

FAQ Version 2: The Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT) and Correlates of Admission to Sexual Interest in Children (CASIC) Scale

20 June 2018

Angela W. Eke, L. Maaiké Helmus, and Michael C. Seto

In this FAQ, we provide responses to questions we have received regarding the CPORT and CASIC. Questions are grouped according to themes. Multi-part questions were separated, those with identifying features were anonymized, and we sometimes edited the text for readability.

Some questions relate to the limits of CPORT and CASIC, reflecting the fact that neither of the tools have been tested in the ‘real world’ – that is, the validation work to date has been conducted in a research environment and has yet to be field tested with front-line evaluators. This has an impact on our knowledge regarding reliability of scoring as well as the validity of the tool and the appropriateness of alternative coding options (e.g., scoring sexual interest in children based on a post-conviction admission to a clinician).

We have been contacted by a variety of stakeholders regarding potential validation studies and field testing. We’re providing support to these initiatives and we’re excited about these developments. As we’ve stated, the way CPORT is used, as well as the actual content itself, is expected to develop and change with more research, similar to what has occurred with other tools and as is the benefit of empirical evaluation.

Please note, this document is not to be used in lieu of the CPORT and CASIC scoring guide posted on ResearchGate, <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Child-Pornography-Offender-Risk-Tool-CPORT>.

A. Eligibility for Scoring CPORT

1. Can I use CPORT with an individual with no contact sexual offending, including those with no other offending besides child pornography?

A. The CPORT can be useful to rank individuals with no other known criminal offending.

Their score would be dependent on age at index, they may have male focused content (child pornography, child nudity/other), they may admit to a sexual interest in children (or score 3 or more on the CASIC) and they may have a prior child pornography offense.

This question likely stems from our development research indicating CPORT was not predictive of new sexual offending in this specific subgroup (no other offending). Similar to other sex offender groups, general criminality is a key component in risk assessment of child pornography offenders; child pornography offenders with no other criminal history have lower scores on the CPORT, and this also corresponds with their low observed rates of recidivism. The items on CPORT are predictive because of the heterogeneous group of

offenders, with varying backgrounds, histories, and collections; all subgroups of offenders contributed to the predictive validity of the CPORT.

Data relating to our samples (development, validation, combined) and the predictive efficacy of CPORT among contact and non-contact child pornography offenders is available in the ATSA 2016 slides posted on our ResearchGate project page.

Future research comparing subgroups of child pornography offenders may find different probability estimates are relevant for child pornography offenders with, versus without, other offending.

2. Can I use CPORT with an individual who is currently undergoing a risk appraisal because of his involvement in a non-child pornography offense (e.g., voyeurism), but he also has a past child pornography conviction? That is, can CPORT be used in cases where the child pornography is not the index offense (offense leading to the current risk assessment)?
 - A. We do not recommend that the CPORT be scored in these cases at this time. Everyone in our development sample and validation sample was scored based on child pornography offending being part, or all, of their index offending. In the future, validation research may assist with probability estimates for shortened time frames as well as provide data regarding adjustments for time offense-free.

The index offenses may include a ‘cluster’ of offenses. For example, if the individual was charged with fraud, which led to the seizure and search of his computer, which led to the discovery of child pornography - these offenses are all part of the same investigation and are all considered part of his index offenses. Similarly, if the individual is investigated for child pornography, charged for the offense and then the investigation reveals contact offenses against children for which he is also charged – for the purpose of CPORT (and our original coding) these again all relate to the index offenses.

Offenses that occur after the index child pornography charge(s) but before conviction (e.g., while the offender was on bail awaiting trial) are not part of the index offenses. In these instances, the offender has been detected and charged for the child pornography and then goes on to commit a new offense, which we counted as recidivism.

In rare instances, an individual may commit a new offense after being arrested for a child pornography offense, but prior to any police or court action relating to a charge; although we had none of these cases, we would consider these as part of the index offense. For example, the offender is being arrested for child pornography, he resists arrest and is charged with assaulting a police officer – we would have counted the assault charge as an index offense as well.

3. Can I use CPORT in cases where offenders are charged, but are still involved in the court process?
 - A. See page 11 of the guide (Version 2) for a full response to this question. The following is an excerpt: *One question that might arise is whether CPORT can be used*

with charged offenders who are still involved in criminal proceedings (e.g., for use at a bail hearing). While there is reason to believe that CPORT would work similarly prior to conviction as it does post-conviction (e.g., the data used to score CPORT relates to prior criminal history or information available during the investigation but not post-conviction information, recidivism was collected from charge onwards) we have not empirically assessed CPORT with a charged group so we have no details on how it performs for those who do not go on to be convicted (a less common occurrence in Canada, where the majority of charged individuals are convicted). If an evaluator decides to use CPORT prior to conviction for the purpose of sharing information about the risk factors, we highly recommend you add a caveat about your use so those reviewing your report understand the CPORT scoring criteria have not been met, for example stating: “While there is reason to believe CPORT will be applicable to charged individuals, there is currently no empirical support for this use. This information is intended to provide insight into individual risk factors and provide some context to an individual’s offending, but it is not being used to score the individual in comparison to other offenders.” If a conviction is registered you might then decide to use the CPORT as a score. Do not use CPORT in cases where the individual’s child pornography charge has already been withdrawn or dismissed until there is further research evidence of the use of CPORT with this type of group.

4. In our jurisdiction or country we do not have child pornography laws exactly like Canada, can we still score CPORT for someone with a similar offense?
 - A. Please refer to page 10 of the guide (Version 2) for a full response to this question, as well as page 6 in the guide for our definitions of child pornography. The following is an excerpt that starts on page 10: “... we used the legal definition for child pornography in Canada. Not all countries have the same definitions. CPORT can be used with individuals convicted of similar child pornography offenses, specifically: accessing, possessing, distributing and/or producing material (any visual depiction, text etc) which involve either children engaged in, or depicted to engage in, sexual acts or material in which the dominant characteristics included the sexual organs or anal regions of a child. Our definition is broader than some other countries because the Canadian legal definition of child pornography includes depictions of fictional children (e.g., stories, anime). In Canada, images of nude or partially dressed children where there is no sexual activity and no focus on the sexual organs or anal region of a child are not illegal. A conviction solely for possession of content depicting child nudity in another country (e.g., under obscenity legislation) would not fit the criteria for using CPORT.”
5. Does the child pornography material need to have been collected or accessed by the offender online, in order to use CPORT?
 - A. No, you can use CPORT regardless of how the material was accessed as individuals in the sample may have collected, accessed, produced or distributed child pornography content online or offline. The majority of individuals in the development sample (88%) had accessed at least some child pornography material online.

6. Can CPORT be used for a man who now identifies as a woman? Someone was convicted as a man, but now identifies as transgender - will it still be valid now that they identify as a woman?
- A. We recommend that you score CPORT and CASIC based on the gender (man) of the individual at the time of their offending. The research scoring was based on what was known at the index offense(s). We do not know if any individual in our samples identified as transgender at that time or at a later time.

If you use CPORT with an individual who is male but identifies as a woman, we recommend adding a clear caveat statement that there is no CPORT data for transgender persons or for women.

7. When you originally obtained your sample from police, how many were excluded because of a successfully appealed conviction?
- A. No cases were excluded due to a successful appeal of the individual's conviction. In one instance, the case was under appeal and we waited for the outcome (conviction was upheld) prior to coding it for the study. We had one case in the validation sample in which the individual successfully appealed his sentence (not his conviction); this case was included in the study.

8. I am evaluating an individual originally convicted of child pornography and another non-violent, non-sexual offense, who later successfully appealed the child pornography conviction (he was still convicted of the other offense). Does the CPORT apply? I had originally scored it after the conviction, for sentencing purposes.
- A. Our development and validation samples were retrospective and selected based on conviction, with no successful appeal. In practice, the original CPORT score (upon conviction) would be valid. If an individual successfully appealed their child pornography conviction, then we recommend the CPORT score not be used. If conducting a risk evaluation in a case where the individual is currently appealing their child pornography conviction(s) (not just their sentence) we recommend waiting to score CPORT until the appeal decision is made.

We do not recommend scoring CPORT for an individual who has already successfully appealed their child pornography conviction(s).

9. I have an individual charged with child pornography when he was 17 and convicted at 18; can I use the CPORT?
- A. One of the original inclusion criteria in the development sample was that the individual was an adult (18 or older) at the time of the investigation, therefore we recommend the CPORT for use with adults only, until further research is conducted with those who were minors at the time of the investigation.

10. Has there been any research by other (independent) researchers that validates the CPORT?

- A.** We are aware of one independent validation study so far. In Amy Pilon's (2016) thesis, a modified CPORT (missing the two child content items and modified coding for three of the remaining five items) significantly predicted any new criminal convictions in a three-year follow-up of 279 child pornography offenders in Ontario and produced a higher (though nonsignificantly) predictive accuracy than a general offender risk assessment tool, the Level of Service Inventory-Ontario Revised (LSI-OR; Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 1995). The modified CPORT did not significantly predict sexual recidivism, probably in part as a result of the low base rate of sexual recidivism (2.9%) and the missing child content items and modified sexual interest item, which may be particularly relevant in predicting sexual as opposed to nonsexual offenses. It is possible Pilon's sample has some overlap with our CPORT development sample, because data came from the same geographic region during an overlapping time period, but we cannot confirm (identify) or disconfirm the overlap.

11. Can the CPORT be applied with people from different racial or ethnic groups?

- A.** We do not have a breakdown of the racial or ethnic backgrounds of the individuals in our development or validation samples, and there has been no evaluation of the efficacy of CPORT and CASIC according to these demographic characteristics. In considering racial/ethnicity groups, we suspect the majority of our samples were Caucasian men based on the sample breakdown reported by Pilon (2016; which potentially had some overlap with our development sample): Caucasian (87.1%), Aboriginal (3.0%), Southern Asian (1.5%), Hispanic (1.1%), Southeast Asian (0.7%), East Asian (0.7%), Black (0.7%), Unknown (4.8%) and 'did not specify' (0.4%). On a related note, a recent meta-analysis reported that most online sexual offenders are Caucasian (see, Babchishin, Hanson, & VanZuylen, 2015).

Future research involving larger samples may specifically assess cultural and/or ethnic background, as we've seen with other risk assessment and forensic assessment tools employed in clinical and correctional settings.

12. The CPORT only has 7 items, what about other risk factors for child pornography offender recidivism?

- A.** We expect other factors are also related to risk to reoffend among child pornography offenders; for example, models of sexual offending would suggest antisocial personality or other clinical information would be important. However, we were only able to examine variables we could reliably and consistently code from police files, and clinical information was uncommon (e.g., see Table 5, Seto & Eke, 2015).

In our research, we examined a large number of variables we thought could be related to an individual's risk for future offending. In our guide, we discuss the fact CPORT does not include all potentially (some of which may be redundant) relevant risk factors and describe other variables we examined, or believe may have some importance, on page 38. In that section, we also speak to the relevance of information regarding content and themes within

an individual's collection, or specific information regarding their online behaviors, and how that can be valuable for overall risk evaluation and informing management strategies.

- 13.** CPORT predicts new charges, not whether they are convicted, so isn't it a prediction tool for accusations rather than findings of fact? Another related question was: Based on the way CPORT was developed, risk really relates to whether the person comes to the attention of police again, not whether they have committed a new offense (i.e., they may do something and not get caught for it). Therefore, this is a prediction tool for detection.

- A.** The CPORT assesses the likelihood of a person being charged again, post-index.

In our samples, almost all child pornography related charges result in convictions, which we have attributed to the presence of physical (digital or non-digital) evidence.

Individuals in our development and validation samples were more likely to be charged with new child pornography offenses than with other new sexual offenses, which have a lower conviction rate.

Because we relied on criminal records for our outcome data, not follow-up surveys of offenders or other methods involving self-report, we do not have any information on undetected new offenses.

- 14.** What would lower risk to reoffend? Why doesn't the CPORT take into account what will lower risk for the person I'm evaluating?

- A.** In our development sample, we were not able to code possible protective factors (e.g., social stability) or dynamic risk factors that can change over time, in large part because we accessed police case files and they did not contain this information in a consistent way. Further prospective research examining potential protective and dynamic risk factors is needed to understand what else can influence risk in this group.

Evaluators may decide to include CPORT as a static risk assessment and share other relevant information, including that relating to potential protective (e.g., strong social supports) and dynamic risk (e.g., if the evaluation determines child pornography activity was higher when drinking, then monitoring alcohol use might be warranted), with the caveat that the contribution of protective or dynamic factors has not yet been established for individuals involved specifically with child pornography. This type of information is also likely helpful for case management.

- 15.** If someone has a concurrent (index) contact sexual offense, why would someone use the CPORT instead of the STATIC-99R, a widely used and well validated risk tool for sex offenders?

- A.** An evaluator should choose the tool(s) they believe are most relevant to their individual case. There may be situations where one tool is more applicable over another. In this example, the STATIC-99R is likely more relevant if there is a concurrent contact sexual offense. However, an evaluator may be less confident if the contact sexual offense was

historical (e.g., it was committed 12 years ago) and the index offenses involve child pornography.

16. What about scoring both the CPORT and the STATIC-99R?

- A.** There is a variety of research discussing the benefits and drawbacks of using more than one risk tool within an evaluation. Reasons to use multiple tools include assessing different aspects related to reoffending (e.g., static vs dynamic factors, risk and protective factors, different recidivism outcomes) or multiple assessments potentially increasing the validity of the overall assessment. The CPORT and STATIC-99R have some similar items (e.g., relevance of criminal history, sexual interests, offending involving male children) and both are static in nature. However, they predict different outcomes, with the CPORT predicting any sexual recidivism (contact, CP, other noncontact) and child pornography specifically whereas the Static-99R predicts any sexual recidivism, contact sexual and nonsexually violent recidivism. As well, the corresponding percentile ranks would differ because they use different reference groups. Whereas dual offenders would be in the higher range on the CPORT (they receive an extra point for the contact sexual offense), they might be similar to or lower than typical STATIC-99R samples.

B. CPORT Item Scoring Questions

1. The individual I'm evaluating was 35 years and 11 months old at the time the police conducted their search warrant on his home, looking for child pornography (= index date). Do I score Item 1 "35 or younger" as a 0 or a 1?

- A.** You score Item 1 positively (1) because the individual is 35 or younger; at the time of the index investigation, they had not yet had their 36th birthday.

2. The recently updated STATIC-99R scoring guidelines includes the following as a contact sexual offense - *If the offender manipulates the victim into engaging in sexual acts (sending nude or partially nude pictures/videos; engaging in sexual activity either on camera or while in verbal contact with the offender) then it crosses into a contact/attempted contact offense (because the victim is being coerced into more than perceiving the offense). Judgements should be based on the intent of the offender and not the victim's engagement.* Are you going to use this definition as a contact sexual offense in the CPORT?

- A.** No, *soliciting a child for pornographic images* was not considered a contact sexual offense in the CPORT development research. Although the Static-99R is now considering this kind of offense under the new coding rules, the data we had did not consider it this way. Future research could examine how this broader coding of Item 4 might affect CPORT validity.

Also note, based on the above example, the individual may score a 1 on the CASIC, if this activity was online (see CASIC Item 6: online sexual communication with a minor).

3. An individual is 58 at this index offense, but he first began CP offending 30 years ago, incurring his first charge – why can't I score him for that age?

- A. When using the CPORT, the assessment of risk relates to the individual's index offense of child pornography, not past offending, even if it is related to child pornography. CPORT Item 1 (age 35 or younger) is coded at the time of the current index offense, therefore, at age 58 he scores a 0 for Item 1. Because of his prior offending, he will score a 1 on Item 2.
4. I'm assessing a man convicted of child pornography who has also been charged with bestiality. Does bestiality count as a contact sexual offense for Item 4 on CPORT?
- A. We did not have cases involving bestiality in our development or validation sample. All of the contact offending in our sample's history involved human victims. If the bestiality was a prior charge, then you would include it under Item 1 (prior criminal history). If the charge was concurrent with the child pornography charges, we do not recommend counting it under Item 4. Including bestiality as a contact sexual offense could be tested in future research.
5. We received multiple questions about scoring CPORT Item 5 – sexual interest in children – using information known post-conviction. For example: (i) The individual I'm assessing did not admit a sexual interest in children in his police interview, but he did admit it to me during his initial (post-conviction) clinical interview and; (ii) Mr. X has demonstrated a sexual preference for children in recent phallometric testing, this occurred post-conviction. Can this information be used to score CPORT Item 5?
- A. No. We did not have access to post-index clinical evaluation information from the police case files. We do not know how correlated post-conviction admissions are to admissions made to police investigators upon arrest and charge. We also do not know how subsequent clinical diagnoses based on admission, phallometric testing or other information are related, except for the occasions when someone was evaluated post-index charge but pre-conviction (see next question). An option is to note the risk-relevant information in the evaluation report. Future research examining post-conviction clinical data and how it relates to risk of recidivism for this group would be helpful.
6. I have an individual who had a sexological assessment after his child pornography charge but prior to his conviction - he was diagnosed as having pedophilia. Can I score CPORT Item 5 positively?
- A. Yes. If we had this information during coding, as part of his police investigation file, which can sometimes include post-charge evaluation reports, we would have scored this positively for a diagnosis of pedophilia and that information would have been included in the variables that made up CPORT Item 5.
7. The file I received in probation includes an officer's summary regarding communications the individual was having online with other offenders. The officer reported that in these chats, the offender indicated repeatedly that his sexual preference is children. Can I positively code Item 5 of CPORT?

- A. No, this information cannot be used for CPORT Item 5 at this time. This information may be relevant to his overall evaluation regarding his sexual interest in children.

We mention the potential relevance of this type of information, for the overall evaluation, in the guide on page 41: *Other information available in child pornography collections or based on online behaviours might also be helpful, for example: (1) file sharing rules or search criteria (e.g., “girls only! aged 5-12 only! no adult!”), (2) admissions made to others online (e.g., “loved boys since I was a boy, turned on by beautiful sexy boys...” “never had an adult, never want one, kids only”), and (3) postings in child sexual interest groups (e.g., girl love or boy chat groups).*

8. In the guide, you’ve included an appendix with Other Considerations – can I “score” any of these factors or items?

- A. No, these are not to be scored as part of the CPORT. The other considerations were listed for two main reasons: 1) to share the other variables we examined, so researchers and clinicians have broader information regarding what did and what did not predict sexual recidivism in our samples, and; 2) to share our experience regarding the difficulties in coding or measuring certain variables. Future researchers may decide to examine these variables in their studies. At this time, we do not know if these variables are empirically related to sexual recidivism for adult male child pornography offenders. However, this information may provide helpful context regarding an individual’s offending and be helpful for treatment and case management considerations.

C. Reporting CPORT Scoring

1. Do you have risk categories for CPORT?

- A. We did not create risk categories for CPORT, however, the development and validation samples were quite similar with regards to score distributions and risk groupings could be considered for both any sexual recidivism and child pornography recidivism, specifically. We report further on risk categories in Version 2 of the scoring guide, with consideration to other work examining the use of standard risk categories. In Version 2 of the scoring guide, we have provided percentiles based on CPORT scores.

2. It would be helpful if you would say something about high density offenders vs. low density offenders. For example, an offender who has been getting child pornography for three months may have 100s or 1000s of images, while another offender may have 10 or fewer images in the same time frame. If their scores are the same, are they really the same level of risk?

- A. It may seem counter-intuitive, but neither the amount of child pornography content (e.g., number of images) or the "duration" of child pornography offending added to the other CPORT items in our analysis. We say “duration” of offending because our measure didn’t capture density directly, instead it captured *time frame*. While this specific variable didn’t contribute directly to risk of recidivism in our research, *time frame* did predict the

likelihood that an individual convicted of child pornography would have admitted to (or been diagnosed with) a sexual interest in children (see our paper on the CASIC and the scoring guide).

3. Is CPORT only good for predicting recidivism over 5 years? Because it was developed using a 5-year fixed follow up method? A second, similar, question was the following: Why have a 5-year fixed period for recidivism? I'm interested in recidivism over a long time, not just the next 5 years.
 - A. The CPORT was developed to predict fixed five year outcomes. Longer-term follow-up is required to examine the association between CPORT score and recidivism after 5 years, and to determine the recidivism probabilities after a longer period of time.

More general sexual offending recidivism research would suggest that rank order is stable over time, that is, individuals with higher scores will be higher risk than those with lower scores irrespective of followup time duration, even though the base rates of recidivism will change with time. Research assessing this with child pornography offender samples will be helpful.

D. Eligibility for Scoring CASIC

1. Can I use CASIC regardless of CPORT, just to assess sexual interest in children in a male convicted of CP offending?
 - A. CASIC is not recommended as a stand-alone assessment for pedophilic or hebephilic sexual interests. At this time, we only have evidence that CASIC predicts admission to police, or pre-conviction diagnosis, of sexual interest in children; we don't have evidence of other construct validity, such as comparisons with other tools assessing pedophilic or hebephilic interests, or whether CASIC predicts future admissions (e.g., to clinicians, to probation officers) or post-conviction diagnoses of pedophilia or hebephilia.

The CASIC may be helpful in sharing information across stakeholders, for example regarding an individual's particular activities and the breadth of their collections. This information might be useful in a post-conviction clinical assessment.
2. If an individual admits their sexual interest in children, can I still code information on CASIC, in order to share more information about their interests (e.g., different child pornography mediums accessed)?
 - A. Yes, CASIC may be helpful as a way of documenting and sharing information.
3. If an individual denies sexual interest in children (in relation to Item 5 on CPORT) but he has a CASIC score of 3 or more, can I positively score Item 5?
 - A. CASIC items were tested based on their ability to predict admission of sexual interest. Then, CASIC was assessed as a substitute in CPORT, where Item 5 was "missing". In our analyses (see Table 3 in our Seto & Eke, 2017 CASIC paper) CASIC also improves the

predictability of CPORT when it is substituted across the board for Item 5 (including denial of interest). Overall, that research is limited, therefore if an evaluator wants to substitute CASIC in cases of denial, we recommend a caveat indicating the limited research to date.

4. I do not have enough information to code Item 5 on CPORT, but the CASIC score I have for the individual I'm assessing is 4. However, the other two items on CASIC are missing. The guide indicates CASIC can be used for Item 5 if the score is 3 or more, but with only 1 missing item. Why does that matter? I have a score of 4, why can't I use it? (Note to reader: this question was referring to the December 2016 version of the guide).
 - A. It is defensible to use a CASIC score of 3 or more as a replacement for a missing CPORT Item 5, regardless of the number of CASIC items missing, because the cutoff has already been reached. In our development work, we tested scores higher than 3 and found they did not predict admission of sexual interest in children better than a score of 3.

We had originally recommended CASIC scores not be used with more than 1 item missing (and rarely did we have missing items in the development sample). The information in the guide indicates: *Overall, few items in the development sample were missing, however in practice (e.g., outside of policing) information on certain items might not be as easily available. We have provided information on missing data in the coding information; in our development sample, the more commonly missing item was time span collecting or accessing the child pornography material. Until further research is available, we do not recommend using CASIC if there is more than one item missing.*

As stated above, it is defensible to use a score of 3 or more because it has reached that threshold/cutoff for Item 5; we now include this information in our updated Version 2 of the scoring guide. However, if a score is less than 3 and more than 1 item is missing, we do not consider that to be an accurate CASIC score.

E. CASIC Item Scoring Questions

1. Define "child" for the purpose of the tool. For example, I'm scoring it now for an offender who had a 16 year old girl masturbate for him and he recorded it. On the CASIC, item 6 does he get a score of 1 or 0? Since the first line of appendix B refers to pedophilia/hebephilia, I assume that the score would be 1.
 - A. Yes, if he was engaged in this behavior online with the 16 year old it would fit Item 6 (relating to online sexual communication with a minor) and be scored a 1 on that CASIC item. For both CPORT and CASIC, a child is someone under the age of 18.

F. Other Questions

1. The CPORT guide is provided under a Creative Commons (CC) license. Do I need to ask permission to use CPORT and CASIC in a research project?

- A. While we would appreciate knowing if someone is using the CPORT or CASIC for clinical purposes or working on new research (and, if allowed, would like to post that information on the ResearchGate Project Page in case others are interested) the tools and guide are free to use. The primary purpose of the Creative Commons license is to support further research. The license we chose requests attribution and extension of open access; for example, if someone translates CPORT or CASIC, we are to be advised of the translation and these modified versions made available to others. In addition, CPORT and CASIC were developed with the support of government grant funding, which is why we provide them free for use; the CC license restricts commercial use of the tools (e.g., selling a translated version of the tools).

G. Sample Statements

(Note: these are carried over from Version 1 of the Guide and therefore do not include the combined sample data)

We provide, with permission from the writers, some sample statements used to share information from CPORT and CASIC. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of an evaluator to accurately share how they employed tools such as CPORT and CASIC in any given case, including providing caveats for atypical scoring or applications.

Example #1

In this evaluation I used the Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT; Seto & Eke, 2015) and the Correlates of Admission of Sexual Interest in Children scale (CASIC; Seto & Eke, 2017) following the guide (Eke & Seto, 2016) and other materials available including information shared on the developers ResearchGate project page <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Child-Pornography-Offender-Risk-Tool-CPORT>. As per the Guide, CPORT is scored based on information known at the time of conviction (e.g., pre-conviction data)."

The CPORT was developed to predict all types of sexual recidivism (i.e., contact, non-contact, and child pornography sexual offenses) among men who have been convicted for a child pornography offense. To date, the CPORT is the first specific risk assessment tool for individuals convicted of a child pornography offense and appears to perform sensibly. However, at this time, it is not recommended that the CPORT is used to reference recidivism probabilities until there are further validation studies. As a result, this tool is being used in conjunction with other empirically validated risk tools to consider the ranking according to risk score and aid in case management, supervision, and prioritizing treatment goals. On the CPORT, Mr. S scored 1 out of a possible 7 points. An indication of pedophilic or hebephilic interests was the domain contributing to this total score.

Example #2

Recent studies have found that factors associated with sexual re-offense include: (1) Age 35 or younger at index offense; (2) Any prior criminal history; (3) Any prior contact sexual offense

history; (4) Any conditional release failure; (5) Admission of pedophilic or hebephilic sexual interests; (6) greater content featuring boys as compared to girls in child pornography viewed/possessed; (7) greater content featuring boys as compared to girls in other child materials. The factors have accordingly been compiled to form the Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT). Research has indicated that though preliminary risk percentages have been generated using this tool, these percentages have not yet been cross-validated or demonstrated to have stability across samples to allow for numerical risk estimates applied to an individual.

With that caveat, in the current evaluation, Mr. F presents with 1 out of 7 of these static risk indicators: admission of pedophilic interest. The observed recidivism rate in the developmental study for persons with this score is 4%. (Persons with a score of 5 or more had an observed recidivism rate of 47%.)

However, consideration of these factors does provide the basis for a more general risk assessment (internet and contact offenses) for child pornography offenders using a structured clinical judgement framework. Mr. F appears to be a relatively low risk of re-offense using this approach.

It is my impression that Mr. F is an appropriate candidate for specialized treatment in a community setting. Risks in the community can be managed by limiting his opportunities to have unfettered access to the Internet, which has been his primary source of images of children engaged in sexually explicit conduct. I anticipate he is likely to comply with court, probation or treatment-mandated rules and directives. He acknowledges the problem and appears to be motivated for treatment. I believe he is a reasonable candidate for community based treatment as long as sufficient external controls are in place.

Example #3

The CPORT development sample was comprised of two hundred sixty-six adult male offenders who had suffered child pornography convictions (associated with charges of: possession – 90 percent of the sample – accessing, distribution, or production) in Canada. These subjects were followed in the community for a fixed period of five years' post-offense. One-fifth of the sample, additionally, had either previous convictions or current charges associated with 'hands-on' sexual contact with a child. Information was obtained by review of police files, and recidivism was defined by the existence of new criminal charges. The sample as a whole demonstrated the following recidivism rates: (1) Any kind of offense: 29%; (2) New Sexual Offense: 11%; (3) New Contact Sexual Offense Against a Child: 3%; (4) New Child Pornography Offense: 9%

Seven CPORT items were identified that discriminated subjects that reoffended from those that did not: (1) Age under 35 at the time of index offense investigation; (2) Any prior criminal history; (3) Any failure on conditional release; (4) Any history of contact sexual offending; (5) Indications of pedophilic or hebephilic sexual interests; (6) More boy than girl child pornography content; (7) More boy than girl content in 'nude/other child' material. Mean CPORT score for the development sample was 1.94; the predictive accuracies for both 'any' sexual recidivism (AUC = .74) and child pornography recidivism (AUC = .76).

Mr. W's score of 1 on CPORT is below the mean of the development sample (1.94). While a caution is provided by the authors in regard to using the instrument in a purely actuarial fashion, due to an absence of validation studies, subjects from the development sample who scored similarly to the defendant achieved a predicted sexual recidivism rate, over a five-year time period, of 4.5 percent. This is, obviously, commensurate with the statement that approximately 95 percent of the offenders most closely matching the particulars of this case did not go on to commit a new sexual crime within a five-year period. An additional caveat: While CPORT predicted sexual recidivism among the entire sample, it did not do so among subjects without other criminal history. In a 13 March 2017 personal communication, however, Michael Seto, Ph.D., one of the instrument's developers, argued for the use of the CPORT with 'CP-only' offenders, on the basis that these subjects were part of the larger subject pool, with which the instrument was found to be valid. If we agree with Dr. Seto's logic, we can then presume that Mr. W's score is an accurate means of encapsulating his risk. If one were to disagree, however, we can 'fall back' upon the base rate of sexual recidivism among the entire CPORT sample, of 12 percent. If, finally, we chose to combine both methods –and this is perhaps best – we would say that between 88 and 95 percent of the child pornography offenders with whom the defendant most closely matches did not commit a new sexual crime, over a follow-up period of five years.