



## ASSESSING THE RISK OF JUVENILE SEX OFFENDERS USING THE INTENSIVE PAROLE SEX OFFENDER DOMAIN

### Introduction

The Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA) within the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services contracted with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Institute) to determine if an empirically valid risk assessment for sexual reoffending could be developed using data from the Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment (IPSA). This report summarizes the findings.

The IPSA, implemented by JRA in 1998, is modeled after the Washington State Juvenile Court Assessment. Prior to implementation, JRA added a sex offender domain to the IPSA. The items for this domain were proposed by therapists who work with juvenile sex offenders. Appendix A contains the sex offender domain of the IPSA.

Seven items are included in the sex offender domain. Four items include three to six sub-items, each with a sub-item score. The sub-item scores are summed to produce item-level scores. The item scores are then summed to produce a domain score.

Since 1999, the sex offender domain of the IPSA has been administered to two groups of juveniles. The *parole population sample* consists of Level 1 and Level 2 juvenile sex offenders already on intensive parole.<sup>1</sup> The *parole release sample* consists of Level 3 juvenile sex offenders who were administered the IPSA when released from a JRA institution from 1999 through 2002.

Because juvenile sexual reoffending rates are low, we rely on a five-year, rather than the more typical 18-month, recidivism follow-up period. Recidivism is defined as a juvenile committing an offense that results in a conviction.<sup>2</sup> The follow-up period for both groups starts on the date the juvenile is released from a JRA institution.

### Report Highlights

The Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration contracted with the Institute to determine whether a valid risk assessment for sexual reoffending could be developed using data from the sex offender domain of the Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment (IPSA).

No single item or combination of items from the sex offender domain had a strong association with sexual recidivism.

This result may be due to the sample. Most of the assessment data were collected after the juveniles had been on parole for over a year. The sample may not be representative of sex offenders under JRA jurisdiction since most of the sample consisted of Level 1 and 2 sex offenders who were able to remain on parole. The sample size was relatively small (319) and few youth in the sample recidivated with a sex offense (30). These factors make it difficult to validate or develop a reliable risk scale; a much larger sample of sex offenders is needed.

Nevertheless, four measures of a youth's degree of sex offending self-control and self-management can be used to identify those with an approximate 25 percent sexual recidivism rate. This finding suggests that it may be possible to identify attributes that are predictive of sexual recidivism through an expanded data collection and analysis effort.

To develop a state-of-the-art juvenile sex offender assessment instrument, the state could undertake a comprehensive data collection effort and analysis described in the potential next steps section of this report.

<sup>1</sup> JRA sex offenders are classified by the End of Sentence Review Board into three risk levels: Level I is the lowest and Level III is highest.

<sup>2</sup> R. Barnoski. (1997). *Standards for improving research effectiveness in adult and juvenile justice*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Document No. 97-12-1201.

## The Study Sample

We now describe the study group that includes two groups of JRA sex offenders who were administered the IPSA sex offender domain.

### Parole Population Sample

The parole population sample includes 278 Level 1 and Level 2 juvenile sex offenders who were released to parole between 1995 and 2002.<sup>3</sup> These juveniles had been on parole for an average of 694 days when administered the sex offender domain of the IPSA.

Since these juveniles were administered the IPSA after they were on parole, the assessment information is not relevant to the time of release, but rather to the time of the assessment. In addition, this sample may represent juvenile sex offenders less likely to recidivate, since they had to have remained on parole without reoffending to be included in the sample. That is, the higher-risk offenders may have recidivated and been returned to an institution before being administered the IPSA. These factors could introduce bias to the sample and result in findings that are not representative of the entire JRA sex offender population.

### Parole Release Sample

There are 41 assessments for the Level 3 juvenile sex offenders who were administered the sex offender domain when paroled between 1999 and 2002. Since the assessment was administered at the time of release to parole, the information reflects the youth's situation at the start of the recidivism measurement period.

This parole release sample is too small to analyze by itself, so it must be combined with the parole population sample. In addition, this sample is restricted to Level 3 juvenile sex offenders and is not representative of the entire sex offender population.

In summary, the data used for this report are weak, because most of the sample consisted of Level 1 and 2 sex offenders who were able to remain on parole.

<sup>3</sup> A small number of juveniles (17) were released and assessed more than once during this period.

## Recidivism Rates

**Exhibit 1** displays the number of juveniles in the sample and the number who recidivated. Altogether, the analysis sample includes 319 juveniles.

Although this report is concerned with recidivism for a sex offense, five types of recidivism are displayed for the sake of completeness. The sex offense recidivism rate is 9 percent (30 of the 319 juveniles).

The small number recidivating for a sex offense may make it difficult to develop a reliable risk scale, and the results could change substantially if applied to a larger and more representative sample of sex offenders.

**Exhibit 1**  
**Recidivism Rates**

	Study Samples		
	Parole Population (Levels 1 and 2)	Parole Release (Level 3)	Total
<b>Number of Assessments</b>	278	41	319
<b>Type of Recidivism</b>	<b>Number Recidivating</b>		
Any Felony	96	28	124
Violent Felony	51	15	66
Felony Sex	23	5	28
Misdemeanor Sex	2	0	2
Any Sex	25	5	30
<b>Type of Recidivism</b>	<b>Recidivism Rate</b>		
Any Felony	35%	68%	39%
Violent Felony	18%	37%	21%
Felony Sex	8%	12%	9%
Misdemeanor Sex	1%	0%	1%
Any Sex	9%	12%	9%*

\*Does not add to 10 percent because of rounding, and some youth recidivated with a felony and misdemeanor sex offense.

The recidivism rates for the parole release sample are higher than the rates for the parole population sample. For example, the felony recidivism rate for parole releases is 68 percent compared with 35 percent for the parole population. The difference is not as large for sexual reoffending, 12 percent vs. 9 percent.

These recidivism rate differences could arise because the parole release group is higher risk, being restricted to Level 3 sex offenders. In addition, the parole population includes only those sex offenders who did not recidivate while on parole before being administered the IPSA.

## Measuring Predictive Accuracy

Unfortunately, calculating a single measure of predictive accuracy is not as simple as correctly computing the percentage classified as recidivists. There are two kinds of errors in prediction: false negatives, which include juveniles predicted not to recidivate but who do; and false positives, which include juveniles predicted to recidivate but who do not. Conversely, there are true negatives and true positives. Perfect prediction is the absence of false negatives and false positives.

The best measure of the strength of association between the sex offender assessment and recidivism is a statistic called the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUC).<sup>4</sup> True and false positives and negatives are combined to measure how closely the classification scheme matches perfect prediction.

The AUC ranges from .500 to 1.000. This statistic is .500 when there is no association and 1.000 when there is perfect association—no false negatives and no false positives. AUCs in the .500s indicate little to no predictive accuracy, .600s weak, .700s moderate, and AUCs above .800 have strong predictive accuracy.<sup>5</sup>

Perfect prediction is achieved when:

- 1) All juveniles classified as high risk recidivated with a sex offense, and
- 2) None of the other juveniles recidivated with a sex offense.

Perfect prediction for our study sample requires that 9 percent of the sample be classified as high risk, and the sex offense recidivism rate for this group is 100 percent. That is, for perfect prediction, the percentage of high-risk sex offenders must equal the sex offense recidivism rate.

<sup>4</sup> V. Quinsey, G. Harris, M. Rice, & C. Cormier. (1998). *Violent offenders: Appraising and managing risk*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association; P. Jones. (1996). Risk prediction in criminal justice. In A. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 33–68.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

## IPSA Sex Offender Domain Predictive Accuracy

### Individual Item Predictive Accuracy

**Exhibit 2** displays the AUCs between sexual recidivism and sex offender domain items.<sup>6</sup> The exhibit also includes the standardized parameter estimates (Std. Est.) for each item.<sup>7</sup> This statistic indicates that all of the items are positively related to sexual recidivism; juveniles with higher scores on an item have higher recidivism rates than juveniles with lower scores on the item. Although all of the items have a positive association with sexual recidivism, none of the items achieved moderate predictive accuracy.

**Exhibit 2**  
**Strength of Associations Between Any Five-Year Sexual Recidivism and Individual Sex Offender Domain Items**

Item Description	AUC	Std. Est.
1. Sex offender registration violations	0.559	+0.13
2. Level of denial	0.583	+0.15
3. Treatment progress total*	0.604	+0.19
3a. Treatment attendance	0.540	+0.07
3b. Treatment participation*	0.630	+0.26
3c. Treatment cooperation	0.569	+0.14
3d. Treatment completion	0.597	+0.20
3e. Treatment contract compliance	0.589	+0.19
3f. Treatment overall progress*	0.632	+0.27
4. Functional social skills total	0.599	+0.20
4a. Friendship skills*	0.619	+0.26
4b. Communication skills	0.561	+0.13
4c. Response to feedback	0.547	+0.10
5. Self-control/self-management of sexual behavior*	0.680	+0.36
5a. Understands offense cycle*	0.659	+0.31
5b. Motivation to interrupt cycle*	0.637	+0.29
5c. Ability/skills to interrupt cycle*	0.650	+0.31
5d. Awareness of thinking errors*	0.619	+0.25
6. Deviant arousal management total*	0.604	+0.20
6a. Deviant arousal management: occurrence*	0.600	+0.20
6b. Deviant arousal management: masturbation	0.563	+0.12
6c. Deviant arousal management: arousal*	0.610	+0.23
7. Practices responsible/legal sexual behavior	0.596	+0.21
Level 3 Sex Offender	0.521	+0.06
Sex Offender Domain Total*	0.659	+0.30

Std. Est. = Standardized Parameter Estimate

\*Statistically significant at .05 probability level and weak predictive accuracy.

<sup>6</sup> Appendix B provides descriptive statistics for each item.

<sup>7</sup> The standardized estimate is another measure of the strength of association.

**IPSA Item 5 Predictive Accuracy**

Since Item 5 had the highest AUC (.680), we examine its relationship with recidivism in more detail to illustrate its predictive accuracy.

Item 5 is the sum of four sub-items (5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d) that measure self-control/self-management of sexual behavior. Sub-item 5a, understands offense cycle, had an AUC of 0.659, which is in the middle of the weak predictive accuracy range.

**Exhibit 3** displays the recidivism rates for three sets of scores (0 to 1, 2 to 6, and 7 to 8) for Item 5. The lower scores represent a lower risk. The score for Item 5 is the sum of the four sub-items and ranges from a low of 0 to a high of 8 points.

*Exhibit 3*

**Recidivism Rates for Three Item 5 Score Ranges**

Item 5 Scores	Percentage of Sample	5-Year Recidivism			
		Any Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
0 to 1	32%	33%	13%	5%	5%
2 to 6	56%	38%	20%	8%	8%
7 to 8	12%	59%	41%	20%	26%
<b>Total</b>	100%	39%	20%	9%	9%

Thirty-two percent of the JRA sex offenders had an Item 5 score between 0 and 1 points, 56 percent a score of 2 to 6, and 12 percent a score of 7 to 8. For those with a score of 0 to 1, 33 percent recidivated with a felony offense, and 5 percent recidivated with a sex offense. Of those with a score between 7 and 8, 59 percent recidivated with a felony offense and 26 percent recidivated with a sex offense.

Exhibit 3 indicates that youth with scores of 7 and 8 have a sexual recidivism rate five times that of youth in the 0 to 1 range. Clearly there is an association between Item 5 scores and sexual recidivism.

**Exhibit 4** presents the Item 5 scores for only those juveniles who recidivated with a sex offense. Of the 30 sexual recidivists, 10 have scores of 7 and 8, 15 have scores of 2 to 6, and 5 have scores of 0 or 1. That is, 20 out of the 30 sexual recidivists have scores below 7 points—this false negative rate lowers the AUC.

*Exhibit 4*

**Item 5 Scores of the Sexual Recidivists**

	Number of Sexual Recidivists	Percentage
0 to 1	5	17%
2 to 6	15	50%
7 to 8	10	33%
<b>Total</b>	30	100%

**Exhibit 5** summarizes the true and false positive and negative rates for Item 5. Juveniles with scores of 7 to 8 points are defined as sexual recidivists. The high false positive rate of 74 percent contributes to a lower AUC even though the true positive rate is 26 percent and the true negative rate is 93 percent. The true negative rate is high because 91 percent of all juveniles in the sample do not recidivate with a sex offense.

*Exhibit 5*

**True and False Positive and Negative Rates for Item 5 Using Seven or More Points to Define a Sexual Recidivist**

Predicted to Recidivate	Yes	No
Yes	True Positive (7 to 8) 26%	False Positive (7 to 8) 74%
No	False Negative (0 to 6) 7%	True Negative (0 to 6) 93%
<b>Total</b>	9%	91%

In summary, the AUC of juvenile sex offenders is low because of the high false positive rate and because two-thirds of the sexual recidivists have low Item scores.

## Total Domain Score Predictive Accuracy

The sex offender domain total score had an AUC of 0.659, which is in the middle of the weak predictive accuracy range of the AUC.

**Exhibit 6** examines the predictive accuracy of the total sex offender domain score in more detail. When JRA implemented the sex offender domain of the IPSA, they divided the score range to create low-, moderate-, and high-risk groups. Youth in the high-risk group (a domain score of 26 to 39) account for 10 percent of the sample and have a sex offense recidivism rate of 18 percent. This recidivism rate is less than the 26 percent recidivism rate for Item 5 scores of 7 to 8 (shown in Exhibit 3). This difference accounts for the lower AUC for the total sex offender domain score.

**Exhibit 6**  
Recidivism Rates for Total Sex Offender Domain Score Ranges

Total Domain Score	Percentage of Sample	5-Year Recidivism			
		Any Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
0 to 12	48%	31%	14%	6%	6%
13 to 25	41%	42%	23%	11%	11%
26 to 39	10%	67%	46%	15%	18%
<b>Total</b>	100%	39%	20%	9%	9%

## Total Domain Score Using Items Known at Time of Release to Parole

If the sex offender domain classified risk for sexual reoffending when the youth was first placed in the community, Item 1 (youth has violated registration requirements during current review period) and Item 3 (youth's level of treatment progress) would not be known.

A domain score that excludes these items was computed, and its relationship to recidivism analyzed. The AUC with any sexual recidivism is 0.641, which is lower than the AUC for the total domain score. That is, excluding these items decreases the accuracy of prediction.

**Exhibit 7** displays the recidivism rates for three score ranges when Items 1 and 3 are excluded. There is less difference in the sexual recidivism rates for the three score ranges. In particular, the sexual recidivism rate for juveniles in the 10 to 15 range is slightly higher than the rate in the 16 to 23 range.

**Exhibit 7**  
Recidivism Rates for Total Sex Offender Domain Score Excluding Items 1 and 3

Total Domain Score	Percentage of Sample	5-Year Recidivism			
		Any Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
0 to 9	58%	34%	14%	5%	5%
10 to 15	29%	40%	26%	16%	17%
16 to 23	13%	55%	35%	13%	15%
<b>Total</b>	100%	39%	20%	9%	9%

Thus far we have examined how well individual sex offender domain items and domain scores predict sexual recidivism. The best predictor is Item 5, which has weak predictive accuracy.

We next determine if some weighted combination of items can produce better predictive accuracy.

## Weighted Combinations of Items

**Exhibit 8** displays the results from a multivariate statistical analysis (logistic regression) which weights and sums the seven items to best predict sexual recidivism. The AUC for this combination is 0.681, which is higher than the total domain score but still in the upper range of weak association. Only Item 5 is statistically significant.

In addition, Items 2, 3, and 4 have negative standardized coefficients. This means, when combined with the other items, these items decrease the likelihood of sexual reoffending. This is a "statistical artifact" (i.e., a relationship that does not exist) that indicates the instability of these results because of the small number of juveniles who sexually reoffended. Thus, weighting these seven items based on this small sample of sex offenders is not reliable or valid.

**Exhibit 8**  
Multivariate Results for Any Five-Year Sexual Recidivism and Combined Sex Offender Domain Items  
(AUC=0.681)

Sex Offender Domain Items	Std. Est.
1. Sex offender registration violations	+0.07
2. Level of denial	-0.11
3. Treatment progress	-0.09
4. Functional social skills	-0.05
5. Self-control/self-management of sexual behavior*	+0.46
6. Deviant arousal management	+0.01
7. Practices responsible/legal sexual behavior	+0.08
Level 3	-0.03

Std. Est. = Standardized Estimate

\* Statistically significant at the .05 probability level.

**Exhibit 9** displays the results from a logistic regression that combines the items and sub-items to best predict sexual recidivism. Even though the AUC of 0.728 is in the moderately strong range, none of the items or sub-items is statistically significant. That is, this higher AUC is a statistical artifact of a small sample with few juveniles recidivating with a sex offense.

In addition, some of the items take on negative standardized estimates when combined. This result indicates that these estimates are unreliable because of the small number of sexual recidivists. The weighting of the items and sub-items is neither reliable nor valid.

Next, stepwise logistic regression is used to determine if any subset of items results in moderately strong and stable prediction. No such combination was found.

In summary, the weighting of the items and sub-items does not produce a more reliable or valid measure of risk for sexual reoffending.

**Exhibit 9**  
**Multivariate Results for Any Five-Year Sexual Recidivism and Combined Sex Offender Domain Items and Sub-Items\***  
 (AUC=0.728)

Sex Offender Domain Items	Std. Est.
1. Sex offender registration violations	+0.01
2. Level of denial	-0.05
3a. Treatment attendance	-0.12
3b. Treatment participation	+0.25
3c. Treatment cooperation	-0.24
3d. Treatment completion	+0.03
3e. Treatment contract compliance	-0.08
3f. Treatment overall progress	+0.08
4a. Friendship skills	+0.14
4b. Communication skills	-0.11
4c. Response to feedback	-0.12
5a. Understands offense cycle	+0.15
5b. Motivation to interrupt cycle	+0.15
5c. Ability/skills to interrupt cycle	+0.16
5d. Awareness of thinking errors	+0.05
6a. Deviant arousal management: occurrence	+0.17
6b. Deviant arousal management: masturbation	-0.43
6c. Deviant arousal management: arousal	+0.31
7. Practices responsible/legal sexual behavior	-0.01

Std. Est. = Standardized Estimate

\* None of the items are statistically significant at the .05 probability level in the logistic regression.

## IPSA Sex Offender Domain Conclusions

These analyses indicate that the sex offender domain of the IPSA could have sufficient predictive accuracy, but that a larger sample of sex offenders is needed to more fully explore this potential.

We now examine how well criminal history and other assessment data predict sexual reoffending and whether these data can be combined with IPSA sex offender domain data to improve predictive accuracy.

## Analyses of Other Information About the Study Sample

### Criminal History

The pre-screen assessment used by Washington State juvenile courts includes a criminal history domain. Eight of the 12 items included in this criminal history domain can be computed from the Institute's research database for any sample of juvenile offenders.<sup>8</sup> Appendix C contains detailed statistics for these items.

**Exhibit 10** displays the AUCs of these eight items for predicting sexual recidivism. None of the items, or the total score based on these eight items, has an AUC indicating even weak predictive accuracy. That is, the criminal history scale from the pre-screen has little predictive accuracy for sexual reoffending.

**Exhibit 10**  
**Predictive Accuracy of Criminal History Items From the Washington State Juvenile Court Pre-Screen Assessment**

Criminal History Items	AUC	Std. Est.
1. Age First Arrest	0.595	+0.07
2. Misdemeanors	0.500	-0.01
3. Felonies	0.511	-0.03
4. Weapons	0.503	+0.02
5. Misdemeanor Person	0.513	+0.01
6. Felony Person	0.514	+0.05
7. Misdemeanor Sex	0.500	-0.01
8. Felony Sex	0.549	+0.11
Total Score	0.547	+0.02

<sup>8</sup> The Institute's database includes records from the juvenile and superior court data systems managed by the Administrative Office for the Courts.

**Exhibit 11** displays the AUCs for a youth's prior record of convictions; these data are stored in the Institute's research database. None of these prior adjudications has an AUC indicating even weak predictive accuracy. Combining the criminal history variables in a logistic regression also produced a low AUC. Appendix D details statistics for these items.

**Exhibit 11**  
**Predictive Accuracy of Criminal History Adjudications From the Institute Research Database**

Prior Adjudications	AUC	Std. Est.
Felony Sex	0.500	+0.03
Misdemeanor Sex	0.521	+0.10
Felony or Misdemeanor Sex	0.512	+0.02
Felony Person	0.518	-0.06
Misdemeanor Person	0.513	+0.01
Felony or Misdemeanor Person	0.507	-0.04
Total Misdemeanors and Felonies	0.500	-0.02
Child Sex History	0.500	+0.02
Rape History	0.514	-0.05

## Initial Security Classification Assessment

**Exhibit 12** displays the AUCs of the items included in JRA's Initial Security Classification Assessment (ISCA). None of the items, including the ISCA total score, has an AUC indicating even weak predictive accuracy. Appendix E contains detailed statistics for these items.

**Exhibit 12**  
**Predictive Accuracy of JRA's Initial Security Classification Assessment (ISCA)**

ISCA	AUC	Std. Est.
Total Score	0.567	+0.15
Risk Level	0.529	+0.05
A. Assaults	0.517	+0.04
B. Impulsivity	0.532	+0.07
C. Age at First Arrest	0.583	+0.17
D. Drug/Alcohol	0.517	+0.04
E. Problem Solving	0.519	-0.03
F. Peer Relations	0.516	+0.04
G. Prior Adjudications	0.515	-0.04
H. Compliant	0.580	+0.13
I. Escapes	0.514	+0.05
J. Prior Commitments	0.556	+0.18
K. Gender	0.523	+1.35
L. Sex Offender	0.507	+0.04
M. Age at Admission	0.542	+0.07
Length of Maximum Sentence	0.567	-0.15

Finally, the IPSA sex offender domain, criminal history, and ISCA items were included in a logistic regression model, but this did not result in a more accurate and stable predictive model.

## Conclusions About Criminal History and the ISCA

An examination of both criminal history and the ISCA failed to uncover even weak predictors of sexual reoffending.

## Potential Next Steps

At this time, we are not aware of any assessments for juvenile offenders that have been shown to be strongly predictive of sexual reoffending. Yet, decisions about the risk that juvenile sex offenders pose must be made. Selecting one assessment from the available instruments to estimate the risk of juvenile sexual reoffending may not provide decision-makers with sufficient information.

To increase the state's capacity for a valid assessment of juvenile sex offenders' risk to reoffend, the Institute recommends that an information collection instrument be developed. This instrument would capture all information that is known or suspected to be important for predicting violent, as well as sexual, recidivism. The information would be derived from the various juvenile and adult risk assessments currently available. A database would be created to record this information for all Washington State juvenile sex offenders, including those not committed to JRA.

Since these data would be comprehensive, scores for the various existing juvenile risk assessments could be computed and displayed for decision-makers. This approach would provide the best available information for a clinical determination of a youth's risk level. That is, the information from the instrument would assist clinicians in assessing level of risk.

This process would also produce a comprehensive database allowing future analyses with predictive accuracy.

**Appendix A**  
**IPSA Sex Offender Domain Items**

<b>Sex Offender Domain</b>	
1. Youth has violated sex offender registration requirements during current review period	(0) No (1) Yes
2. Youth's most consistently displayed level of denial	(0) No denial, accepts full responsibility (1) Weak avoidance, admits to facts of offense (2) Moderate denial, justifies, minimizes, admits to committing offense but denies arousal (3) Strong denial: admits past but not current offenses, denies committing any offenses, does not acknowledge harm of offense, is hostile/defensive when denying.
3. Youth's level of treatment progress	
a. Attendance	Good(0) Fair(1) Poor(2)
b. Participation	Good(0) Fair(1) Poor(2)
c. Cooperation	Good(0) Fair(1) Poor(2)
d. Assignment Completion	Good(0) Fair(1) Poor(2)
e. Treatment Contract Compliance	Good(0) Fair(1) Poor(2)
f. Overall Treatment Progress	Good(0) Fair(1) Poor(2)
4. Youth's degree of functional social skills	
a. Friendships	(0) Makes and keeps peer age friends (1) Has a few peer age friends but relationships may be unstable (2) Has no peer age friends
b. Communication	(0) Can maintain appropriate conversation (1) May dominate or not engage fully in conversation (2) Cannot maintain appropriate conversation
c. Response to feedback	(0) Accepts positive and negative feedback well (1) Inconsistent responses to positive and negative feedback (2) Inappropriate responses to positive and negative feedback
5. Youth's overall degree of self-control and self-management of sex offending behavior	
a. Understanding of offense cycle	(0) Understands offense cycle, triggers and cues. (1) Learning offense cycle, triggers and cues (2) Does not understand offense cycle, triggers and cues
b. Motivation to interrupt cycle	(0) Motivated to avoid and interrupt cycle (1) May be motivated to avoid and interrupt cycle (2) Lacks motivation to avoid and interrupt cycle
c. Ability and skills to interrupt cycle	(0) Has ability/skills to avoid and interrupt cycle (1) Has some ability/skills to avoid and interrupt cycle (2) Lacks ability/skills to avoid and interrupt cycle
d. Awareness of thinking errors	(0) Recognizes thinking errors (1) Inconsistent awareness of thinking errors (2) Is not aware of thinking errors
6. Youth manages deviant arousal appropriately	
a. Occurrence	(0) Rarely has deviant fantasies (1) Occasional deviant fantasies (weekly or monthly) (2) Frequent deviant fantasies (daily or weekly)
b. Masturbation	(0) Does not masturbate to deviant fantasies (1) Occasional masturbation to deviant fantasies (monthly) (2) Frequent masturbation to deviant fantasies (daily or weekly)
c. Arousal	(0) Primary arousal is to non-deviant stimuli (1) Mixed arousal: aroused to deviant and non-deviant stimuli (2) Primary arousal is to deviant stimuli
7. Youth practices responsible/legal sexual behavior	(0) No (1) Yes



**Appendix B.1  
IPSA Sex Offender Domain Items**

	Total	% of Sample	Number of Youth Recidivating				Recidivism Rate			
			Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex	Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
Total Sample	319	100%	124	66	28	30	39%	21%	9%	9%
1. Youth has violated sex offender registration requirements during current review period.										
No	236	74%	73	39	17	19	31%	17%	7%	8%
Yes	83	26%	51	27	11	11	61%	33%	13%	13%
2. Youth's most consistently displayed level of denial.										
(0) No denial, accepts full responsibility	126	39%	42	16	6	7	33%	13%	5%	6%
(1) Weak avoidance, admits to facts of offense	82	26%	29	21	11	11	35%	26%	13%	13%
(2) Moderate denial, justifies, minimizes, admits to committing offense but denies arousal	82	26%	39	19	8	8	48%	23%	10%	10%
(3) Strong denial: admits past but not current offenses, denies committing any offenses, does not acknowledge harm of offense, is hostile/defensive when denying.	28	9%	14	10	3	4	50%	36%	11%	14%
3. Youth's level of treatment progress Score.										
0	56	18%	16	8	3	3	29%	14%	5%	5%
1	38	12%	11	3	3	3	29%	8%	8%	8%
2	30	9%	5	1	1	1	17%	3%	3%	3%
3	16	5%	5	3	1	1	31%	19%	6%	6%
4	33	10%	13	8	3	3	39%	24%	9%	9%
5	37	12%	15	7	5	6	41%	19%	14%	16%
6	26	8%	11	8	3	3	42%	31%	12%	12%
7	17	5%	7	4	0	0	41%	24%	0%	0%
8	18	6%	5	4	3	4	28%	22%	17%	22%
9	9	3%	7	3	2	2	78%	33%	22%	22%
10	36	11%	28	16	4	4	78%	44%	11%	11%
4. Youth's degree of functional social skills score.										
	1	0%	1	1	0	0	100%	100%	0%	0%
0	59	18%	19	5	1	1	32%	8%	2%	2%
1	64	20%	25	14	5	5	39%	22%	8%	8%
2	79	25%	31	17	11	12	39%	22%	14%	15%
3	60	19%	24	14	6	6	40%	23%	10%	10%
4	33	10%	13	7	2	2	39%	21%	6%	6%
5	19	6%	9	6	2	2	47%	32%	11%	11%
6	4	1%	2	2	1	2	50%	50%	25%	50%
5. Youth's overall degree of self-control and self-management of sex offending behavior Score										
0	60	19%	18	7	2	2	30%	12%	3%	3%
1	40	13%	15	6	3	3	38%	15%	8%	8%
2	29	9%	7	3	2	2	24%	10%	7%	7%
3	39	12%	14	6	1	1	36%	15%	3%	3%
4	56	18%	23	14	6	6	41%	25%	11%	11%
5	31	10%	13	6	4	4	42%	19%	13%	13%
6	23	7%	10	7	2	2	43%	30%	9%	9%
7	24	8%	13	8	5	7	54%	33%	21%	29%
8	15	5%	10	8	3	3	67%	53%	20%	20%
6. Youth manages deviant arousal appropriately score.										
0	170	53%	62	30	11	11	36%	18%	6%	6%
1	18	6%	8	5	2	2	44%	28%	11%	11%
2	14	4%	7	5	2	2	50%	36%	14%	14%
3	79	25%	35	18	10	10	44%	23%	13%	13%
4	10	3%	2	1	1	2	20%	10%	10%	20%
5	12	4%	4	2	0	0	33%	17%	0%	0%
6	11	3%	5	4	2	3	45%	36%	18%	27%
7. Youth practices responsible/legal sexual behavior.										
No	212	66%	79	40	15	15	37%	19%	7%	7%
Yes	103	32%	44	25	13	15	43%	24%	13%	15%

**Appendix B.2**  
**IPSA Sex Offender Domain Sub-Item Statistics**

	Total	% of Sample	Number of Youth Recidivating				Recidivism Rate			
			Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex	Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
Total Sample	319	100%	124	66	28	30	39%	21%	9%	9%
<b>3. Youth's level of treatment progress.</b>										
<b>3a Attendance</b>										
Good	182	57%	54	29	13	15	30%	16%	7%	8%
Fair	76	24%	27	15	9	9	36%	20%	12%	12%
Poor	57	18%	41	21	6	6	72%	37%	11%	11%
<b>3b Participation</b>										
Good	138	43%	42	14	7	7	30%	10%	5%	5%
Fair	106	33%	37	26	12	12	35%	25%	11%	11%
Poor	72	23%	44	25	9	11	61%	35%	13%	15%
<b>3c Cooperation</b>										
Good	123	39%	33	14	8	8	27%	11%	7%	7%
Fair	120	38%	47	25	12	13	39%	21%	10%	11%
Poor	69	22%	41	25	7	8	59%	36%	10%	12%
<b>3d Assignments</b>										
Good	97	30%	27	12	5	5	28%	12%	5%	5%
Fair	135	42%	46	27	13	14	34%	20%	10%	10%
Poor	83	26%	50	26	10	11	60%	31%	12%	13%
<b>3e Compliance</b>										
Good	102	32%	27	12	6	6	26%	12%	6%	6%
Fair	104	33%	40	17	9	10	38%	16%	9%	10%
Poor	110	34%	56	36	13	14	51%	33%	12%	13%
<b>3f Overall Progress</b>										
Good	92	29%	21	8	4	4	23%	9%	4%	4%
Fair	101	32%	33	18	8	8	33%	18%	8%	8%
Poor	106	33%	57	30	13	15	54%	28%	12%	14%
Missing	14	4%	11	8	2	2	79%	57%	14%	14%
<b>4. Youth's degree of functional social skills.</b>										
<b>4a Friendships</b>										
(0) Makes and keeps peer age friends	108	34%	39	18	5	5	36%	17%	5%	5%
(1) Has a few peer age friends but relationships may be unstable	176	55%	73	39	18	19	41%	22%	10%	11%
(2) Has no peer age friends	34	11%	11	8	5	6	32%	24%	15%	18%
<b>4b Communication</b>										
(0) Can maintain appropriate conversation	189	59%	72	34	15	15	38%	18%	8%	8%
(1) May dominate or not engage fully in conversation	103	32%	37	21	10	11	36%	20%	10%	11%
(2) Cannot maintain appropriate conversation	25	8%	14	10	3	4	56%	40%	12%	16%
<b>4c Response to feedback</b>										
(0) Accepts positive and negative feedback well	93	29%	30	10	5	6	32%	11%	5%	6%
(1) Inconsistent responses to positive and negative feedback	194	61%	78	46	21	21	40%	24%	11%	11%
(2) Inappropriate responses to positive and negative feedback	31	10%	15	9	2	3	48%	29%	6%	10%
<b>5. Youth's overall degree of self-control and self-management of sex offending behavior.</b>										
<b>5a Understanding of offense cycle</b>										
(0) Understands offense cycle, triggers and cues.	153	48%	49	22	7	7	32%	14%	5%	5%
(1) Learning offense cycle, triggers and cues	109	34%	45	24	12	13	41%	22%	11%	12%
(2) Does not understand	55	17%	29	19	9	10	53%	35%	16%	18%

	Total	% of Sample	Number of Youth Recidivating				Recidivism Rate			
			Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex	Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
Total Sample	319	100%	124	66	28	30	39%	21%	9%	9%
offense cycle, triggers and cues										
5b Motivation to interrupt cycle										
(0) Motivated to avoid and interrupt cycle	108	34%	34	14	6	6	31%	13%	6%	6%
(1) May be motivated to avoid and interrupt cycle	121	38%	47	21	9	9	39%	17%	7%	7%
(2) Lacks motivation to avoid and interrupt cycle	88	28%	42	30	13	15	48%	34%	15%	17%
5c Ability and skills to interrupt cycle										
(0) Has ability/skills to avoid and interrupt cycle	124	39%	42	18	6	6	34%	15%	5%	5%
(1) Has some ability/skills to avoid and interrupt cycle	143	45%	55	29	14	14	38%	20%	10%	10%
(2) Lacks ability/skills to avoid and interrupt cycle	49	15%	26	18	8	10	53%	37%	16%	20%
5d Awareness of thinking errors										
(0) Recognizes thinking errors	96	30%	31	12	4	4	32%	13%	4%	4%
(1) Inconsistent awareness of thinking errors	177	55%	64	36	18	19	36%	20%	10%	11%
(2) Is not aware of thinking errors	43	13%	27	17	6	7	63%	40%	14%	16%
6. Youth manages deviant arousal appropriately.										
6a Occurrence										
(0) Rarely has deviant fantasies	178	56%	63	31	12	12	35%	17%	7%	7%
(1) Occasional deviant fantasies (weekly or monthly)	106	33%	50	27	13	13	47%	25%	12%	12%
(2) Frequent deviant fantasies (daily or weekly)	30	9%	10	7	3	5	33%	23%	10%	17%
6b Masturbation										
(0) Does not masturbate to deviant fantasies	192	60%	74	39	15	15	39%	20%	8%	8%
(1) Occasional masturbation to deviant fantasies (monthly)	93	29%	39	20	11	12	42%	22%	12%	13%
(2) Frequent masturbation to deviant fantasies (daily or weekly)	26	8%	9	6	2	3	35%	23%	8%	12%
6c Arousal										
(0) Primary arousal is to non-deviant stimuli	190	60%	71	36	13	13	37%	19%	7%	7%
(1) Mixed arousal: aroused to deviant and non-deviant stimuli	106	33%	44	24	12	13	42%	23%	11%	12%
(2) Primary arousal is to deviant stimuli	16	5%	7	5	3	4	44%	31%	19%	25%

**Appendix C**  
**Demographic and Criminal History Item Statistics**

Gender and Age	Total	Percentage of Sample	Number of Youth Recidivating				Recidivism Rate			
			Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex	Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
<b>Gender</b>										
Female	14	4%	2	0	0	0	14%	0%	0%	0%
Male	305	96%	121	65	28	30	40%	21%	9%	10%
<b>Age at Release</b>										
Under 15	88	28%	39	21	12	14	44%	24%	14%	16%
15 to 17	178	56%	58	30	9	9	33%	17%	5%	5%
Over 17	53	17%	26	14	7	7	49%	26%	13%	13%
<b>1. Age at First Arrest</b>										
Over 16	4	1%	4	3	3	3	100%	75%	75%	75%
16	11	3%	5	3	0	0	45%	27%	0%	0%
15	39	12%	10	2	0	0	26%	5%	0%	0%
13 to 14	119	37%	37	14	7	7	31%	12%	6%	6%
Under 13	144	45%	63	39	16	18	44%	27%	11%	13%
<b>2. Misdemeanors</b>										
None or one	249	78%	82	41	21	23	33%	16%	8%	9%
Two	33	10%	16	8	4	4	48%	24%	12%	12%
Three or four	23	7%	13	7	2	2	57%	30%	9%	9%
Five or more	14	4%	10	7	1	1	71%	50%	7%	7%
<b>3. Felonies</b>										
None	2	1%	2	2	2	2	100%	100%	100%	100%
One	205	64%	63	34	15	17	31%	17%	7%	8%
Two	74	23%	33	15	7	7	45%	20%	9%	9%
Three or more	38	12%	23	12	4	4	61%	32%	11%	11%
<b>4. Weapons</b>										
None	310	97%	114	60	27	29	37%	19%	9%	9%
One or more	9	3%	7	3	1	1	78%	33%	11%	11%
<b>5. Misdemeanors. Person</b>										
None	254	80%	87	45	21	23	34%	18%	8%	9%
One	48	15%	22	12	6	6	46%	25%	13%	13%
Two or more	17	5%	12	6	1	1	71%	35%	6%	6%
<b>6. Felony. Person</b>										
None	5	2%	5	3	2	2	100%	60%	40%	40%
One or two	295	92%	105	54	22	24	36%	18%	7%	8%
Three or more	19	6%	11	6	4	4	58%	32%	21%	21%
<b>7. Misdemeanors. Sex</b>										
None	226	71%	75	39	18	20	33%	17%	8%	9%
One	67	21%	32	16	8	8	48%	24%	12%	12%
Two or more	12	4%	7	3	2	2	58%	25%	17%	17%
None	14	4%	7	5	0	0	50%	36%	0%	0%
<b>8. Felony. Sex</b>										
None	68	21%	20	10	5	5	29%	15%	7%	7%
One	207	65%	77	40	17	19	37%	19%	8%	9%
Two or more	44	14%	24	13	6	6	55%	30%	14%	14%

Gender and Age	Total	Percentage of Sample	Number of Youth Recidivating				Recidivism Rate			
			Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex	Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
Criminal History Total										
0	2	1%	2	2	2	2	100%	100%	100%	100%
6	8	3%	3	2	2	2	38%	25%	25%	25%
7	21	7%	7	4	0	0	33%	19%	0%	0%
8	32	10%	9	4	1	1	28%	13%	3%	3%
9	69	22%	17	7	3	3	25%	10%	4%	4%
10	65	20%	20	9	5	7	31%	14%	8%	11%
11	18	6%	7	3	2	2	39%	17%	11%	11%
12	21	7%	8	5	4	4	38%	24%	19%	19%
13	10	3%	4	3	2	2	40%	30%	20%	20%
14	22	7%	12	5	2	2	55%	23%	9%	9%
15	7	2%	5	4	0	0	71%	57%	0%	0%
16	4	1%	1	0	0	0	25%	0%	0%	0%
17	8	3%	6	4	0	0	75%	50%	0%	0%
18	10	3%	6	3	1	1	60%	30%	10%	10%
19	3	1%	2	2	2	2	67%	67%	67%	67%
20	6	2%	4	2	1	1	67%	33%	17%	17%
21	5	2%	4	1	1	1	80%	20%	20%	20%
22	5	2%	2	2	0	0	40%	40%	0%	0%
23	1	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
24	1	0%	1	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%	0%
25	1	0%	1	1	0	0	100%	100%	0%	0%
Criminal History Total Ranges										
0 to 9	132	41%	38	19	8	8	28.8%	14.4%	6.1%	6.1%
10 to 11	83	26%	27	12	7	9	32.5%	14.5%	8.4%	10.8%
12 to 25	104	33%	56	32	13	13	53.8%	30.8%	12.5%	12.5%

**Appendix D**  
**History of Juvenile Court Adjudication Statistics**

Juvenile Court Adjudications	Total	% of Sample	Number of Youth Recidivating				Recidivism Rate			
			Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex	Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
Total Sample	319	100%	124	66	28	30	39%	21%	9%	9%
<b>Child Sex</b>										
0	42	13%	23	11	6	6	55%	26%	14%	14%
1	168	53%	57	29	13	13	34%	17%	8%	8%
2	77	24%	29	16	6	8	38%	21%	8%	10%
3	19	6%	5	2	0	0	26%	11%	0%	0%
4	12	4%	6	4	3	3	50%	33%	25%	25%
5	1	0%	1	1	0	0	100%	100%	0%	0%
One or more	277	87%	98	52	22	24	35%	19%	8%	9%
<b>Rape</b>										
0	289	91%	111	58	26	28	38%	20%	9%	10%
1	24	8%	7	4	1	1	29%	17%	4%	4%
2	4	1%	2	1	1	1	50%	25%	25%	25%
3	1	0%	1	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%	0%
5	1	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
One or more	30	9%	10	5	2	2	33%	17%	7%	7%
<b>Felony Sex</b>										
0	8	3%	7	3	2	2	88%	38%	25%	25%
1	263	82%	97	51	21	23	37%	19%	8%	9%
2	42	13%	12	6	3	3	29%	14%	7%	7%
3	6	2%	5	3	2	2	83%	50%	33%	33%
<b>Misdemeanor Sex</b>										
0	310	97%	116	60	26	28	37%	19%	8%	9%
1	9	3%	5	3	2	2	56%	33%	22%	22%
<b>Any Sex</b>										
0	7	2%	7	3	2	2	100%	43%	29%	29%
1	257	81%	92	48	19	21	36%	19%	7%	8%
2	49	15%	17	9	5	5	35%	18%	10%	10%
3	5	2%	5	3	2	2	100%	60%	40%	40%
4	1	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
One or more	55	17%	22	12	7	7	40%	22%	13%	13%
<b>Felony Against Person</b>										
0	5	2%	5	3	2	2	100%	60%	40%	40%
1	253	79%	92	48	20	22	36%	19%	8%	9%
2	42	13%	13	6	2	2	31%	14%	5%	5%
3	16	5%	9	6	4	4	56%	38%	25%	25%
4	1	0%	1	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%	0%
5	2	1%	1	0	0	0	50%	0%	0%	0%
One or more	61	19%	24	12	6	6	39%	20%	10%	10%
<b>Misdemeanor Person</b>										
0	254	80%	87	45	21	23	34%	18%	8%	9%
1	48	15%	22	12	6	6	46%	25%	13%	13%
2	11	3%	8	4	1	1	73%	36%	9%	9%
3	4	1%	4	2	0	0	100%	50%	0%	0%
4	1	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
6	1	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
One or more	65	20%	34	18	7	7	52%	28%	11%	11%
<b>Any Person</b>										
0	5	2%	5	3	2	2	100%	60%	40%	40%
1	204	64%	66	34	15	17	32%	17%	7%	8%
2	73	23%	27	13	6	6	37%	18%	8%	8%
3	20	6%	13	8	3	3	65%	40%	15%	15%
4	11	3%	8	5	2	2	73%	45%	18%	18%
5	2	1%	1	0	0	0	50%	0%	0%	0%
6	2	1%	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
7	1	0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
8	1	0%	1	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%	0%
One or more	110	34%	50	26	11	11	45%	24%	10%	10%


**Appendix E**  
**Initial Security Classification Assessment Statistics**

ISCA Risk Level	Total	% of Sample	Number of Youth Recidivating				Recidivism Rate			
			Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex	Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
Missing	12	4%	5	3	2	2	42%	25%	17%	17%
1	226	71%	67	33	17	19	30%	15%	8%	8%
2	58	18%	32	17	7	7	55%	29%	12%	12%
3	23	7%	17	10	2	2	74%	43%	9%	9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>A. Assaults</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) None	142	45%	46	26	10	12	32%	18%	7%	8%
(3) Prior Assaultive Behavior	167	52%	70	34	16	16	42%	20%	10%	10%
<b>B. Impulsive</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) Generally does not act out	54	17%	12	5	4	4	22%	9%	7%	7%
(1) Occasionally hostile or impulsive response	190	60%	68	37	15	17	36%	19%	8%	9%
(2) Frequently hostile or impulsive response	65	20%	36	18	7	7	55%	28%	11%	11%
<b>C. Age at First Adjudication</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) 16 years or older	34	11%	12	6	3	3	35%	18%	9%	9%
(5) 14 to 15 years old	106	33%	31	12	5	5	29%	11%	5%	5%
(10) 13 years or younger	169	53%	73	42	18	20	43%	25%	11%	12%
<b>D. Substance Abuse</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) Non-use or experimentation only	219	69%	74	41	17	19	34%	19%	8%	9%
(3) Abuse or dependency	90	28%	42	19	9	9	47%	21%	10%	10%
<b>E. Problem Solving</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) Generally appropriate response to problems	19	6%	3	1	1	1	16%	5%	5%	5%
(1) Inconsistent appropriate response	185	58%	71	39	17	19	38%	21%	9%	10%
(2) Rarely or never appropriate response	105	33%	42	20	8	8	40%	19%	8%	8%
<b>F. Peer Relationships</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) Adequate support and influence	86	27%	27	14	7	7	31%	16%	8%	8%
(1) Negative influence/delinquent peers/gang	223	70%	89	46	19	21	40%	21%	9%	9%
<b>G. Prior Adjudications</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) None	193	61%	56	27	16	18	29%	14%	8%	9%
(5) One or two	73	23%	33	21	7	7	45%	29%	10%	10%
(10) Three or more	43	13%	27	12	3	3	63%	28%	7%	7%
<b>H. Compliance</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) High level of compliance	155	49%	43	20	9	9	28%	13%	6%	6%
(1) Moderate level	122	38%	52	29	15	17	43%	24%	12%	14%
(2) No or minimal compliance	32	10%	21	11	2	2	66%	34%	6%	6%
<b>I. Escapes</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) None	284	89%	104	54	23	25	37%	19%	8%	9%
(3) Left court-ordered placement/escaped	25	8%	12	6	3	3	48%	24%	12%	12%

ISCA Risk Level	Total	% of Sample	Number of Youth Recidivating				Recidivism Rate			
			Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex	Felony	Violent Felony	Felony Sex	Any Sex
<b>J. Prior Commitments</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) None	296	93%	106	53	22	24	36%	18%	7%	8%
(3) One	11	3%	8	6	3	3	73%	55%	27%	27%
(5) Two or more	2	1%	2	1	1	1	100%	50%	50%	50%
<b>K. Gender</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) Female	13	4%	1	0	0	0	8%	0%	0%	0%
(5) Male	296	93%	115	60	26	28	39%	20%	9%	9%
<b>L. Adjudicated Sex Offender</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) Current or historic	302	95%	111	59	25	27	37%	20%	8%	9%
(5) Not a sex offender	7	2%	5	1	1	1	71%	14%	14%	14%
<b>M. Age At Admittance</b>										
Missing	12	4%	5	3	2	2	42%	25%	17%	17%
(0) Over 16	34	11%	12	7	4	4	35%	21%	12%	12%
(5) 15 or 16	130	41%	40	17	8	8	31%	13%	6%	6%
(10) Under 15	143	45%	64	36	14	16	45%	25%	10%	11%
<b>N. Length of Maximum Sentence</b>										
Missing	10	3%	5	3	2	2	50%	30%	20%	20%
(0) 52 weeks or less	128	40%	48	25	15	15	38%	20%	12%	12%
(2) More than 52 weeks	181	57^	68	35	11	13	38%	19%	6%	7%
<b>O. Violent Offense</b>										
Missing	277	87%	104	57	24	26	38%	21%	9%	9%
(0) None	8	3%	4	1	0	0	50%	13%	0%	0%
(2) One or more	34	11%	13	5	4	4	38%	15%	12%	12%
<b>Serious Offense</b>										
Missing	52	16%	22	9	6	6	42%	17%	12%	12%
(0) No serious offense	22	7%	18	12	5	5	82%	55%	23%	23%
(2) Serious offense	245	77%	81	42	17	19	33%	17%	7%	8%

For further information, contact Robert Barnoski at (360) 349-2089 or [barney@wsipp.wa.gov](mailto:barney@wsipp.wa.gov)

Document No. 08-05-1101



The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs the Institute and guides the development of all activities. The Institute's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.