 26% of the SFA items were not significantly related to the outcome, while an additional 11% to 21% of the items were significantly *negatively* associated with the

Table 6

*Overview of Relationships between SFA Items and Community Outcomes*

SFA component	<i>k</i>	Non-significant		Significant negative accuracy		Significant positive accuracy	
		%	( <i>k</i> )	%	( <i>k</i> )	%	( <i>k</i> )
Revocations without offence							
Criminal History Record	26	0	(0)	4	(1)	96	(25)
Offence Severity Record	61	34	(21)	20	(12)	46	(28)
Total	87	24	(21)	15	(13)	61	(53)
Readmissions with any offence							
Criminal History Record	26	0	(0)	4	(1)	96	(25)
Offence Severity Record	61	38	(23)	28	(17)	34	(21)
Total	87	26	(23)	21	(18)	53	(46)
Readmissions with violent offence							
Criminal History Record	26	4	(1)	0	(0)	96	(25)
Offence Severity Record	61	34	(21)	15	(9)	51	(31)
Total	87	25	(22)	11	(9)	64	(56)

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; *k* = number of items (which could be a single item, or a composite item summing a series of items assessing the same construct).

<sup>6</sup> In these instances, the OMS automatically checks all subordinate items. There are other sets of items that could arguably form an ordinal scale (e.g., severe, moderate, and mild psychological harm to victims), but OMS does not code them in this way, and inspection of the data suggested that parole officers are not consistently treating them as subordinate. Consistent with how they are often scored, these items were treated as distinct, individual items.

outcomes. This means that among those items that were negatively correlated, as the items were endorsed, the likelihood of the outcome decreased. For all outcomes, over half of the items (53% to 64%) were positively and significantly related to the outcomes.

The CHR had the highest proportion of items with significant and positive relationships to the outcomes. For all outcomes, 96% of the CHR items showed positive and significant effect sizes. Support for the OSR subcomponent was mixed. Roughly half of the OSR items were significantly and positively related to revocations (46%) and readmissions for violent offences (51%), but only one third (34%) were positively related to readmissions for any offence.

To compare risk factors for the three different outcomes, correlations were examined between the value of the AUCs across pairs of outcomes for the overall sample (using composite items where available). For example, the AUCs for the 87 items related to revocations were very strongly correlated with the AUCs for the 87 items related to any readmission. The correlation ( $r = .93$ ) means that the items with the highest AUCs for revocations also tended to have the highest AUCs for any readmissions. Among all outcomes, correlations between AUCs were extremely high and all significant (for revocations and violent readmissions,  $r = .92$ ; for readmissions for any offence and for violent readmissions,  $r = .87$ ), meaning that the items with the highest AUCs for one of these outcomes tended have the highest AUCs for the other outcomes. In other words, the best risk factors were very similar across the outcomes.

In total, of the 87 items or composite items on the SFA (as summarized in Table 6), half of them (45 items; 52%) significantly and positively predicted all three outcomes. These included 23 of the 26 CHR items (or composite items) and 20 of the 61 OSR items (mostly the items assessing previous offences as opposed to current offences).

In contrast, of the 87 items or composite items examined, 28 of them (32%) were not significantly and positively related to *any* of the outcomes. In other words, one third of the SFA items were not related to any of the outcomes in the direction they were intended to be (a full list of these items is included in Appendix G). All but one of these items were from the OSR, and they generally captured drug offences, more serious offences, greater impact on victims, and having vulnerable victims (e.g., children, elderly, handicapped).

## Discussion

This study explored the relationship between the Static Factors Assessment (SFA; items, subcomponents, and overall risk ratings) and release decisions and community outcomes. The overall SFA ratings were related to first release. Offenders with higher risk ratings were less likely to be granted discretionary release and they served a higher proportion of their sentence before their first release date. These findings also held true for the subgroups examined (non-Aboriginal men, Aboriginal men, non-Aboriginal women, and Aboriginal women).

In terms of outcomes in the community for all offenders, the overall risk rating on the SFA was significantly related to revocations without an offence, readmissions with any offence, and readmissions with a violent offence. Relationships to outcomes tended to be lower for Aboriginal offenders and slightly higher for non-Aboriginal women offenders. For example, relationships to all outcomes for the overall SFA rating were significantly lower for Aboriginal men compared to non-Aboriginal men.

Regarding the total scores on the subcomponents, the CHR tended to demonstrate the strongest relationships to the outcomes, and the OSR showed acceptable associations with most outcomes. Similar to the analyses of the overall rating, relationships tended to be lower for Aboriginal offenders (male or female) and similar or slightly higher for non-Aboriginal women. For all subgroups, however, the CHR was consistently the most strongly related to the outcomes (compared to the OSR or the summary risk rating).

These results are consistent with previous research that has found criminal history to be a strong and robust risk factor (e.g., Andrews & Bonta, 2010), whereas findings are more mixed for offence severity (summarized earlier). Examination of the particular items in the OSR, however, indicates that this subcomponent is likely reflective of criminal history and versatility. Roughly half of the OSR items are indicators of previous offences. In other words, it is difficult to disentangle the constructs of offence severity and criminal history in the OSR subcomponent, and it is possible that much of its relationship to the outcomes is derived from indicators of criminal history as opposed to offence severity. Interestingly, most of the OSR items that were not significantly and positively related to the outcomes were assessing presence of serious offences or vulnerable victims, supporting previous research that offence severity (more narrowly defined than the OSR) is not an empirically supported risk factor.

For all outcomes, the total score on the CHR had meaningfully higher effect sizes than



the summary risk rating of the SFA. For example, in the overall sample, the summary risk rating for the SFA was related to any readmission with a small effect, but the CHR total score had a large effect. The finding of higher effects for the CHR compared to the overall rating was true for all gender/Aboriginal ancestry subgroups. The effect sizes for the CHR subcomponent tended to be moderate to large, and was significant for all groups and outcomes. The CHR subcomponent also had higher effect sizes compared to the SIR-R1 for non-Aboriginal male offenders and the SIR-proxy (used for research purposes) for Aboriginal and women offenders (from Barnum & Gobeil, 2012).<sup>7</sup> This pattern of findings suggests the CHR subcomponent is robust and consistently more informative than the overall rating formed using structured professional judgement. The higher effect sizes for the total scores compared to the overall summary rating is not surprising given that previous meta-analyses have found that mechanical/actuarial scales have outperformed structured professional judgement (Hanson et al., 2007; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009) and SPJ scales may have greater variability in their relationships to outcomes (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009; Helmus & Bourgon, 2011).

In terms of the individual items of the SFA, more than half of them were related to the outcomes. Similar to the subcomponent analyses, the CHR items tended to perform best, with 96% of the items from this subcomponent significantly related to the outcomes. The items in the OSR checklist showed more mixed performance, with roughly half the items related to community outcomes. Additionally, among all outcomes, there was considerable similarity in which items were the strongest risk factors. Overall, these results indicate that over half of the SFA items are functioning as intended, though there are differences across subcomponents (i.e., the CHR items work the best). Findings from a previous report, however, indicate that evaluators may give more weight to the OSR than the CHR in their summary risk ratings (Helmus & Forrester, 2014).

### **Limitations**

One limitation of the current study was the small sample size of Aboriginal women, which reduced statistical power. This resulted in somewhat fewer significant findings for this group. Given the lower power, interpretations of findings should also consider the magnitude of the effect size, which was often similar to the overall group.

---

<sup>7</sup> The effect sizes from Barnum and Gobeil (2012) examined general and violent readmissions within 3 years of release, as opposed to the 5-year follow-up of the current study. Revocations were not examined.

Similarly, low base rates reduced the statistical power of readmissions for a violent offence (11% base rate after five years). This highlights concerns with using “readmission” as an outcome criteria, as opposed to any new conviction. Readmissions captures new offences that occur while the offender is on community supervision, or new convictions resulting in new federal sentences. Although the increased monitoring given to offenders who are on supervision may increase the detection rate of new offences, most offenders were not on community supervision for the majority of the follow-up period. During this timeframe, the “readmission” outcome would capture new convictions only if they resulted in a new federal sentence. As an example of the impact this could have, only approximately 11% of all sexual convictions (which are generally considered very serious) result in a federal sentence (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2008), so the proportion of recidivism convictions that could be omitted by our definition could be quite substantial, even accounting for the likelihood that all new convictions should be captured while offenders are still on community supervision, and even after community supervision ends, offenders with a previous federal sentence are presumably more likely to receive another federal sentence for a future serious offence. The benefit of readmissions as an outcome is that it is easy to extract this information from OMS, whereas coding new charges or convictions from national criminal history records is substantially more time consuming. Nonetheless, the limitations of restricting the outcome to federal readmissions should be noted.

Other limitations of this study pertain to general issues of measurement error. The SFA ratings were conducted by staff during routine assessment practices in CSC. This means the results are generalizable to real-world settings. Conversely, however, there was no way to examine the quality or reliability of the SFA assessments. The previous report on the construct validity of the SFA provides more detail on potential reliability/quality issues with these assessments (Helmus & Forrester, 2014). The extent of measurement error would inversely impact the utility of the scale. Similarly, the extent to which outcomes (e.g., recidivism) are undetected would also introduce additional error in the current findings.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The SFA is a static risk scale intended to assess the risk of criminal recidivism. The current investigation indicates that the overall rating of the SFA shows an acceptable relationship with community outcomes, and the previous report found that it also has acceptable construct

validity (Helmus & Forrester, 2014). In this report, the overall SFA ratings were related to first release. Offenders with higher risk ratings were less likely to be granted discretionary release and they served a higher proportion of their sentence at their first release. These findings also held true for the subgroups examined. The overall risk rating on the SFA and the CHR and OSR subcomponents were significantly related to all of the community outcomes assessed. Most of the individual items in the CHR were significantly related to the community outcomes, whereas the support for the OSR items was more mixed. Effect sizes tended to be lower for Aboriginal offenders (men or women) and similar or slightly higher for non-Aboriginal women.

Despite the acceptable performance of the SFA, it may be possible to improve the utility of the scale based on the findings of this report and the previous study (Helmus & Forrester, 2014). In particular, it may be possible to increase efficiency by reducing the length of the scale. In fact, strategic reductions (i.e., removing non-informative items) could increase the scale's ability to assess recidivism risk.

For the CHR and OSR subcomponents, it is possible that reducing the number of items in these scales could improve its utility and efficiency. Twenty-seven of the OSR items or composite items were not related to any of the outcomes in the expected direction, and may be possible candidates for removal, though consideration should be made with respect to retaining some unrelated items for general reporting purposes but not having any weight in SFA scores or ratings. Retaining items in the SFA that are not validated risk factors can be problematic because it may detract from the overall assessment by encouraging evaluators to give weight to non-valid cues. Additionally, although the remaining items were significantly related to at least one of the outcomes, it is unlikely that all items of the CHR and OSR subcomponents add incremental value. It may be possible to reduce these scales to the strongest and most unique risk factors, potentially improving efficiency among staff performing the assessments and improving assessments of risk. Exploring such refinements to the scale should involve a synthesis of the findings from the current study as well as the construct validity findings (Helmus & Forrester, 2014). Additional analyses should also explore incremental effects of the items.

Given the finding of consistently and meaningfully higher effect sizes for the CHR subcomponent compared to the overall SFA rating, further consideration should also be given to possible refinements to the structure of the SFA. Using an objectively derived total score may allow higher levels of consistency and accuracy than a structured professional judgement rating.

This decision requires substantial reflection, however, given that there are advantages involved with retaining the flexibility inherent in the SPJ approach.

## References

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5<sup>th</sup>ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexus/Anderson.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, *52*, 7-27. doi:10.1177/0011128705281756
- Babchishin, K. M., Blais, J. & Helmus, L. (2012). Do static risk factors predict differently for Aboriginal sex offenders? A multi-site comparison using the original and revised Static-99 and Static-2002 scales. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *54*, 1-43. doi:10.3138/cjccj.2010.E.40
- Barnum, G., & Gobeil, R. (2011). *Prediction of re-offence using the SIR-R1 and a proxy*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Bennett Cattaneo, L., & Goodman, L. A. (2005). Risk factors for reabuse in intimate partner violence: A cross-disciplinary critical review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *6*, 141-175. doi:10.1177/1524838005275088
- Blanchette, K., Verbrugge, P., & Wichmann, C. (2002). *The Custody Rating Scale, initial security level placement, and women offenders* (Research Report No. R-127). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Boer, D. P., Wilson, R. J., Gauthier, C. M., & Hart, S. D. (1997). Assessing risk of sexual violence: Guidelines for clinical practice. In C. D. Webster & M. A. Jackson (Eds.), *Impulsivity: Theory, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 326-342). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bonta, J. (1996). Risk-needs assessment and treatment. In A. T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply* (pp. 18-32). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Bonta, J. (2002). Offender risk assessment: Guidelines for selection and use. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *29*, 355-379. doi:10.1177/0093854802029004002
- Bonta, J., Law, M., & Hanson, K. (1998). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *123*, 123-142. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.123.2.123
- Brown, S. L., & Motiuk, L. L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process: A meta-analytic, psychometric and consultative review* (Research Report No. R-164). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.

- Campbell, M., French, S., & Gendreau, P. (2009). The prediction of violence in adult offenders: A meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 567-590. doi:10.1177/0093854809333610
- Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (2008). *Adult Criminal Court Survey*.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2009a). *The changing federal offender population: Aboriginal offender highlights 2009*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2009b). *The changing federal offender population: Highlights 2009*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2012). *Supplementary intake assessments. Commissioner's Directive 705-5*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Dawes, R. M., Faust, D., & Meehl, P. E. (1989). Clinical versus actuarial judgment. *Science*, 243, 1668-1674. doi:10.1126/science.2648573
- Gobeil, R. (2009). *Assessing security reclassification with male Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders* (Research Report No. R-203). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Gobeil, R. (2007). *Revalidation of the Security Reclassification Scale for Women (SRSW)* (Research Report No. R-191). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Grann, M., & Wedin, M. (2002). Risk factors for recidivism among spousal assault and spousal homicide offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 8, 5-23. doi:10.1080/10683160208401806
- Grant, B. A., & Luciani, F. (1998). *Security classification using the Custody Rating Scale* (Research Report No. R-67). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Grove, W. M., Zald, D. H., Lebow, B. S., Snitz, B. E., & Nelson, C. (2000). Clinical versus mechanical prediction: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 12, 19-30. doi:10.1037//1040-3590.12.1.19
- Gutierrez, L., Wilson, H., Ruge, T., & Bonta, J. (2013). The prediction of recidivism with Aboriginal offenders: A theoretically informed meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 55, 55-99. doi:10.1353/cj.2013.0005
- Hanley, J. A., & McNeil, B. J. (1983). A method of comparing the areas under Receiver Operating Characteristic curves derived from the same cases. *Radiology*, 148, 839-843.
- Hanson, R. K. (2005). Twenty years of progress in violence risk assessment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 212-217. doi:10.1177/0886260504267740

- Hanson, R. K., Helmus, L., & Bourgon, G. (2007). *The validity of risk assessments for intimate partner violence: A meta-analysis* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2007-07). Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2009). The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sex offenders: A meta-analysis of 118 prediction studies. *Psychological Assessment, 21*, 1-21. doi:10.1037/a0014421
- Helmus, L., & Bourgon, G. (2011). Taking stock of 15 years of research on the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment guide (SARA): A critical review. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 10*, 64-75. doi:10.1080/14999013.2010.551709
- Helmus, L., & Forrester, T. (2014). *Construct validity of the Static Factors Assessment in the Offender Intake Assessment Process*. Report currently under review. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Services Canada.
- Hilton, N. Z., Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., Lang, C., Cormier, C. A., & Lines, K. J. (2004). A brief actuarial assessment for the prediction of wife assault recidivism: The Ontario Domestic Violence Risk Assessment. *Psychological Assessment, 16*, 267-275. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.16.3.267
- Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report NCJ 193427). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Luciani, F. P., Motiuk, L. L., & Nafekh, M. (1996). *An operational review of the Custody Rating Scale: Reliability, validity and practical utility* (Research Report No. R-47). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Luciani, F., Taylor, G., & Motiuk, L. (1998). *National field test results of the security reclassification protocol: Final report*. Unpublished manuscript. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Mossman, D. (1994). Assessing predictions of violence: Being accurate about accuracy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*, 783-792. doi:10.1037//0022-006X.62.4.783
- Motiuk, L. L. (1993). Where are we in our ability to assess risk? *Forum on Corrections Research, 5*(2), 14-18.
- Motiuk, L. L. (1997). Classification for correctional programming: The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process. *Forum on Corrections Research, 9*(1), 18-22.
- Nafekh, M., & Motiuk, L. L. (2002). *The Statistical Information on Recidivism – Revised 1 (SIR-R1) scale: A psychometric examination*. Ottawa, ON: Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

- Nuffield, J. (1982). *Parole decision-making in Canada: Research towards decision guidelines*. Ottawa, ON: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Porporino, F. J., Luciani, F., Motiuk, L., Johnston, M., & Mainwaring, B. (1989). *Pilot implementation of a Custody Rating Scale: Interim report* (Research Report No. R-02). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Quinsey, V. L., Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., & Cormier, C. A. (2006). *Violent offenders: Appraising and managing risk* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (2005). Comparing effect sizes in follow-up studies: ROC area, Cohen's *d*, and *r*. *Law and Human Behavior*, 29, 615-620. doi: 10.1007/s10979-005-6832-7
- Thorndike, E. L. (1911). *Animal intelligence*. New York: MacMillan.
- Webster, C. D., Douglas, K. S., Eaves, D. & Hart, S. D. (1997a). Assessing risk of violence to others. In C. D. Webster & M. A. Jackson (Eds.), *Impulsivity: Theory, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 251-277). New York: Guilford Press.



## Appendices

### Appendix A: SFA Ratings and First Release Type

Table A1. Relationship between SFA Rating and First Release Type: Non-Aboriginal Men

Release type	SFA risk rating					
	Low risk		Moderate risk		High risk	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Day parole (n = 3,003)	78.9	(955)	50.4	(1,528)	21.3	(520)
Full parole (n = 200)	8.8	(106)	2.2	(66)	1.1	(28)
Statutory release (n = 3,260)	12.0	(145)	46.4	(1,405)	70.0	(1,710)
Other (n = 221)	0.3	(4)	1.0	(31)	7.6	(186)
Total (n = 6,684)	100.0	(1,210)	100.0	(3,030)	100.0	(2,444)

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment. Other release types include detained past statutory release but released prior to warrant expiry, released at warrant expiry and released at warrant expiry on a long term supervision order. Value in parenthesis is the sample size. Cramer's  $v = .34$ .

Table A2. Relationship between SFA Rating and First Release Type: Aboriginal Men

Release type	SFA risk rating					
	Low risk		Moderate risk		High risk	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Day parole (n = 414)	74.0	(57)	42.2	(219)	15.3	(138)
Full parole (n = 23)	9.1	(7)	1.7	(9)	0.8	(7)
Statutory release (n = 975)	16.9	(13)	55.5	(288)	74.5	(674)
Other (n = 88)	0.0	(0)	0.6	(3)	9.4	(85)
Total (n = 1,500)	100.0	(77)	100.0	(519)	100.0	(904)

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment. Other release types include detained past statutory release but released prior to warrant expiry, released at warrant expiry and released at warrant expiry on a long term supervision order. Value in parenthesis is the sample size. Cramer's  $v = .30$ .

Table A3. Relationship between SFA Rating and First Release Type: Non-Aboriginal Women

Release type	SFA risk rating					
	Low risk		Moderate risk		High risk	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Day parole (n = 278)	84.4	(162)	71.7	(101)	34.1	(15)
Full parole (n = 22)	8.8	(17)	2.1	(3)	4.5	(2)
Statutory release (n = 75)	6.8	(13)	26.2	(37)	56.8	(25)
Other (n = 2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	4.6	(2)
Total (n = 377)	100.0	(192)	100.0	(141)	100.0	(44)

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment. Other release types include detained past statutory release but released prior to warrant expiry, released at warrant expiry and released at warrant expiry on a long term supervision order. Value in parenthesis is the sample size. Cramer's  $v = .33$ .

Table A4. Relationship between SFA Rating and First Release Type: Aboriginal Women

Release type	SFA risk rating					
	Low risk		Moderate risk		High risk	
	%	( <i>n</i> )	%	( <i>n</i> )	%	( <i>n</i> )
Day parole ( <i>n</i> = 98)	89.7	(26)	71.5	(50)	44.0	(22)
Full parole ( <i>n</i> = 3)	3.4	(1)	1.4	(1)	2.0	(1)
Statutory release ( <i>n</i> = 47)	6.9	(2)	27.1	(19)	52.0	(26)
Other ( <i>n</i> = 1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	2.0	(1)
Total ( <i>n</i> = 149)	100.0	(29)	100.0	(70)	100.0	(50)

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment. Other release types include detained past statutory release but released prior to warrant expiry, released at warrant expiry and released at warrant expiry on a long term supervision order. Value in parenthesis is the sample size. Cramer's  $v = .27$ .

Table A6. Relationship between SFA Rating and Proportion of Sentence Served by Subgroup

Subgroup	<i>r</i>	<i>n</i>
Non-Aboriginal men	.48	6,665
Aboriginal men	.42	1,495
Non-Aboriginal women	.51	372
Aboriginal women	.42	148

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment. For all correlations,  $p < .001$

## Appendix B: Relationship Between SFA Items and Community Outcomes

Table B1. Relationship between SFA Items and Community Outcomes ( $N = 8,767$ )

		Revocations without offence		Readmissions with any offence		Readmissions with violent offence	
Item	<i>N</i>	<i>(n = 1,959)</i>		<i>(n = 2,298)</i>		<i>(n = 981)</i>	
		<b>AUC</b>	95% CI	<b>AUC</b>	95% CI	<b>AUC</b>	95% CI
<b>Criminal History Record</b>							
<i>Previous Offences – Youth Court</i>							
Previous offences in youth court?	8,729	<b>.588</b>	[.576 - .601]	<b>.629</b>	[.618 - .641]	<b>.641</b>	[.626 - .657]
Previous youth convictions (sum of 5 items below)	8,569	<b>.598</b>	[.584 - .611]	<b>.650</b>	[.638 - .663]	<b>.661</b>	[.643 - .679]
15+ convictions?	8,569	<b>.528</b>	[.520 - .536]	<b>.544</b>	[.537 - .552]	<b>.548</b>	[.536 - .560]
10-14 convictions?	8,568	<b>.546</b>	[.536 - .556]	<b>.568</b>	[.559 - .578]	<b>.575</b>	[.560 - .590]
5-9 convictions?	8,560	<b>.564</b>	[.552 - .576]	<b>.602</b>	[.591 - .613]	<b>.610</b>	[.594 - .626]
2-4 convictions?	8,555	<b>.584</b>	[.571 - .597]	<b>.630</b>	[.618 - .642]	<b>.634</b>	[.618 - .651]
1 conviction?	8,553	<b>.586</b>	[.573 - .598]	<b>.630</b>	[.619 - .642]	<b>.642</b>	[.627 - .658]
Scheduled convictions?	8,627	<b>.545</b>	[.534 - .556]	<b>.558</b>	[.548 - .568]	<b>.586</b>	[.570 - .602]
Dispositions – community supervision?	8,639	<b>.580</b>	[.567 - .592]	<b>.623</b>	[.612 - .635]	<b>.633</b>	[.617 - .650]
Dispositions – Open custody?	8,639	<b>.569</b>	[.557 - .581]	<b>.600</b>	[.589 - .612]	<b>.607</b>	[.590 - .623]
Dispositions – Secure custody?	8,642	<b>.578</b>	[.565 - .590]	<b>.611</b>	[.600 - .622]	<b>.629</b>	[.613 - .646]
Fail during community supervision?	8,508	<b>.573</b>	[.560 - .585]	<b>.610</b>	[.599 - .622]	<b>.614</b>	[.597 - .630]
Disciplinary transfers from open to secure?	8,395	<b>.526</b>	[.519 - .534]	<b>.535</b>	[.528 - .542]	<b>.546</b>	[.535 - .558]
Disciplinary reports in secure custody?	8,162	<b>.537</b>	[.528 - .546]	<b>.554</b>	[.546 - .563]	<b>.577</b>	[.563 - .591]
Attempt escape/UAL/escape from secure custody?	8,491	<b>.526</b>	[.519 - .534]	<b>.538</b>	[.531 - .546]	<b>.554</b>	[.542 - .566]
Transfer to adult facility?	8,556	<b>.510</b>	[.505 - .514]	<b>.509</b>	[.504 - .513]	<b>.513</b>	[.507 - .520]

Item	N	Revocations without offence		Readmissions with any offence		Readmissions with violent offence	
		(n = 1,959)		(n = 2,298)		(n = 981)	
		AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
<i>Previous Offences – Adult Court</i>							
Previous offences in adult court?	8,760	<b>.560</b>	[.552 - .568]	<b>.566</b>	[.559 - .573]	<b>.548</b>	[.539 - .558]
Previous adult convictions (sum of 5 items below)	8,751	<b>.637</b>	[.624 - .650]	<b>.643</b>	[.631 - .655]	<b>.590</b>	[.573 - .607]
15+ convictions?	8,751	<b>.597</b>	[.584 - .609]	<b>.603</b>	[.591 - .614]	<b>.551</b>	[.535 - .568]
10-14 convictions?	8,751	<b>.612</b>	[.600 - .625]	<b>.609</b>	[.598 - .621]	<b>.569</b>	[.553 - .585]
5-9 convictions?	8,751	<b>.605</b>	[.594 - .616]	<b>.609</b>	[.598 - .619]	<b>.578</b>	[.563 - .592]
2-4 convictions?	8,750	<b>.580</b>	[.571 - .589]	<b>.585</b>	[.576 - .593]	<b>.562</b>	[.550 - .573]
1 conviction?	8,749	<b>.561</b>	[.553 - .568]	<b>.567</b>	[.560 - .574]	<b>.550</b>	[.540 - .559]
Scheduled convictions?	8,742	<b>.582</b>	[.570 - .594]	<b>.560</b>	[.549 - .572]	<b>.577</b>	[.562 - .592]
Sanctions – Community supervision?	8,748	<b>.574</b>	[.564 - .583]	<b>.579</b>	[.570 - .588]	<b>.558</b>	[.546 - .570]
Sanctions – Provincial terms?	8,756	<b>.592</b>	[.582 - .603]	<b>.609</b>	[.600 - .618]	<b>.585</b>	[.572 - .598]
Sanctions – Federal terms?	8,754	<b>.566</b>	[.554 - .578]	<b>.578</b>	[.566 - .589]	<b>.558</b>	[.542 - .574]
Failure during community supervision?	8,705	<b>.609</b>	[.598 - .620]	<b>.620</b>	[.609 - .630]	<b>.597</b>	[.583 - .611]
Segregation for disciplinary infractions?	8,413	<b>.601</b>	[.588 - .613]	<b>.615</b>	[.603 - .626]	<b>.621</b>	[.604 - .638]
Attempt escape/UAL/escapes?	8,714	<b>.563</b>	[.552 - .575]	<b>.589</b>	[.578 - .600]	<b>.566</b>	[.550 - .582]
Reclassified to higher levels of security?	8,613	<b>.554</b>	[.543 - .565]	<b>.574</b>	[.564 - .584]	<b>.573</b>	[.558 - .588]
Failures on conditional release?	8,713	<b>.595</b>	[.583 - .608]	<b>.619</b>	[.608 - .631]	<b>.592</b>	[.576 - .609]
< 6 months since last incarceration?	8,744	<b>.564</b>	[.553 - .575]	<b>.589</b>	[.578 - .600]	<b>.575</b>	[.559 - .590]
No crime free period of one year or more?	8,741	<b>.548</b>	[.538 - .559]	<b>.586</b>	[.575 - .596]	<b>.583</b>	[.568 - .598]
<i>Current Offences</i>							
Current convictions (sum of 5 items below)	8,766	<b>.548</b>	[.534 - .561]	<b>.587</b>	[.574 - .600]	<b>.559</b>	[.542 - .577]
15+ current convictions?	8,766	<b>.503</b>	[.497 - .509]	<b>.518</b>	[.512 - .524]	<b>.510</b>	[.502 - .519]
10-14 current convictions?	8,766	<b>.509</b>	[.501 - .518]	<b>.532</b>	[.524 - .541]	<b>.515</b>	[.503 - .527]
5-9 current convictions?	8,765	<b>.534</b>	[.522 - .547]	<b>.563</b>	[.551 - .574]	<b>.540</b>	[.523 - .556]
2-4 current convictions?	8,764	<b>.535</b>	[.525 - .545]	<b>.552</b>	[.544 - .561]	<b>.542</b>	[.530 - .554]
1 current conviction?	8,764	<b>.499</b>	[.497 - .500]	<b>.501</b>	[.501 - .502]	<b>.501</b>	[.500 - .502]
Scheduled current convictions?	8,766	<b>.478</b>	[.466 - .490]	<b>.427</b>	[.416 - .438]	<b>.511</b>	[.496 - .526]

		Revocations without offence		Readmissions with any offence		Readmissions with violent offence	
Item	N	(n = 1,959)		(n = 2,298)		(n = 981)	
		AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
<b>Offence Severity Record</b>							
<i>Previous Offences</i>							
Previous offences?	8,764	<b>.567</b>	[.560 - .573]	<b>.571</b>	[.565 - .577]	<b>.561</b>	[.554 - .568]
Previous serious offences?	8,754	<b>.588</b>	[.577 - .599]	<b>.569</b>	[.559 - .580]	<b>.593</b>	[.580 - .606]
Drug cultivation?	8,750	<b>.497</b>	[.494 - .500]	<b>.498</b>	[.495 - .501]	<b>.499</b>	[.495 - .504]
Drug trafficking?	8,749	<b>.505</b>	[.495 - .514]	<b>.505</b>	[.496 - .514]	<b>.497</b>	[.484 - .509]
Drug importation?	8,750	<b>.499</b>	[.498 - .501]	<b>.499</b>	[.498 - .500]	<b>.500</b>	[.498 - .502]
Arson/fire-setting?	8,750	<b>.507</b>	[.502 - .511]	<b>.503</b>	[.500 - .507]	<b>.502</b>	[.497 - .507]
Use of prohibited weapons?	8,736	<b>.520</b>	[.512 - .528]	<b>.521</b>	[.514 - .529]	<b>.535</b>	[.524 - .547]
Discharge firearms?	8,733	<b>.499</b>	[.496 - .502]	<b>.504</b>	[.501 - .507]	<b>.508</b>	[.502 - .513]
Forcible confinement/kidnapping?	8,747	<b>.501</b>	[.497 - .506]	<b>.507</b>	[.503 - .512]	<b>.510</b>	[.503 - .517]
Violence (assault, robbery)?	8,752	<b>.604</b>	[.592 - .616]	<b>.585</b>	[.573 - .596]	<b>.617</b>	[.602 - .631]
Sexual offences?	8,750	<b>.507</b>	[.500 - .513]	<b>.494</b>	[.488 - .500]	<b>.506</b>	[.496 - .515]
Attempt murder?	8,752	<b>.501</b>	[.499 - .503]	<b>.501</b>	[.499 - .503]	<b>.502</b>	[.499 - .505]
Homicide?	8,753	<b>.500</b>	[.498 - .502]	<b>.499</b>	[.497 - .501]	<b>.501</b>	[.498 - .505]
Conspire to any of the above?	8,748	<b>.500</b>	[.496 - .505]	<b>.497</b>	[.493 - .501]	<b>.505</b>	[.498 - .512]
B&E with commission to any of above?	8,725	<b>.519</b>	[.512 - .526]	<b>.517</b>	[.511 - .524]	<b>.526</b>	[.516 - .537]
Victims were children?	8,631	<b>.509</b>	[.502 - .515]	<b>.497</b>	[.491 - .503]	<b>.507</b>	[.498 - .516]
Victims were handicapped/infirm?	8,607	<b>.502</b>	[.500 - .505]	<b>.500</b>	[.498 - .502]	<b>.500</b>	[.498 - .503]
Victims were elderly?	8,596	<b>.505</b>	[.501 - .509]	<b>.504</b>	[.500 - .507]	<b>.508</b>	[.502 - .514]
Previous victims (sum of 3 items below)	8,679	<b>.620</b>	[.607 - .633]	<b>.596</b>	[.583 - .609]	<b>.635</b>	[.618 - .652]
Three or more victims?	8,679	<b>.592</b>	[.580 - .605]	<b>.577</b>	[.565 - .588]	<b>.610</b>	[.594 - .627]
Two victims?	8,674	<b>.600</b>	[.588 - .612]	<b>.579</b>	[.567 - .591]	<b>.609</b>	[.592 - .625]
One victim?	8,668	<b>.600</b>	[.588 - .611]	<b>.579</b>	[.568 - .590]	<b>.610</b>	[.595 - .624]
Use of power/position/authority on victim?	8,647	<b>.525</b>	[.515 - .535]	<b>.513</b>	[.503 - .522]	<b>.527</b>	[.513 - .541]
Threat of violence to victim?	8,514	<b>.599</b>	[.586 - .611]	<b>.576</b>	[.564 - .588]	<b>.612</b>	[.600 - .628]

Item	N	Revocations without offence		Readmissions with any offence		Readmissions with violent offence	
		(n = 1,959)		(n = 2,298)		(n = 981)	
		AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
Threaten victim with a weapon?	8,388	<b>.579</b>	[.566 - .591]	<b>.561</b>	[.550 - .573]	<b>.595</b>	[.578 - .611]
Violence used against victim?	8,614	<b>.590</b>	[.577 - .602]	<b>.572</b>	[.560 - .583]	<b>.598</b>	[.582 - .614]
Weapons used against victim?	8,450	<b>.548</b>	[.537 - .558]	<b>.541</b>	[.531 - .551]	<b>.564</b>	[.549 - .580]
Caused death to victim?	8,741	<b>.502</b>	[.499 - .505]	<b>.499</b>	[.496 - .501]	<b>.502</b>	[.498 - .506]
Serious injury to victim?	8,425	<b>.523</b>	[.514 - .531]	<b>.515</b>	[.507 - .523]	<b>.528</b>	[.516 - .540]
Minor injury to victim?	8,460	<b>.595</b>	[.582 - .608]	<b>.576</b>	[.564 - .588]	<b>.605</b>	[.588 - .621]
Serious psychological harm to victim?	7,925	<b>.520</b>	[.512 - .529]	<b>.505</b>	[.496 - .513]	<b>.523</b>	[.510 - .536]
Moderate psychological harm to victim?	7,972	<b>.568</b>	[.555 - .580]	<b>.552</b>	[.540 - .564]	<b>.587</b>	[.570 - .605]
Mild psychological harm to victim?	8,059	<b>.591</b>	[.578 - .604]	<b>.567</b>	[.555 - .580]	<b>.599</b>	[.582 - .616]
Prior sentence length (sum of 4 items below)	8,762	<b>.589</b>	[.579 - .599]	<b>.606</b>	[.596 - .616]	<b>.601</b>	[.588 - .614]
Sentence length over 24 years?	8,762	<b>.500</b>	[.499 - .501]	<b>.500</b>	[.499 - .500]	<b>.500</b>	[.499 - .501]
Sentence length 10 to 24 years?	8,760	<b>.501</b>	[.498 - .504]	<b>.503</b>	[.500 - .506]	<b>.504</b>	[.499 - .509]
Sentence length 5 to 9 years?	8,759	<b>.505</b>	[.499 - .512]	<b>.514</b>	[.508 - .521]	<b>.523</b>	[.513 - .533]
Sentence length 1 day to 4 years?	8,753	<b>.591</b>	[.582 - .600]	<b>.603</b>	[.595 - .611]	<b>.590</b>	[.580 - .601]
<i>Current Offences</i>							
Current serious offences?	8,766	<b>.471</b>	[.460 - .483]	<b>.420</b>	[.409 - .431]	<b>.498</b>	[.484 - .513]
Drug cultivation?	8,765	<b>.490</b>	[.487 - .493]	<b>.488</b>	[.486 - .491]	<b>.491</b>	[.487 - .494]
Drug trafficking?	8,766	<b>.457</b>	[.448 - .466]	<b>.458</b>	[.450 - .466]	<b>.447</b>	[.437 - .457]
Drug importation?	8,763	<b>.489</b>	[.487 - .492]	<b>.486</b>	[.484 - .488]	<b>.488</b>	[.486 - .490]
Arson/fire-setting?	8,766	<b>.503</b>	[.500 - .506]	<b>.500</b>	[.497 - .503]	<b>.501</b>	[.497 - .505]
Use of prohibited weapons?	8,760	<b>.498</b>	[.491 - .504]	<b>.505</b>	[.498 - .512]	<b>.519</b>	[.509 - .530]
Discharge firearms?	8,766	<b>.497</b>	[.494 - .500]	<b>.499</b>	[.496 - .502]	<b>.507</b>	[.502 - .513]
Forcible confinement/kidnapping?	8,763	<b>.497</b>	[.492 - .502]	<b>.491</b>	[.486 - .496]	<b>.499</b>	[.492 - .506]
Violence (assault, robbery)?	8,762	<b>.554</b>	[.542 - .567]	<b>.520</b>	[.508 - .531]	<b>.600</b>	[.583 - .616]
Sexual offences?	8,765	<b>.474</b>	[.468 - .481]	<b>.460</b>	[.454 - .465]	<b>.468</b>	[.460 - .475]

Item	N	Revocations without offence		Readmissions with any offence		Readmissions with violent offence	
		(n = 1,959)		(n = 2,298)		(n = 981)	
		AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
Attempt murder?	8,765	<b>.498</b>	[.496 - .500]	<b>.497</b>	[.495 - .499]	<b>.497</b>	[.495 - .500]
Homicide?	8,766	<b>.493</b>	[.489 - .498]	<b>.489</b>	[.485 - .493]	<b>.492</b>	[.487 - .497]
Conspire to any of the above?	8,762	<b>.488</b>	[.484 - .493]	<b>.486</b>	[.482 - .490]	<b>.490</b>	[.484 - .496]
B&E with commission to any of above?	8,767	<b>.504</b>	[.498 - .509]	<b>.504</b>	[.499 - .509]	<b>.506</b>	[.498 - .513]
Victims were children?	8,754	<b>.476</b>	[.470 - .482]	<b>.467</b>	[.461 - .472]	<b>.477</b>	[.470 - .485]
Victims were handicapped/infirm?	8,749	<b>.501</b>	[.499 - .504]	<b>.497</b>	[.495 - .499]	<b>.499</b>	[.496 - .502]
Victims were elderly?	8,738	<b>.503</b>	[.498 - .508]	<b>.501</b>	[.497 - .505]	<b>.506</b>	[.500 - .513]
Current victims (sum of 3 items below)	8,752	<b>.533</b>	[.520 - .547]	<b>.498</b>	[.484 - .511]	<b>.589</b>	[.571 - .608]
Three or more victims?	8,752	<b>.511</b>	[.501 - .520]	<b>.513</b>	[.504 - .522]	<b>.550</b>	[.536 - .564]
Two victims?	8,752	<b>.523</b>	[.511 - .535]	<b>.519</b>	[.508 - .530]	<b>.573</b>	[.557 - .590]
One victim?	8,750	<b>.530</b>	[.518 - .543]	<b>.481</b>	[.469 - .493]	<b>.565</b>	[.549 - .581]
Use of power/position/authority on victim?	8,757	<b>.482</b>	[.472 - .491]	<b>.469</b>	[.461 - .478]	<b>.502</b>	[.489 - .516]
Threat of violence to victim?	8,725	<b>.540</b>	[.528 - .553]	<b>.516</b>	[.505 - .528]	<b>.588</b>	[.572 - .605]
Threaten victim with a weapon?	8,702	<b>.529</b>	[.518 - .541]	<b>.516</b>	[.505 - .526]	<b>.568</b>	[.552 - .584]
Violence used against victim?	8,746	<b>.524</b>	[.512 - .536]	<b>.491</b>	[.480 - .502]	<b>.535</b>	[.519 - .551]
Weapons used against victim?	8,735	<b>.504</b>	[.494 - .513]	<b>.494</b>	[.486 - .503]	<b>.525</b>	[.512 - .538]
Caused death to victim?	8,760	<b>.490</b>	[.485 - .495]	<b>.483</b>	[.478 - .487]	<b>.487</b>	[.482 - .493]
Serious injury to victim?	8,717	<b>.494</b>	[.486 - .502]	<b>.479</b>	[.471 - .487]	<b>.495</b>	[.484 - .506]
Minor injury to victim?	8,724	<b>.529</b>	[.517 - .540]	<b>.497</b>	[.486 - .507]	<b>.532</b>	[.516 - .547]
Serious psychological harm to victim?	8,369	<b>.469</b>	[.459 - .479]	<b>.446</b>	[.437 - .455]	<b>.479</b>	[.466 - .493]
Moderate psychological harm to victim?	8,371	<b>.519</b>	[.507 - .531]	<b>.501</b>	[.490 - .512]	<b>.565</b>	[.548 - .582]
Mild psychological harm to victim?	8,446	<b>.542</b>	[.530 - .554]	<b>.504</b>	[.492 - .516]	<b>.562</b>	[.545 - .579]
Current sentence (sum of 4 items below)	8,767	<b>.467</b>	[.459 - .474]	<b>.482</b>	[.474 - .490]	<b>.494</b>	[.483 - .506]
Sentence length over 24 years?	8,767	<b>.498</b>	[.497 - .499]	<b>.499</b>	[.498 - .500]	<b>.500</b>	[.498 - .502]
Sentence length 10 to 24 years?	8,767	<b>.492</b>	[.489 - .494]	<b>.496</b>	[.493 - .499]	<b>.498</b>	[.494 - .502]
Sentence length 5 to 9 years?	8,767	<b>.465</b>	[.458 - .473]	<b>.480</b>	[.472 - .488]	<b>.493</b>	[.482 - .504]
Sentence length 1 day to 4 years?	8,765	<b>.502</b>	[.499 - .504]	<b>.503</b>	[.501 - .505]	<b>.502</b>	[.499 - .505]

### Appendix C: Community Outcome Analyses for Non-Aboriginal Men

Table C1. Relationship between SFA Overall Rating and Community Outcomes for Non-Aboriginal Men

Overall SFA rating by outcome	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i> with outcome	% outcome	AUC	95% CI
Revocations without offence					
Low risk	1,191	110	9.2		
Moderate risk	2,987	615	20.6	.614	[.600 - .629]
High risk	2,245	678	30.2		
Overall	6,423	1,403	21.8		
Readmission: Any offence					
Low risk	1,210	128	10.6		
Moderate risk	3,030	775	25.6	.598	[.585 - .612]
High risk	2,444	782	32.0		
Overall	6,684	1,685	25.2		
Readmission: violent offence					
Low risk	1,210	34	2.8		
Moderate risk	3,030	298	9.8	.623	[.605 - .641]
High risk	2,444	376	15.4		
Overall	6,684	708	10.6		

Note. SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

Table C2. Relationship between SFA Subcomponent Ratings and Community Outcomes for Non-Aboriginal Men

Outcome variables	<i>N</i>	Criminal History		Offence Severity	
		AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
Revocations without offence					
No revocations	5,020				
Revocation	1,403	.677	.662 - .692	.598	[.582 - .615]
Readmissions with any offence					
No readmission	4,999				
Readmission	1,685	.718	.705 - .731	.544	[.528 - .560]
Readmissions with violent offence					
No readmission	5,976				
Readmission	708	.709	.691 - .727	.641	[.620 - .662]

Note. SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.



## Appendix D: Community Outcome Analyses for Aboriginal Men

Table D1. Relationship between SFA Overall Rating and Community Outcomes for Aboriginal Men

Overall SFA rating by outcome	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i> with outcome	% outcome	AUC	95% CI
<b>Revocations without offence</b>					
Low risk	77	18	23.4		
Moderate risk	513	141	27.5		
High risk	810	279	34.4	.544	[.517 - .572]
Overall	1,400	438	31.3		
<b>Readmission: Any offence</b>					
Low risk	77	18	23.4		
Moderate risk	519	179	34.5		
High risk	904	341	37.7	.529	[.503 - .554]
Overall	1,500	538	35.9		
<b>Readmission: violent offence</b>					
Low risk	77	8	10.4		
Moderate risk	519	74	14.3		
High risk	904	167	18.5	.543	[.511 - .576]
Overall	1,500	249	16.6		

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

Table D2. Relationship between SFA Subcomponent Ratings and Community Outcomes for Aboriginal Men

Outcome variables	<i>N</i>	Criminal History		Offence Severity	
		AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
<b>Revocations without offence</b>					
No revocations	962				
Revocation	438	.605	.574 - .636	.545	[.513 - .577]
<b>Readmissions with any offence</b>					
No readmission	962				
Readmission	538	.654	.625 - .682	.471	[.441 - .502]
<b>Readmissions with violent offence</b>					
No readmission	1,251				
Readmission	249	.622	.586 - .659	.540	[.501 - .579]

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

## Appendix E: Community Outcome Analyses for Non-Aboriginal Women

Table E1. Relationship between SFA Overall Rating and Community Outcomes for Non-Aboriginal Women

Overall SFA rating by outcome	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i> with outcome	% outcome	AUC	95% CI
Revocations without offence					
Low risk	190	25	13.2		
Moderate risk	141	34	24.1		
High risk	42	8	19.0	.576	[.509 - .643]
Overall	373	67	18.0		
Readmission: Any offence					
Low risk	192	8	4.2		
Moderate risk	141	21	14.9		
High risk	44	10	22.7	.688	[.610 - .767]
Overall	377	39	10.3		
Readmission: violent offence					
Low risk	192	2	1.0		
Moderate risk	141	6	4.3		
High risk	44	6	13.6	.748	[.622 - .873]
Overall	377	14	3.7		

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

Table E2. Relationship between SFA Subcomponent Ratings and Community Outcomes for Non-Aboriginal Women

Outcome variables	<i>N</i>	Criminal History		Offence Severity	
		AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
Revocations without offence					
No revocation	306				
Revocation	67	.670	.607 - .734	.572	[.500 - .645]
Readmissions with any offence					
No readmission	338				
Readmission	39	.785	.708 - .862	.650	[.561 - .740]
Readmissions with violent offence					
No readmission	363				
Readmission	14	.830	.729 - .932	.819	[.723 - .915]

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

## Appendix F: Community Outcome Analyses for Aboriginal Women

Table F1. Relationship between SFA Overall Rating and Community Outcomes for Aboriginal Women

Overall SFA rating by outcome	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i> with outcome	% outcome	AUC	95% CI
<b>Revocations without offence</b>					
Low risk	29	6	20.7		
Moderate risk	70	17	24.3		
High risk	49	16	32.6	.562	[.464 - .660]
Overall	148	39	26.4		
<b>Readmission: Any offence</b>					
Low risk	29	2	6.9		
Moderate risk	70	16	22.9		
High risk	50	15	30.0	.619	[.526 - .712]
Overall	149	33	22.2		
<b>Readmission: violent offence</b>					
Low risk	29	0	0.0		
Moderate risk	70	4	5.7		
High risk	50	6	12.0	.684	[.549 - .818]
Overall	149	10	6.7		

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

Table F2. Relationship between SFA Subcomponent Ratings and Community Outcomes for Aboriginal Women

Outcome variables	<i>N</i>	Criminal History		Offence Severity	
		AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
<b>Revocations without offence</b>					
No revocation	109				
Revocation	39	.629	.531 - .727	.594	[.487 - .700]
<b>Readmissions with any offence</b>					
No readmission	116				
Readmission	33	.698	.601 - .794	.573	[.464 - .682]
<b>Readmissions with violent offence</b>					
No readmission	139				
Readmission	10	.762	.663 - .861	.737	[.620 - .855]

*Note.* SFA = Static Factors Assessment; AUC = Area Under the Curve; CI = confidence interval.

## **Appendix G: Items Not Significantly and Positively Related to Any Outcome**

### **Criminal History Record**

- Scheduled current convictions

### **Offence Severity Record**

- Previous offences – drug cultivation
- Previous offences – drug trafficking
- Previous offences – drug importation
- Previous offences – attempt murder
- Previous offences – homicide
- Previous offences – sexual offences
- Previous offences – conspire to any of the above
- Previous offences – victims were handicapped/infirm
- Previous offences – caused death to victim
- Current offences – serious offences
- Current offences – drug cultivation
- Current offences – drug trafficking
- Current offences – drug importation
- Current offences – arson/fire-setting
- Current offences – forcible confinement/kidnapping
- Current offences – attempt murder
- Current offences – homicide
- Current offences – sexual offences
- Current offences – conspire to any of the above
- Current offences – B&E with commission to any of the above
- Current offences – victims were handicapped/infirm
- Current offences – victims were children
- Current offences – victims were elderly
- Current offences – used of power/position/authority on victim
- Current offences – caused death to victim
- Current offences – caused serious injury to victim
- Current offences – caused serious psychological harm to victims
- Current offences – sentence length