Psychology, Public Policy and Law (in press, 2025, November)

How Public Registries Obscure Sexual Recidivism Risk: Evidence from State Administrative Data

R. Karl Hanson,[1,2] German Marquez Alcala[3] & J.J. Prescott[3]

[1] Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada

[2] SAARNA: The Society for the Advancement of Actuarial Risk Needs Assessment

[3] University of Michigan Law School

Author note

R. Karl Hanson, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0920-884X

German Marquez Alcala, https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2962-3651

J.J. Prescott, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5483-3516

The empirical findings of the current article are the same as those reported in the report of Marquez Alcala et al. (2023) that was submitted as evidence in *Does III v Whitmer*. The submitted report is available from the Michigan ACLU (https://www.aclumich.org/sites/default/files/field_documents/123-6_exhibit_4_-_expert_report_on_class_data.pdf) and the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/j6h59).

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to R. Karl Hanson, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Loeb Building, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6, Canada. rhanson@cunet.carleton.ca

Author Contribution Statement

Conceptualization: JJP, RKH; Data curation: GMA; Formal analysis: GMA, RKH; Funding acquisition: N/A; Investigation: N/A; Methodology: RKH, GMA; Project administration: JJP, RKH; Resources: N/A; Software: GMA, RKH; Supervision: JJP; Validation: RKH, GMA; Visualization: GMA, RKH; Writing—original draft: RKH, GMA, JJP; Writing—review and editing: RKH, JJP, GMA.

Abstract

Public sex offender registries were created on the assumption that people with a history of sexual offending present a high and enduring risk for sexual recidivism. Analyzing data from everyone on Michigan's sex offender registry (n = 45,145), we found that recidivism risk was very low for many registrants—and predictably declined in systematic ways that are relevant to registry design. The sexual recidivism rates were 3% to 5% after five years and 10% after 20 years. Risk of future offending predictably declined the longer people remained sex-offense free in the community. Assuming a typical distribution of initial risk levels and the observed time free in the community, the likelihood of sexual recidivism was very low for approximately half of the registrants: out of 35,000 registrants in the community in Michigan, the risk level for 17,000 to 19,000 individuals was no different from the likelihood of first-time sexual offending in the general male population (< 2% lifetime). Michigan's registry provides no means for the public to differentiate between the *noise* presented by the large number of very low-risk individuals and the *signal* representing the minority of registrants who may be genuinely high-risk. Major reforms are needed if public sex offender registries have any potential for advancing community safety. However, instead of placing our hopes in large, passive, and stigmatizing registries, we are more likely to reduce sexual recidivism by investing in individualized supervision, treatment, and other support for people at high risk for sexual recidivism.

Keywords: Sex Offender Registries, Sexual Recidivism, Community Notification, Registry Reform, Desistance, Michigan

How Public Registries Obscure Sexual Recidivism Risk: Evidence from State Administrative Data

Sexual crimes are all too common in the U.S. (Finkelhor et al., 2024; Tapp & Coen, 2024) and elsewhere (Barth et al., 2013; World Health Organization, 2021). Sexual victimization causes serious harm and is associated with significant and long-lasting negative outcomes for victims (Maniglio, 2009). For almost 100 years, criminal justice policymakers in Canada and the U.S. have considered people who have committed sexual offenses to be different from other people with a history of criminal behavior (e.g., the Sexual Psychopath laws of the 1930s and 1940s; Lussier et al., 2023; Petrunik, 2003), a trend that has intensified in recent decades. Since the 1990s, many countries have enacted a diverse suite of civic public protection measures that uniquely apply to people convicted of sexual crimes (e.g., community notification, registration, and residency restrictions). Policymakers have justified and continue to justify these measures on the assumption that the rate of sexual recidivism among people with a history of sexual crime is "frightening and high" (Ellman & Ellman, 2015).

The current study examines one such policy measure: public sex offender registries as a form of community notification. Inspired by U.S. legislation, countries established public sex offender registries to promote public safety in response to notorious cases of sexual violence and murder by individuals with prior sexual crime convictions. Support for public registries in the U.S. skyrocketed following the murder of Megan Kanka in 1994, a tragedy that led to the enactment of the federal Megan's Law in 1996 (Zgoba et al., 2018). This law followed the Jacob Wetterling Act of 1994, which mandated private, law enforcement-oriented registries (Zgoba et al., 2018). Federal law now requires community notification of registrants sentenced for federal

sex crimes and encourages nationwide adoption of state-level public sex offender registries (Logan, 2021).

Currently, all U.S. states host public-facing online registries that allow anyone to search for individuals by name, location, or other identifying criteria (Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d. [Dru Sjodin]). By contrast, Canada's Sex Offender Information Registration Act (SOIRA) limits access to law enforcement agencies (Jung et al., 2018). U.S. sex offender registries typically share common features (guided by federal guidelines), although the specifics range by jurisdiction and most states do not fully comply with federal funding conditions (Harris & Walfield, 2021; Zgoba & Mitchell, 2023). States also differ in how they categorize registrants and in the frequency with which they update their registries (Drake et al., 2021; Flattery et al., 2022). State sex offender registries vary widely in terms of public access, case classification, and registration requirements (Agan, 2011; Flattery et al., 2022; Harris et al., 2014; Harris et al., 2017; Prescott & Rockoff, 2011). Differences include the types of offenses that require registration, the duration of registration requirements, and the frequency of reporting (Flattery et al., 2022; Harris et al., 2017; Levenson et al., 2016). Additionally, states diverge on whether their registries include juveniles, allow for registry removal, or implement risk assessment tools (Fix et al., 2021; Levenson et al., 2016; Tabachnick & Klein, 2011).

Most states sort registrants into categories, or tiers, based on offense severity or perceived risk of sexual reoffending (Ackerman, 2021; Ackerman et al., 2011). Although these categorizations vary across states, they follow similar principles (Logan, 2021). Many states, including Michigan (the focus of the current study), group registrants solely on the basis of a list of qualifying criminal offenses, aligning tiers with the offense's statutory definition and severity (Furtaw, 2022; Sex Offenders Registration Act, 1994). For example, individuals who have been

convicted of offenses considered violent or convicted of more than one sexual crime are automatically placed in higher tiers (Ackerman et al., 2011; Flattery et al., 2022). Fewer than a third of states use some kind of formal risk assessment tool or an individualized evaluation to determine a registrant's likelihood of sexual reoffending (Tabachnick & Klein, 2011). These assessments may consider factors like age, psychological evaluations, past offenses, and compliance with court orders (Baldwin, 2015).

Although, on average, people with a history of sexual offending are higher risk than the general population, this general tendency will not hold for many registrants. The observed sexual recidivism rates for people with a history of sexual offending are typically in the range of 5% to 15% after five years (Harris & Hanson, 2004; Helmus et al., 2012; Lussier et al., 2023). This is higher than the rate of first-time sexual offending among people released from prison without a history of sexual crime (Alper & Durose, 2019). Whether this rate is "frightening and high," however, is not an objective, scientific question: opinions vary. The very mention of "sex offender" immediately evokes images of stranger danger, child abduction, and sexual murder by depraved predators. For many people, the concept of a "low-risk sex offender" is an oxymoron. Every single instance of new sexual offending by an individual with a prior sexual offense conviction is perceived as a preventable tragedy. Knighton et al. (2014) found that 82% of jurors considered a 15% chance of sexual recidivism to be sufficiently high to justify lifelong civil commitment. More telling, 54% of jurors regarded a 1% likelihood of recidivism to meet that threshold. Such findings demonstrate the challenges faced by those developing public-protection policies for people with a history of sexual crime.

It is not feasible to set a 1% sexual dangerousness threshold for the application of post-conviction/release policies. A 1% likelihood is lower than the rate of first-time sexual offending

among very large classes of people whom virtually no one believes should be subject to public sex offender registration, including people convicted of nonsexual crimes (about 2% after five years; Alper & Durose, 2019; Kahn et al., 2017). A 1%-likelihood threshold is even lower than the rate of sexual offending in the general male population (about 2% lifetime; Lee et al., 2023; Marshall, 1997). By contrast, some people with sexual offense convictions are very low risk for sexual recidivism even at the time of sentencing (Lee & Hanson, 2021). Furthermore, the proportion of very low risk individuals increases with age and years offense free in the community (Hanson et al., 2018). Within five to 10 years of release, many people with sexual offense convictions present sexual offending risk levels comparable to those without any history of sexual offending.

People with older or dated criminal histories are often low risk because criminal activity declines with age after early adulthood. Scholars have understood this since the advent of social statistics in the 1830s (see Hacking [1990] and Laws and Ward [2011] for summaries of the classic works of Adolphe Quetelet and others). As people age, they are much less likely to commit any type of crime (sexual or otherwise), even those individuals who were persistent, serious offenders as young adults (Sampson & Laub, 2017). The rate of criminal behavior is low after age 50, and it is very low after age 60 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d. [Crime, 2016]; Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1983). The pattern exists in officially recorded crime data (e.g., arrests, convictions) as well as in self-reported crime data (Rowe & Tittle, 1977). This tendency for criminal activity to decline with age is evident in cross-sectional as well as longitudinal studies (Farrington, 2018; Sampson & Laub, 2017).

The rate of sexual offending similarly diminishes with age, both with respect to the onset of first-time sexual offending in the general population (Lee et al., 2023) and sexual recidivism

among men with a history of sexual offending (Hanson, 2002; Helmus et al., 2012; Lussier & Healey, 2009; Prentky & Lee, 2007). Although there are some exceptions (e.g., Rettenberger et al., 2015), most studies find a linear decline in the rate of sexual recidivism across the lifespan. The rate of decline for sexual crime, however, appears to be slower than for nonsexual crime. Consequently, although sexual crimes account for a small proportion of total arrests, sexual offending is relatively more common among older people (1.5% at age 60+) than among younger people (0.7% under age 60; Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d. [Crime, 2016]). There is a sharp drop in the rate of sexual recidivism after age 60 (Helmus et al., 2012), which interestingly corresponds to a period of rapid aging of organs and other bodily health systems (Lehallier et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2024). In addition to declining health, other factors that may further reduce sexual recidivism risk include lower sexual motivation, fewer opportunities to offend, and greater prosocial adjustment (Hanson, 2002).

A related protective factor is the amount of time that has elapsed since a person's last involvement with the criminal justice system. The highest risk period immediately follows conviction or release, after which recidivism risk progressively declines. For most people with a prior conviction (sexual or nonsexual), the likelihood of any recidivism decreases until it is indistinguishable from the ambient baseline offending rate in the general population. Such very low likelihoods for general (any) recidivism have been used by criminologists as a statistical definition of desistance (Blumstein & Nakamura, 2009; DeWitt et al., 2017; Bushway et al., 2022). Time-free effects are widely recognized in existing criminal justice policies, as evidenced by expungements, pardons, sealed records, spent records (Australia), and record suspensions (Canada). Typically, the waiting periods before record relief are between five and 10 years for

adult convictions, which roughly aligns with the time to desistance for people with nonsexual convictions who remain offense free in the community (Hanson, 2018).

One complicating factor is that time-to-desistance varies based on the individual's criminogenic propensity at time of release. High-risk cases take longer to drop below the desistance threshold than low-risk cases. Most pardon systems make some distinctions based on offense seriousness; however, offense seriousness is only one of many factors to consider and, by itself, is unlikely to provide an accurate assessment of a person's overall risk for criminal recidivism. Some studies have developed statistical models for general recidivism risk that account for time spent offense free along with other risk and protective factors at time of release (Bushway et al., 2022; Frisch-Scott & Nakamura, 2022). Although these models are plausible, we are unaware of any statistical model for general recidivism risk that integrates time spent offense free currently in use in real-world decision-making. In practice, the decisions informed by nonsexual criminal histories most often concern employment-related background checks rather than the application of registration or public notification requirements.

Just as the risk for general recidivism declines the longer people remain offense free in the community, so too does the risk for sexual recidivism (Amirault & Lussier, 2011; Hanson et al., 2018; Harris & Hanson, 2004; Moore, 2021). On average, the initial risk for sexual recidivism is cut in half for every five years that a person could offend and does not (Hanson et al., 2014; Moore, 2021). After being sexual offense free for 20 years, the remaining risk is vanishingly small (Hanson et al., 2018; Hanson et al., 2024; Holliday et al., 2022). Hanson et al. (2018) introduced two statistical models that combine initial risk with time sexual offense free in the community: one for people with no new criminal convictions (Model 5) and one for people with any nonsexual criminal convictions (Model 6) after release following conviction for the

individual's index (most recent) sexual offense. Based on these models, many people with a sexual offense history would be below the desistance threshold after a few years in the community, most would be after 10 to 15 years, and all would be after 20 years.

To facilitate applied use, Hanson et al. (2018) also provided a figure that displayed standardized risk levels (Hanson et al., 2017) based on Static-99R scores and the number of years sexual offense free in the community (Model 5). Although useful at the time, Hanson et al.'s (2018) figure had a short shelf life. The risk levels in their figure were based on the 2016 recidivism rate norms (Phenix et al., 2016), which were superseded by updated norms in 2021 (Lee & Hanson, 2021; Helmus et al., 2021). Using their figure also required Static-99R scores, whereas the time-free effects were intended to be completely general and independent from whatever methods were used to estimate initial risk. A further limitation of Hanson et al. (2018) was that the standardized risk levels did not directly address cases involving nonsexual recidivism (i.e., Model 6). Although statistically minded evaluators could use the original equations to make these calculations, the necessity of such calculations presented a high barrier to use. Moreover, even for evaluators fluent in logistic regression analysis, the use of multi-step equations increases the likelihood of calculation errors.

In response to the limitations of Hanson et al.'s (2018) equations, Thornton and colleagues (2021) automated the time-free calculations in a more user-friendly way. Thorton et al.'s method allows evaluators to estimate current residual risk for sexual recidivism based on initial risk (assessed using any method), time sexual offense free in the community, and whether the individual had a record of nonsexual recidivism. These time-free adjustments are currently being used in individualized risk assessments for people with a sexual offense history. As of

October 2025, the most recent version of the Time-Free Calculator (May 2024) had been downloaded over 3,000 times (https://saarna.org/research).

Few U.S. states, however, consider the amount of time offense free in the community to be a mitigating factor. Oregon recently came close. In 2024, the Oregon Court of Appeals held that the state's sex-offender classification statute required officials to assess *present* risk and therefore invalidated Board rules that barred consideration of offense-free time (see *Thomsen v. Board of Parole & Post-Prison Supervision*, 333 Or App 703 [2024]); however, in 2025, Oregon's legislature responded by amending the law to permit classification methods that consider only a registrant's risk of reoffending at the time of release, sentencing, or discharge. The Board's 2025 rules implement that approach by directing agencies to assess risk as it was at release and not to consider time offense free, abandoning Oregon's short-lived openness to considering evidence of desistence to assess risk dynamically.

If sexual offending declines with age and the number of years a person is crime free in the community, then existing sex offender registries using what are currently typical registration duration periods will almost necessarily contain many people who are at very low risk for sexual offending. In particular, the group of registrants required to register for life would disproportionately consist of people over age 60 who have been offense free for more than 20 years. As the era of registries continues, and assuming no significant change in crime patterns, the fraction of registrants who are older than 60 will only grow. To our knowledge, however, there has been no previous analysis of the proportion of people on sex offender registries who pose a very low risk for sexual offending. More broadly, relatively little is known about the general characteristics of the people on state registries.

The Current Study

The current study took advantage of a rare opportunity for full access to state registry data from Michigan to provide a descriptive overview of the people on registries, with a particular focus on the extent to which registrants were higher risk for sexual recidivism than people not subject to the registry. To estimate sexual recidivism risk, we used a) current age, b) the number of years sexual offense free in the community, and c) the distribution of initial risk levels. We also examined the extent to which the state's tiers were related to sexual recidivism risk by comparing tier placement with the risk levels estimated by Static-99R, an empirically validated actuarial risk tool (Helmus et al., 2023). The opportunity for this study arose in the context of ongoing litigation challenging the legality of Michigan's public sex offender registry (*Does III v. Whitmer*), in which the authors of the current study serve as expert witnesses for the plaintiffs. As part of this litigation, plaintiffs obtained the full database of people on the registry. We conducted analyses on these data, and our findings were submitted as evidence in the case. Our report formed the basis of the current study.

Method

Transparency and Openness

The data used in this report were provided to plaintiffs' counsel by the Michigan State Police and the Michigan Department of Corrections under court order. Under that order, the data cannot be shared. Permission to republish non-identifying group data was included in the protective order that released the information to the plaintiffs (*Does III v. Whitmer & Gasper*, 2023, §10). The original report as well as Stata and R code are available through the Open Science Framework (Hanson et al., 2025). The code is available only for transparency purposes and cannot be used to reproduce our results because the original data are protected by court order. The study was not preregistered. We used all available data for the questions and concerns

of the current article. Missing data were handled by listwise deletion for each specific analysis. The full report contains additional information relevant to the class action lawsuit (e.g., number of people in the post-2011 subclass, non-Michigan subclass) but not to the current study. University of Michigan's IRB determined this research to be exempt from human subjects review.

Data Sources

The Michigan State Police Sex Offender Registration Unit provided a near-complete census of all 45,145 individuals subject to Michigan's Sex Offender Registration Act (SORA) as of January 24, 2023. These data include publicly available information, such as registrants' identities (e.g., name, date of birth, sex, and race), locations (e.g., incarceration status, home and work addresses, and vehicle descriptions), and registrable sexual offenses (i.e., criminal code numbers/offense names). The information above is available on the registry's online search platform (https://mspsor.com/); however, the information on the platform is not organized or made accessible in a format amenable to statistical analysis. The Michigan State Police data that we received also contain information that is not public, including identifying information about people not on the public registry, the tier assignment of every registrant, out-of-state registration information, and internet usage. The Michigan State Police also shared data on the routine, but complicated, verification requirements registrants must satisfy to maintain compliance with their registration obligations. The state police dataset was supplemented with data from the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC). These MDOC data comprise nonpublic but sparsely populated criminal history data, risk-assessment information, and other information about registrants during periods of incarceration or MDOC supervision.

Measures

Static-99R

Static-99R is an actuarial risk tool for assessing the likelihood of sexual recidivism among adult males (Helmus, Thornton et al., 2012). It has 10 items based on demographic (e.g., age, relationship history) and criminal history (e.g., prior sexual offenses, nonsexual violence, relationship to victims) information. The Static-99R is the most researched and most widely used sexual recidivism risk tool in the world (including routine use in Michigan), with high rater reliability and moderate predictive accuracy (Helmus et al., 2023). Based on total scores, the tool places individuals into one of five risk levels: I – very low risk, II – below average risk, III – average risk, IVa – above average risk, or IVb – well above average risk (Helmus et al., 2021). Static-99R risk-level placements are available in the MDOC dataset for 4,653 registrants who had been incarcerated between June 3, 2016, and March 1, 2023. Compared to the full sample, the subsample with Static-99R scores was somewhat younger (median age of 45 versus 49) and had higher tier placements (86.7% in Tier III versus 73%). These Static-99R scores were collected for administrative purposes, and no rater reliability information is available. The training and qualifications of the scorers is unknown; however, the SAARNA website lists several certified Static-99R trainers located in, or working for, the State of Michigan, who presumably trained many of the scorers involved in these assessments.

Michigan Tiers

Michigan's registry categorizes people with sexual offense convictions into three risk tiers, with Tier I indicating the least serious and Tier III indicating the most serious "menace and danger to the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the people, and particularly the children, of this state" (M.C.L. § 28.721a). For registrants, their tier level stipulates how often, and for how long, they must register. Tiers are based solely on the offense of conviction and prior criminal

history, without any individualized determination of risk (M.C.L. §§ 28.722(q)-(v)) or possible relief through judicial discretion (except in very limited conditions involving consensual acts between teens who are close in age). The statute explicitly lists which criminal convictions compel which tier placement and indicates the consequences of a previous conviction.

People are placed in Tier I for less severe offenses (as defined by statute), such as indecent exposure with fondling, fourth-degree criminal sexual conduct (CSC IV) involving adults, or possession of child sexually abusive material. A Tier I determination requires 15-year registration and yearly reporting (M.C.L. §§ 28.725(11)-(13), 28.725a(3)). Tier II covers more serious offenses, including CSC IV involving minors, producing or distributing child sexually abusive material, or soliciting a minor for sex online. Tier II requires 25-year registration and biannual reporting. Tier III includes the most serious offenses, such as first-degree criminal sexual conduct (CSC I) involving either minors or adults, kidnapping a minor, or repeat sexual offenses of any registrable severity. Tier III requires lifetime registration and quarterly reporting. Tier II and Tier III registrants are automatically listed on Michigan's public sex offender registry. Tier I offenders are only listed under certain circumstances, such as conviction for an offense involving a minor (M.C.L. § 28.728).

Calculating Sexual Recidivism Rates of Registrants

We defined recidivism as a conviction for a new sexual offense committed after the first conviction that led to the individual's placement on the sex offender registry. Multiple sexual crime convictions arising from their first sexual offense prosecution were not counted as recidivism. When a court sentences an individual for more than one conviction on the same day—or within 30 days, based on the assumption that the short temporal separation was more likely due to delays in court processes than to new crimes—we assumed that all crimes occurred

prior to the individual's first sexual offense arrest and conviction. Likewise, convictions after the index sexual offense for behaviors committed prior to the index offense were treated as pseudo-recidivism and not counted as true recidivism (see Phenix et al., 2017, p. 44).

We calculated follow-up time using time in the community (i.e., street time) rather than calendar time (i.e., periods of incarceration are subtracted from at-risk time). Given that registrants are required to report all their addresses and moves, transfers in and out of prison are easily observed in the data. With measures of recidivism and follow-up time, we calculated recidivism rates over specific post-release intervals of time. We report sexual recidivism rates for all individuals on the registry as well as for 5-year cohorts released during the following years: 1995–1999, 2000–2004, 2005–2009, and 2010–2014. For each 5-year cohort, we calculated the sexual recidivism rate at four fixed follow-up periods: 5, 10, 15, and 20 years after registrants' first release date (i.e., the release date after their first conviction for a registrable offense within the 5-year period defining each cohort).

Estimating the Number of Very Low Risk Registrants

We calculated the number of registrants who present a very low risk for sexual recidivism using the method described by Hanson et al. (2018; see also Thornton et al., 2021). We defined very low risk of sexual offending as equivalent to the expected lifetime rate of first-time sexual offending for males in the general population, approximately 2% (Lee et al., 2023). We estimated current recidivism risk for individuals subject to the registry using the following information: a) their risk level at time of release, b) the number of years they were sexual offense free in the community, and c) whether they were convicted for a nonsexual offense after the index sexual offense.

Information on years sexual offense free was available for all individuals; however, individual risk assessments were not always available. Consequently, we assumed that the initial risk distribution of the registry sample was equivalent to the risk distribution of other routine/complete Static-99R normative samples (Hanson et al., 2012). This appears to be a reasonable assumption (see "Static-99R Scores by Tier Level"). Even if their initial risk level was higher than typical, our primary conclusion would still hold: the registry includes thousands of very low-risk individuals (see our conservative estimates in Table 7). Information about nonsexual recidivism was also not reliably recorded in the available data. To set bounds on the estimates, we conducted the analyses in two ways: once assuming a nonsexual recidivism rate of zero and again assuming a nonsexual recidivism rate of 100%. The time free calculations rely on Equation 5 (no nonsexual recidivism) and Equation 6 (any nonsexual recidivism) from Hanson et al. (2018) as implemented in the Time Free Calculator downloaded from the SAARNA website (Thornton et al., 2021). We set the initial recidivism rate estimates using the 2021 Static-99R estimates for routine/complete samples (Lee & Hanson, 2021).

To assemble our estimate for the total number of very low risk cases on Michigan's sex offender registry, we separately calculated the proportion of very low risk individuals for each of the five groups of registrants who had been sexual offense free in the community for at least two, five, 10, 15, and 20 years, respectively. We then converted these proportions to numbers of registrants and summed the five subtotals. The calculations for the 20-year group relied on recidivism rate estimates at 19 years, since the Time Free Calculator artificially sets residual recidivism risk to zero at 20 years and beyond. Using the 19-year estimate provides a conservative benchmark that likely understates the number of very low risk registrants.

Results

Of the 45,145 people subject to Michigan's SORA law on January 24, 2023, 98% lived, worked, or went to school in Michigan or were incarcerated there (In Michigan Group; *n* = 44,154; see Table 1). The adult males in Michigan on the registry represented 1.1% of Michigan's total adult male population (43,100/3,887,282, United States Census Bureau, n.d.). Roughly 20% of the In Michigan Group were incarcerated (Incarcerated Group; *n* = 8,919), and the remaining 80% lived, worked, or attended school in the state (In Community Group; *n* = 25,235). We focus on the In Community Group in this study because our data lack information concerning registrants who had left Michigan at an earlier point and offer no insight regarding the active reoffending risk of those currently incarcerated.

The vast majority of Michigan's registrants in the In Community Group were male (97%), and most were white (75%). Registrants in the community were meaningfully older than Michigan's population overall: the median age for registrants currently in the community was 50 years, compared to 40.5 years in Michigan as a whole (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). Over one-quarter of registrants in the community were 60 years of age or older. Few registrants were under age 18 (only eight out of 45,145); however, a nontrivial number of registrants (2,900 or 6.4% of total) were subject to SORA for a sexual offense they committed prior to their 18th birthday. Finally, the majority of Michigan's registrants living in the community were classified under SORA as Tier III (lifetime registration, 70%) or Tier II (25-year registration, 22%). Only 8% of registrants in our data were classified as Tier I (15-year registration).

Registrants are required to regularly verify and report changes to their employment, housing, and other personal or identifying information. The employment rate for individuals on the registry was 55%. Of the registrants in the In Community Group, roughly three percent were

unhoused at the time the Michigan State Police generated the data, and 9%–11% had been unhoused *at some point* since they first registered under SORA.

Sexual Recidivism Rates

Of the 41,133 registrants currently subject to SORA who have ever returned to the community following their initial registrable offense conviction, about 10% (4,000) had been convicted of at least one subsequent registrable offense. For the In Community Group (i.e., those non-incarcerated registrants in Michigan), the percentage of registrants who had been convicted of a subsequent sexual offense was slightly lower: 7% (2,590). (These figures do not account for time at risk, which varied from a few days to more than 50 years.) The five-year sexual recidivism rates were between 3% and 5%, with lower rates in the more recent cohorts (2.9%; 2010–2014) relative to earlier cohorts (4.9%; 1995–1999). The 10-year rates were between 5.7% and 7.2%, which increased to 9% after 15 years, and to 10% after 20 years (see Table 2). The hazard rates declined for registrants who remained sexual offense free in the community. The likelihood of sexually reoffending between five and 10 years after release was approximately half the rate observed for the period between time of release and five years later (2.2% versus 4.9%), and the rates continued to decline the longer registrants remained sexual offense free (see Table 3).

Static-99R Scores by Tier Level

The distribution of Static-99R scores in the Michigan DOC sample (7%, 19%, 43%, 22%, and 9% for Level I, Level II, Level III, Level IVa, and Level IVb, respectively) was similar to the distribution of Static-99R scores in the norms for routine/complete samples (6%, 18%, 50%, 18%, 8%; Helmus et al., 2021). Michigan had slightly more individuals in the above average categories (Level IVa and IVb, 31% in Michigan versus 26% in the norms), which is consistent

with expectations, given that these individuals were all incarcerated and incarcerated samples are usually higher risk than comparable community samples.

Static-99R scores were inversely related to Michigan Tier Levels (r = –0.19, 95% confidence interval of –0.21 to –0.16, n = 4,648). In other words, people placed in the highest (most serious) tiers were estimated to be less likely to sexually reoffend than people placed in the lower tiers (see Table 4). Specifically, 63% of the people in Tier I were rated as posing above-average risk on the Static-99R, compared to 44% of the people in Tier II, and 28% of the individuals in Tier III. Importantly, Static-99R scores estimate sexual recidivism risk from the time of the index sexual offense; by contrast, a registrant's current risk level is also influenced by the number of years they have lived sexual offense free in the community.

Time Offense Free in the Community

The length of time registrants had been sexual offense free in the community ranged from a few days to 52.5 years (mean = 14.7, SD = 9.3, median = 13.7; n = 35,093). Sixty-three percent (22,262) had been out for 10 years or more, and 31% (10,887) had been out for 20 years or more. A significant proportion of the registrants in the community (16%, 5,724) were placed on the registry in 1995 (when it was created) for sexual offenses dating as far back as the 1970s. The length of time a registrant had been in the community was positively correlated with their tier level (r = 0.286, 95% CI of 0.277 to 0.296, n = 35,010). As can be seen in Table 5, almost all registrants who had been living for 20 or more years in the community were in Tier III (85%, 9,293/10,872), a pattern reflecting their lifetime-registration obligation.

Number of Very Low Risk Registrants

We found that approximately half of the 35,106 registrants in the community were very low risk for sexual recidivism. We estimated the number of very low risk cases from initial risk

levels (using the normative distribution of Static-99R scores), time offense free in the community, any nonsexual recidivism, and a 2% threshold for residual lifetime risk. Assuming that no registrants incurred a subsequent conviction for a new nonsexual offense, the number of very low risk individuals would be 19,994 (57.0%; Table 6). If, instead, we assumed that every registrant had incurred at least one nonsexual conviction, the number of very low risk individuals would be 16,574 (47.2%; Table 7). Consequently, it is reasonable to conclude that there are between 17,000 and 19,000 individuals in the In Community Group who present no more risk for sexual offending than do males in the general population of Michigan. Prudent estimates would be closer to 19,000 than 17,000 because only 15% of registrants in Michigan are returned to prison for a new crime or technical violation (Rydberg et al., 2025). The large number of registrants who were very low risk cannot be attributed to the effectiveness of the registry because the norms and statistical model used to calculate these estimates were almost exclusively drawn from jurisdictions without public notification.

Discussion

Proponents of sex offender registration and notification (SORN) laws argue that the laws reduce recidivism and enhance public safety by tracking people convicted of sexual offenses and informing the public about their whereabouts. The motivating assumption is that people who have been convicted of a sexual offense at any time present a high and enduring risk for sexual recidivism. Using the complete population of Michigan's sex offender registrants, we found that registrant recidivism risk was neither high nor enduring.

Sexual recidivism risk was far lower than commonly assumed. The five-year sexual recidivism rate ranged between 3% and 5%, 7% for 10 years, 9% for 15 years, and 10% for 20 years. These sexual recidivism rates are comparable to the rates observed in other contemporary

U.S. samples (Alper & Durose, 2019; Lussier et al., 2023) and in independent analyses of an overlapping sample from Michigan's registry (6.9% after 15 years; Rydberg et al., 2025). Sexual recidivism rates are also notably smaller than the rate of (largely) nonsexual recidivism by people with nonsexual convictions (84% after nine years; Alper & Durose, 2019). Only a small proportion of people subject to registration were convicted of another sexual offense, even when the follow-up period was decades long. Also consistent with previous research (Lussier et al., 2023), we found that recidivism rates have trended downward over the past 20 years. Although there is no absolute standard for designating recidivism risk as "high," the current rates are lower than they were during the 1980s and 1990s, when SORN regulations were developed and broadly implemented. Importantly, these changes cannot be attributed to the effectiveness of SORN measures because they also occur in states prior to their enactment of SORN laws and in Canada, which never had a public sex offender registry (Lussier et al., 2023).

Sexual recidivism risk also did not endure. Replicating previous findings (Hanson et al., 2014; Moore, 2018), the hazard of sexual recidivism fell the longer registrants remained in the community. The initial five-year hazard was 3% to 5%, which declined to just over 2% during years five through 10, and to just under 2% for years 10 through 15. After 15 years, the residual hazard was approximately 1%. For comparison, the overall rate after living in the community sexual offense free for 10 years was equivalent to the rate of first-time sexual offending for people with a nonsexual conviction but no history of sexual offending (approximately 2% after five years; Alper & Durose, 2019; Kahn et al., 2017). The overall rate after 15 years in the community was even lower, equivalent to the likelihood of first-time sexual offending in the general adult male population (lifetime risk of 2%; Lee et al., 2023).

Given that most people on Michigan's registry have been registered for a very long time, registrants are disproportionately older men who present a very low risk for sexual recidivism. Assuming a typical distribution of initial risk, approximately half of the people currently on the registry would now be no more likely to commit a sexual offense than the general male population. Perhaps a more relevant comparison, a large majority of people on the registry would now be no more likely to commit another sexual offense than people recently released following a nonsexual offense (4% lifetime residual risk). Michigan's sex offender registry is stacked with such very low risk individuals because the mandatory registration periods extend well past when registrants present any significant risk of sexual recidivism.

Sex offender registration and notification schemes are unlikely to influence public safety when they fail to identify people at risk for sexual recidivism. Should a member of the public take action to limit the risk presented by a registrant, not much is likely to change because most registrants already present a negligible risk. Although registries will include a nontrivial number of people at high risk for sexual recidivism, it is almost impossible for the public to differentiate high-risk cases from the much larger pool of low-risk cases. Michigan's Tier III designation is unhelpful and misleading because the label a) covers the vast majority of registrants, b) is *negatively* correlated with actual risk according to an empirically validated assessment tool (Static-99R), and c) includes a disproportionate number of people who have been more than 10 years sexual offense free in the community (68% of all Tier III registrants). These problems are not unique to Michigan (Zgoba et al., 2016). Not surprisingly, sex offender registries do not achieve their intended goals of reducing recidivism or improving law enforcement efficiency (Agan, 2011; Agan & Prescott, 2014; Prescott & Rockoff, 2011; Zgoba & Mitchell, 2023).

Nevertheless, even if policymakers understand that SORN laws do not advance their stated aims, the popular appeal of these measures makes them very attractive to support politically (see, e.g., Sánchez de Ribera et al., 2023). But these laws come at considerable cost. Apart from the obvious costs associated with the administration and enforcement of SORN regimes, they disrupt the lives of innocent family members and even neighbors (Socia, 2021). For registrants, SORN laws create burdens that contribute to housing instability, unemployment, and social isolation, thereby increasing the difficulty of reintegrating as law-abiding citizens (Barnes et al., 2009; Prescott & Rockoff, 2011; Sandler et al., 2008). Registries may also divert the public from addressing the largest source of risk: victimization by people not on the registry. Sexual offenses committed by people with past sexual offense convictions make up fewer than 10% of the total number of sexual crimes (e.g., Sandler et al., 2008). If public registries lead the public into localizing risk to registrants, they may fail to respond appropriately to the more pressing risks presented by (nonregistrant) friends and family (Agan & Prescott, 2014).

Policy Implications

Public sex offender registries, as commonly implemented in the U.S., are a failed public policy experiment. They were based on faulty premises and, with rare exceptions, have not produced discernible improvements in preventing sexual victimization. Nevertheless, there may still be a place for some form of public registry in the public safety toolbox. There are examples of registries in other countries (Auld, 2025) and historical examples of registries in the U.S. (Duwe & Donnay, 2008) that appear to have reduced sexual recidivism. These registries, however, look quite different from the “standard” U.S. registration and notification schemes like the one we examined in this study. On a practical level, given the enduring political appeal of public registries, encouraging reform and redesign may be a more feasible way to reduce harm

and improve safety than pushing for registry abolition outright. There are no guarantees, however, that even an "ideal" public registry would improve public safety (or do less damage). By being attentive to local evaluations and the best available scientific evidence, policymakers are more likely to advance measures that successfully reduce the burden of sexual victimization.

A starting point for registry reform would involve a careful reconsideration of the information disclosed to the public. A smart registry would prioritize signal over noise and take seriously our cognitive limits (Kahneman et al., 2021). We create and attend to curated lists of the best and worst restaurants, clothing brands, and universities because complete lists of all places to eat, shop, or study are overwhelming and unhelpful. So is a public sex offender registry with 40,000 names. Duwe and Donnay's (2008) research in Minnesota suggests that a highly targeted, risk-based notification regime is more likely to be effective at reducing recidivism than broad, inclusive public registries. At a minimum, public notification should exclude individuals whose risk of reoffending is demonstrably lower than that of large groups who have never been convicted of a sexual offense. For high-risk individuals, registries should prioritize information that is most likely to produce the highest return in terms of safety. Too much information undermines usability and hinders effective decision-making. Less is more.

An effective registry would clearly differentiate registrants based on risk, using empirically validated methods that are open to scrutiny and revision. Genuinely high-risk cases would be visually and cognitively salient. Such high-risk designations would be dynamic, and revised based on updated information, such as new nonsexual convictions (increased risk) and the amount of time the person has been sexual offense free in the community (decreased risk). Rather than tens of thousands of cases linked to information that is stale or irrelevant, the public would be selectively directed towards pertinent information (such as current risk level) for a

shortlist of cases of genuine concern. The meaning of risk-level labels would be clearly defined and empirically verifiable (Hanson et al., 2017).

States should also take seriously the accuracy of the information they provide. This requires collecting, updating, and managing that information with rigor. A recent audit of Michigan's sex offender registry identified widespread lapses in policy compliance by the administrators, and many incorrect entries concerning the registrants (Officer of the Auditor General, 2025). For example, the recorded date of conviction was incorrect for an estimated 4,671 cases out of the approximately 44,000 cases on Michigan's registry. Although many of these errors are likely to be inconsequential (e.g., a date that is off by a day or two), widespread and commonplace error indicates lack of care and reduces public trust in the whole scheme. We fully support the auditor's recommendation for better training for administrators and more effective mechanisms for correcting errors. The audit should also remind policymakers that maintaining accurate registry information demands nontrivial investments of time and resources by governmental actors.

Individuals listed on any registry, as well as relevant government agencies, should also have access to a structured process for requesting review when they believe risk designations or other key information are inaccurate or no longer reflect current circumstances. Massachusetts, for example, permits registrants to petition for risk-tier reclassification after a set period of time has elapsed or in light of new evidence (803 CMR § 1.31), an option that other states should consider. A system that signals everyone is dangerous, regardless of actual threat, is not only ineffective—it risks losing credibility with the public.

Better Options for Managing Genuinely High-Risk Cases

As sexual crime prevention policies, public registries are inherently passive. Community members must take the initiative to find and extract information from the registry and then decide what it means and how to respond to it. For the public, registries provide little or no direction about what to do with the information they provide (other than general warnings against vigilantism). For registrants and their families, registries do not even aspire to help publicly listed individuals reintegrate as law-abiding citizens.

Effective, active interventions for individuals assessed as high risk involve psychological and community support combined with social control and supervision. Rather than relying solely on punitive exposure through registries, these interventions aim to reduce recidivism by addressing criminogenic needs and building prosocial supports. Examples include Canada's post-sentence community supervision orders, which are administered by police and tailored to risk and treatment needs (Jung & Kitura, 2022), and the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) common in the UK and Scotland (Lundrigan et al., 2024; National MAPPA Team, 2024a). The New Zealand Register (a nonpublic register) uses an evidence-based human services approach to reduce reoffending by people convicted of sexual crimes against children (Auld, 2025). Another promising approach involves mobilizing trained community volunteers to assist in reintegration, as formalized in Circles of Support and Accountability (COSA) programs (Duwe, 2018). These programs combine support and accountability to help reduce social isolation and build trust, and emerging evidence suggests they are effective in reducing recidivism (Duwe, 2018). There is also growing support for sexual offense-specific psychological treatment for high-risk cases, particularly when therapists have appropriate professional qualifications and training (Gannon et al., 2019; Holper et al., 2024).

Effective recidivism reduction measures share a common structure: they are proactive, individualized, and focused on reducing the factors associated with risk rather than merely signaling that a person is "risky." Unlike public registries, which offer no tools for behavioral change, programs like COSA, MAPPA, and risk-based treatment emphasize engagement, accountability, and reintegration. Although such interventions require training, coordination, and investment, they provide a genuine—not symbolic—path to reducing sexual victimization. When targeting higher-risk cases, these programs can improve outcomes while offsetting costs through reductions in crime, homelessness, and associated health and social burdens (Letourneau et al., 2018, 2023; Marshall & Marshall, 2021). Rather than amplifying fear or relying on outdated conviction data, these models are grounded in empirical assessments of current risk and are responsive to individual circumstances.

Implications for Research

If registries are to work, we need to understand how people use them. Despite widespread public support, research consistently shows that most individuals rarely consult registries unless prompted by a specific event, such as moving or hearing about a local incident (Kernsmith et al., 2009; Lieb & Nunlist, 2008). When they do use them, the outcome is often limited to increased awareness or emotional reassurance rather than concrete protective action (Anderson & Sample, 2008; Duwe, 2018). Moreover, studies reveal that public comprehension of the information—such as offense severity, risk level, or relevance—is often incomplete, and they indicate that misuse or overreliance on registries can foster a false sense of security or unwarranted fear (Burchfield, 2012; Levenson & Cotter, 2005).

One promising program of research would involve the use of randomization and experimental methods to examine how different registry formats and content affect real-world

behavioral and cognitive responses. Distinct from surveys of attitudes and policy preferences, these studies would examine how people actually react when confronted with registry data. For example, an online experiment could test whether users are better able to identify high-risk individuals or take appropriate precautionary steps when presented with smaller, curated registries compared to long, undifferentiated lists. Similarly, experimental studies could assess whether targeted, contextualized notifications prompt more meaningful safety behavior than generic ones. Once promising formats are identified, they could be implemented and evaluated by tracking how users navigate registry websites, what links they click, and how long they spend reviewing entries. By generating behavioral evidence, such studies would help policymakers refine registry design to improve usability, reduce misinterpretation, and better align the tool with its public safety objectives.

Limitations

One criticism of research showing very low risk of sexual recidivism is that many cases of sexual crime go undetected (e.g., Scurich & John, 2019, 2025). Although there is consensus that observed rates will underestimate actual rates, experts disagree on the rate of undetected offending (Abbott, 2020; Lave et al., 2021). This debate largely focuses on the validity of conceptual models because direct empirical evidence capable of addressing the question is difficult to obtain (for exceptions, see Kelley et al., 2023, 2024). Our conclusions about the number of very low risk registrants are based on comparisons with the offending behavior of people not subject to registration (e.g., people with nonsexual offenses, adult male population), however, and these comparisons do not depend on resolving debates about detection rates. If the observed rates are the same, and the detection rates are the same, then the actual rates are the same. There is no reason to believe that detection rates would be lower—and some evidence that

detection rates are higher—for people with a previous sexual offense conviction relative to individuals without a record of committing a sexual offense (Kelley et al., 2023).

Our analysis was based on data limited to Michigan and as recorded in the state's sex offender registry. We had no information about individuals who had been removed from the registry because of death or deportation. We may have missed incidents of sexual offending in other states by Michigan registrants. Although state police services aspire to share arrest and conviction information with relevant jurisdictions, the timeliness and accuracy of such information sharing are unknown. Another concern is that the sexual recidivism rates of the earliest cohorts may have been artificially high because recidivists are more likely to remain on the registry than nonrecidivists (Hanson & Nicholaichuk, 2000). Our work was also limited by the lack of reliable information about registrants' nonsexual criminal history, which reduced the precision of our estimates of the number of very low risk cases.

Finally, we must acknowledge that we created the original report in the context of litigation, for which we were retained as plaintiffs' experts. Although we aspired to be accurate and balanced in our expert testimony (and in this paper), allegiance effects in expert testimony are common (Murrie & Boccaccini, 2015) and may have inadvertently shaped our analysis and presentation of the data.

Conclusion

Sexual victimization is a significant problem, and we should pursue policies that fairly and effectively protect the public from people who are truly dangerous. There is no evidence, however, that current public sex offender registries contribute to community safety. One reason they do not work as intended is that they fail to identify people at an elevated risk of sexual offending. Although some people with a sexual offending history present a significant risk for

sexual recidivism, registries contain many, perhaps mostly, very low risk individuals because registration periods are very long. Furthermore, the public likely cannot differentiate high-risk from very low-risk cases using registry information (e.g., vague descriptions of crimes, such as "Criminal Sexual Conduct III"). If registries have any hope of contributing to community safety, we need dedicated programs of research that carefully consider the types of individuals and information to include on registries and how this information could be effectively communicated to the public. In the meantime, those concerned with reducing the risk of sexual recidivism should privilege active interventions that address criminogenic needs and policies that promote the orderly reintegration of registrants as law-abiding members of prosocial communities.

References

Abbott, B. R. (2020). Illuminating the dark figure of sexual recidivism. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 38*(6), 543-558. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2494

Ackerman, A. R. (2021). Registries and registrants: Research on the composition of registries. In W. A. Logan & J. J. Prescott (Eds.), *Sex offender registration and community notification laws: An empirical evaluation* (pp. 35–47). Cambridge University Press.

Ackerman, A. R., Harris, A. J., Levenson, J. S., & Zgoba, K. (2011). Who are the people in your neighborhood? A descriptive analysis of individuals on public sex offender registries. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 34*(3), 149–159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2011.04.001

Agan, A. (2011). Sex offender registries: Fear without function? *The Journal of Law & Economics, 54*(1), 207–239. https://doi.org/10.1086/658483

Agan, A. Y., & Prescott, J. J. (2014). Sex offender law and the geography of victimization. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, 11*(4), 786–828. https://doi.org/10.1111/jels.12056

Alper, M., & Durose, M. R. (2019). *Recidivism of sex offenders released from state prison: A 9-year follow-up (2005–14)*. Special Report NCJ 251773. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Amirault, J., & Lussier, P. (2011). Population heterogeneity, state dependence and sexual offender recidivism: The aging process and the lost predictive impact of prior criminal charges over time. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*(4), 344–354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.04.001

Anderson, A. L., & Sample, L. L. (2008). Public awareness and action resulting from sex offender community notification laws. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 19*(4), 371–396. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403408316705

Auld, M. (2025). *An evaluation of a human services approach to registration and community case management for adults who have sexually offended against children*. Doctoral Dissertation. Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.

Baldwin, K. (2015). *Sex offender risk assessment*. Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking, U.S. Department of Justice.

Barnes, J. C., Dukes, T., Tewksbury, R., & De Troye, T. M. (2009). Analyzing the Impact of a Statewide Residence Restriction Law on South Carolina Sex Offenders. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *20*(1), 21–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403408320842

Barth, J., Bermetz, L., Heim, E., Trelle, S., & Tonia, T. (2013). The current prevalence of child sexual abuse worldwide: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Public Health*, *58*, 469–483. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-012-0426-1

Blumstein, A., & Nakamura, K. (2009). Redemption in the presence of widespread criminal background checks. *Criminology, 47*(2), 327–359. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2009.00155.x

Burchfield, K. B. (2012). Assessing community residents' perceptions of local registered sex offenders: Results from a pilot survey. *Deviant Behavior, 33*(3), 241–259. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2011.573396

Bushway, S. D., Vegetabile, B. G., Kalra, N., Remi, L., & Baumann, G. (2022). *Providing another chance: Resetting recidivism risk in criminal background checks.* Rand Corporation.

DeWitt, S. E., Bushway, S. D., Siwach, G., & Kurlychek, M. C. (2017). Redeemed compared to whom? Comparing the distributional properties of arrest risk across populations of provisional employees with and without a criminal record. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *16*(3), 963-997. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12309

Does et al. v Whitmer (Does III). No. 2:22-cv-10209. U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, 2025. Judgment.

Does et al. v. Whitmer & Gasper (Does III). No. 2:22-cv-10209. U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, 2023. Second Amended Stipulated Protective Order.

Drake, B., Sohn, Y., Morrison, M., & Jonson-Reid, M. (2021). In what kinds of communities do people on the sex offender registry live? An analysis of ten states. *Children and Youth Services Review, 127*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106061

Duwe, G. (2018). Can circles of support and accountability (CoSA) significantly reduce sexual recidivism? Results from a randomized controlled trial in Minnesota. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *14*, 463–484. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-018-9325-7

Duwe, G., & Donnay, W. (2008). The impact of Megan's Law on sex offender recidivism: The Minnesota experience. *Criminology*, *46*(2), 411–446. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2008.00114.x

Ellman, I. M., & Ellman, T. (2015). Frightening and high: The Supreme Court's crucial mistake about sex crime statistics. *Constitutional Commentary*, *30*, 495–508. https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/concomm/419

Farrington, D. P. (2018). Developmental criminology. In A. Brisman, E. Carrabine, & N. South (Eds), *The Routledge companion to criminological theory and concepts* (pp. 60–64). Routledge.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (n.d.). *Crime in the United States, Table 20, Arrests by Age, 2016.* https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2016/crime-in-the-u.s.-2016/tables/table-20

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (n.d.). Dru Sjodin sex offender registry website. https://www.fbi.gov/how-we-can-help-you/scams-and-safety/sex-offender-registry.

Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., & Colburn, D. (2024). The prevalence of child sexual abuse with online sexual abuse added. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *149:*106634. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2024.106634

Fix, R. L., Thompson, K. R., Letourneau, E. J., & Burkhart, B. R. (2021). Development and psychometric properties of the concerns about juvenile sex offender registration and notification questionnaire (C-JSORNQ), *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 18*, 397–408. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-020-00468-4

Flattery, M., Zaman, R., & Zakia, H. (2022). Sex offender risk assessment: State-level policies for determining registration and notification requirements. Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking, U.S. Department of Justice.

Frisch-Scott, N. E., & Nakamura, K. (2022). Time for a Change: Examining the Relationships between Recidivism-Free Time, Recidivism Risk, and Risk Assessment. *Justice Quarterly*, *39*(6), 1156–1179. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2021.1957983

Furtaw, A. W. (2022). Sex offender legislation ex post facto: The history and constitutionality of Michigan's sex offenders registration act. *Journal of Legislation, 48*(2), 301–36.

Gannon T. A., Olver M. E., Mallion J. S., James M. (2019). Does specialized psychological treatment for offending reduce recidivism? A meta-analysis examining staff and program variables as predictors of treatment effectiveness. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 73, 101752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2019.101752.

Hacking, I. (1990). *The taming of chance.* Cambridge University Press.

Hanson, R. K. (2018). Long term recidivism studies show that desistance is the norm. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 45*(9), 1340–1436. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854818793382

Hanson, R. K. (2002). Recidivism and Age: Follow-Up Data From 4,673 Sexual Offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17(10), 1046–1062. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605-0201710-02

Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., Helmus, L. M., Thornton, D., & Phenix, A. (2017). Communicating the results of criterion referenced prediction measures: Risk categories for the Static-99R and Static-2002R sexual offender risk assessment tools. *Psychological Assessment, 29*(5), 582–597. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000371

Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2014). High risk sex offenders may not be high risk forever. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(15), 2792–2813. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514526062

Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Letourneau, E., Helmus, L. M., & Thornton, D. (2018). Reductions in risk based on time offense free in the community: Once a sexual offender, not always a sexual offender. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 24*(1), 48–63. https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000135

Hanson, R. K., Lee, S. C., & Thornton, D. (2024). Long term recidivism rates among individuals at high risk to sexually reoffend. *Sexual Abuse, 36*(1), 3–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/10790632221139166

Hanson, R. K., Lloyd, C. D., Helmus, L., & Thornton, D. (2012). Developing non-arbitrary metrics for risk communication: Percentile ranks for the Static-99/R and Static-2002/R sexual offender risk scales. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 11*(1), 9–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2012.667511

Hanson, R. K., Marquez Alcala, G., & Prescott, J. J. (2025, October 31). Michigan SOR. Retrieved from osf.oi/jsh59

Hanson, R. K., & Nicholaichuk, T. (2000). A cautionary note regarding Nicholaichuk et al. (2000). *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 12*(4), 289–293. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009542627754

Harris, A. J., Levenson, J. S., & Ackerman, A. R. (2014). Registered sex offenders in the United States: Behind the numbers. *Crime & Delinquency, 60*(1), 3–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128712443179

Harris, A. J., & Walfield, S. M. (2021). Variations in the structure and operation of SORN systems. In W. A. Logan & J.J. Prescott (Eds.), *Sex offender registration and community notification laws: An empirical evaluation* (pp. 17–34). Cambridge University Press.

Harris, A. J., Walfield, S. M., Lobanov-Rostovsky, C., & Cubellis, M. A. (2017). State implementation of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act: A multidimensional analysis. *Justice Research and Policy, 18*(1), 24–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525107117745645

Harris, A. J. R., & Hanson, R. K. (2004). *Sex offender recidivism: A simple question*. Corrections Users Report No. 2004-03: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada. https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/sx-ffndr-rcdvsm/index-en.aspx

Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., Thornton, D., Babchishin, K. M., & Harris, A. J. R. (2012). Absolute recidivism rates predicted by Static-99R and Static-2002R sex offender risk assessment tools vary across samples: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 39*(9), 1148–1171. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812443648

Helmus, L. M., Kelley, S. M., Frazier, A., Fernandez, Y. M., Lee, S. C., Rettenberger, M., & Boccaccini, M. T. (2023). Static-99R: Strengths, limitations, predictive accuracy meta-analysis, and legal admissibility review. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 28*(3), 307–331. https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000351

Helmus, L. M., Lee, S. C., Phenix, A., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2021). *Static-99R & Static-2002R evaluators' workbook*. SAARNA: The Society for the Advancement of Actuarial Risk Need Assessment. www.saarna.org

Helmus, L., Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., & Babchishin, K. M. (2012). Improving the predictive accuracy of Static-99 and Static-2002 with older sex offenders: Revised age weights. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 24*(1), 64–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063211409951

Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. American Journal of Sociology, *89*(3), 552–584. https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/227905

Holliday, S. B., Sreenivasan, S., Walker, S. C., Jordan, V., Azizian, A., & Garrick, T. (2022). Longitudinal patterns of sexual recidivism by age over a 25-year follow-up in

California. *Sexual Offending: Theory, Research, and Prevention*, *17*, Article e3667, https://doi.org/10.5964/sotrap.3667

Holper, L., Mokros, A., & Habermeyer, E. (2024). Moderators of sexual recidivism as indicator of treatment effectiveness in persons with sexual offense histories: an updated meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse*, *36*(3), 255–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/10790632231159071

Jung, S., Allison, M., & Martin, E. (2018). Perspectives of Americans and Canadians on the use and function of sex offender registries, *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 52*, 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcj.2017.10.003

Jung, S., & Kitura, G. (2022). Offenders on judicial orders: Implications for evidence-based risk management in policing. *Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being*, *7*(1), 32–39. https://doi.org/10.35502/jcswb.222

Kahn, R. E., Ambroziak, G., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2017). Release from the sex offender label. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 46*(4), 861–864. https://doi.org/10.1007/x10508-017-0972-y

Kahneman, D., Sibony, O., & Sunstein, C. R. (2021). *Noise: A flaw in human judgment.* Little, Brown, Spark.

Kelley, S. M., Kahn, R. E., Mundt, J. C., & Barahal, R. M. (2023). Do sanctions affect undetected sexual offending? *Sexual Abuse*, *35*(5), 624–648. https://doi.org/10.1177/10790632221139178

Kelley, S. M., Kahn, R. E., & Zaw, G. (2024). The influence of race on detected and undetected sexual offense histories: A comparison of white and black men committed as sexually violent persons. *Sexual Abuse*, *36*(8), 875–900. https://doi.org/10.1177/10790632241268472

Knighton, J. C., Murrie, D. C., Boccaccini, M. T., & Turner, D. B. (2014). How likely is "likely to reoffend" in sex offender civil commitment trials?. *Law and Human Behavior*, *38*(3), 293–304. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000079

Kernsmith, P., Craun, S. W., & Foster, J. (2009). The relationship between sex offender registry utilization and awareness. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 21*(2), 181–193. https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063209332235

Lave, T. R., Prescott, J. J., & Bridges, G. (2021). The problem with assumptions: Revisiting "The dark figure of sexual recidivism". *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 39*(3), 279–306. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2508

Laws, D. R., & Ward, T. (2011). *Desistance from sex offending: Alternatives to throwing away the keys.* Guilford.

Lee, S. C., Brankley, A. E., & Hanson, R. K. (2023). There is no such thing as zero risk for sexual offending. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 65*(3), 1–31. https://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cjccj-2022-0025

Lee, S. C., & Hanson, R. K. (2021). Updated 5-year and new 10-year sexual recidivism rate norms for Static-99R with routine/complete samples. *Law and Human Behavior, 45*(1), 24–38. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000436

Lehallier, B., Gate, D., Schaum, N., Nanasi, T., Lee, S. E., Yousef, H., Losada, P. M., Berdnik, D., Keller, A., Verghese, J., Sathyan, S., Franceschi, C., Milman, S., Barzilai, N., & Wyss-Coray, T. (2019). Undulating changes in human plasma proteome profiles across the lifespan. *Nature Medicine*, *25*(12), 1843–1850. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0673-2

Letourneau, E. J., Brown, D. S., Fang, X., Hassan, A., & Mercy, J. A. (2018). The economic burden of child sexual abuse in the United States. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *79*, 413–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.02.020

Letourneau, E. J., Roberts, T. W., Malone, L., & Sun, Y. (2023). No check we won't write: A report on the high cost of sex offender incarceration. *Sexual Abuse*, *35*(1), 54–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/10790632221078305

Levenson, J. S., & Cotter, L. P. (2005). The impact of sex offender residence restrictions: 1,000 feet from danger or one step from absurd? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 49*(2), 168–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X04271304

Levenson, J. S., Grady, M. D., & Leibowitz G. (2016). Grand challenges: Social justice and the need for evidence-based sex offender registry reform, *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 43*(2), 3–38. https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.4009

Lieb, R., & Nunlist, C. (2008). *Community notification as viewed by Washington's citizens: A ten-year follow-up*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Logan, W. A. (2021). Origins and evolution. In W. A. Logan & J. J. Prescott (Eds.), *Sex offender registration and community notification laws: An empirical evaluation* (pp. 1–16). Cambridge.

Lundrigan, S., Mann, N., Specht, D., & Kamitz, L. C. (2024). A proven reoffending study of individuals managed under the multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) in England and Wales. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*, 1371023. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1371023

Lussier, P., & Healey, J. (2009). Rediscovering Quetelet, again: The "aging" offender and the prediction of reoffending in a sample of adult sex offenders. *Justice Quarterly, 26*(4), 827–856. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07418820802593360

Lussier, P., McCuish, E., & Jeglic, E. L. (2023). Against all odds: The unexplained sexual recidivism drop in the United States and Canada. *Crime and Justice*, *52*(1), 125–196. https://doi.org/10.1086/727028125

Maniglio, R. (2009). The impact of child sexual abuse on health: a systematic review of reviews. *Clinical Psychology Review, 29*(7)*,* 647–657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.08.003

Marquez Alcala, G., Prescott, J. J., & Hanson, R. K. (2023). Amended report of German Marquez Alcala, James J. Prescott and R. Karl Hanson Re: Class data in *Does III v. Whitmer.* https://www.aclumich.org/en/what-you-need-know-about-does-iii

Marshall, P. (1997). *The prevalence of convictions for sexual offending.* UK Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate.

Marshall, W. L., & Marshall, L. E. (2021). A cost–benefit analysis of a treatment program for adult males who have offended sexually. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *27*(3), 313–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2021.1934133

Moore, L. (2018). *Static risk assessment of sexual offenders in New Zealand: Predictive accuracy, classification of risk, and the moderating effect of time offense-free in the community*. Doctoral Dissertation, Psychology, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ.

Murrie, D. C., & Boccaccini, M. T. (2015). Adversarial allegiance among expert witnesses. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *11*(1), 37–55. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-120814-121714

National MAPPA Team. (2024a). MAPPA Guidance. Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/multi-agency-public-protection-arrangements-mappa-guidance

Office of the Auditor General. (2025). *Michigan sex offender registries: Michigan Department of State Police.* State of Michigan Auditor General.

Petrunik, M. G. (2003). The hare and the tortoise: Dangerousness and sex offender policy in the United States and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 45*(1), 43–72. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.45.1.43

Phenix, A., Fernandez, Y., Harris, A. J. R., Helmus, M., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2017). *Static-99R Coding Rules Revised-2016* (Research Report 2017-R012). Public Safety Canada. https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/sttc-2016/index-en.aspx

Phenix, A., Helmus, L. M., & Hanson, R. K. (2016). *Static-99R and Static-2002R evaluators' workbook*. SAARNA: The Society for the Advancement of Actuarial Risk Need Assessment. www.saarna.org

Prentky, R. A., & Lee, A. F. S. (2007). Effect of age-at-release on long-term sexual reoffense rates in civilly committed sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 19*(1), 43–59. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177%2F107906320701900105

Prescott, J. J., & Rockoff, J. E. (2011). Do sex offender registration and notification laws affect criminal behavior? *The Journal of Law and Economics*, *54*(1), 161–206. https://doi.org/10.1086/658485

Rettenberger, M., Briken, P., Turner, D., & Eher, R. (2015). Sexual offender recidivism among a population-based prison sample. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and*

Comparative Criminology, 59(4), 424–444. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13516732

Rowe, A. R., & Tittle, C. R. (1977). Life cycle changes and criminal propensity. *Sociological Quarterly*, *18*(2), 223–236. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1977.tb01409.x

Rydberg, J., Cole, K., Reilly, M., & Mcgarrell, E. F. (2025). Describing the hazard of recidivism among individuals convicted of sex-related offenses: Results from a long-term follow-up in Michigan. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 52*(9), 1323–1343. https://dx.doi.org/10.11770093548251336788

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2017). Life-course desisters? Trajectories of crime among delinquent boys followed to age 70. In P. Mazerolle (Ed.), *Developmental and life-course criminological theories* (pp. 37–74). Routledge.

Sánchez de Ribera, O., Christensen, L. S., Trajtenberg, N., & Hudson, K. (2023). Public perceptions toward community management policies for individuals convicted of sexual offenses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 25*(2), 1248–1264. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380231174695

Sandler, J. C., Freeman, N. J., & Socia, K. M. (2008). Does a watched pot boil? A time-series analysis of New York State's sex offender registration and notification law. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, *14*(4), 284–302. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013881

Scurich, N., & John, R. S. (2019). The dark figure of sexual recidivism. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 37*(2), 158–175. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2400

Scurich, N., & John, R. S. (2025). Relative impact of underreporting and desistance on the dark figure of sexual recidivism. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2715

Sex Offenders Registration Act, Mich. Comp. Laws § 28.722 (1994 & Supp. 2024). https://www.legislature.mi.gov/Laws/MCL?objectName=MCL-28-722.

Shen, X., Wang, C., Zhou, X., Zhou, W., Hornburg, D., Wu, S., & Snyder, M. P. (2024). Nonlinear dynamics of multi-omics profiles during human aging. *Nature Aging*, *4*, 1619–1624. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43587-024-00692-2

Socia, K. M. (2021). The ancillary consequences of SORN. In W. A. Logan & J. J. Prescott (Eds.), *Sex offender registration and community notification laws: An empirical evaluation* (pp. 78–101). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108328425.007

Tabachnick, J., & Klein, A. (2011). A reasoned approach: Reshaping sex offender policy to prevent child sexual abuse. Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, https://members.atsa.com/ap/CloudFile/Download/P1VYOXyL.

Tapp, S. N., & Coen, E. J. (2024). *Criminal Victimization, 2023*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/criminal-victimization-2023

Thomsen v. Board of Parole, 554 P.3d 308 (Or. Ct. App) rev den, 373 Or. 81 (2024).

Thornton, D., Hanson, R. K., Kelley, S. M., & Mundt, J. C. (2021). Estimating lifetime and residual risk for individuals who remain sexual offense free in the community: Practical applications. *Sexual Abuse, 33*(1), 3–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063219871573

United States Census Bureau. (n.d.). Populations and people: Michigan. https://data.census.gov/profile/Michigan?g=040XX00US26#populations-and-people.

World Health Organization. (2021). *Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018: Global, regional and national prevalence estimates for intimate partner violence against*

women and global and regional prevalence estimates for non-partner sexual violence against women. Author. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240022256

Zgoba, K. M., Jennings, W. G., & Salerno, L. M. (2018). Megan's Law 20 years later: An empirical analysis and policy review. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 45*(7), 1028–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854818771409

Zgoba, K. M., Miner, M., Levenson, J., Knight, R., Letourneau, E., & Thornton, D. (2016). The Adam Walsh Act: An examination of sex offender risk classification systems. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(8), 741–754. https://doi.org/10.1177/107906321556943.

Zgoba, K. M. & Mitchell, M. M. (2023). The effectiveness of sex offender registration and notification: A meta-analysis of 25 years of findings. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 19*, 71–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-021-09480-z

Table 1

Demographic Summary of Michigan's Sex Offender Registry.

		In Michigan Group							
		In Community *N = 35,235*		Incarcerated *N = 8,919*		Out of State *N = 991*		Total Registrants *N = 45,145*	
		N	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*	*%*
Gender	Male	34,285	97.3	8,822	98.9	969	97.8	44,076	97.6
	Female	945	2.7	97	1.1	21	2.1	1,063	2.4
Race/ Ethnicity	White	26,416	75.0	5,489	61.5	677	68.3	32,582	72.2
	Black/African-American	7,962	22.6	3,018	33.8	139	14.0	11,119	24.6
	Hispanic/Latino	315	0.9	240	2.7	98	9.9	653	1.4
	American Indian/Alaska Native	239	0.7	80	0.9	12	1.2	331	0.7
	Asian	150	0.4	35	0.4	19	1.9	204	0.5
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	3	0.0	1	0.0	-	0.0	4	0.0
	Unknown	150	0.4	56	0.6	46	4.6	252	0.6
Current Age	Age < 18	7	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1	8	0.0
	Age 18–19	59	0.2	4	0.0	1	0.1	64	0.1
	Age 20–29	1,923	5.5	1,068	12.0	148	14.9	3,139	7.0
	Age 30–39	6,103	17.3	2,175	24.4	329	33.2	8,607	19.1
	Age 40–49	8,956	25.4	2,231	25.0	222	22.4	11,409	25.3
	Age 50–59	8,554	24.3	1,878	21.1	156	15.7	10,588	23.5
	Age 60–69	6,737	19.1	1,141	12.8	76	7.7	7,954	17.6
	Age 70+	2,896	8.2	422	4.7	58	5.9	3,376	7.5
Age at First Sex Offense	Age < 18	2,449	7.0	397	4.5	54	5.4	2,900	6.4
	Age 18–19	3,115	8.8	767	8.6	57	5.8	3,939	8.7
	Age 20–29	12,227	34.7	3,136	35.2	328	33.1	15,691	34.8
	Age 30–39	8,885	25.2	2,343	26.3	251	25.3	11,479	25.4
	Age 40–49	5,223	14.8	1,333	14.9	145	14.6	6,701	14.8
	Age 50–59	2,196	6.2	617	6.9	80	8.1	2,893	6.4
	Age 60–69	885	2.5	252	2.8	48	4.8	1,185	2.6
	Age 70+	208	0.6	74	0.8	25	2.5	307	0.7

Table continues

Table 1 continued

Registry Classifications	Tier I	2,692	7.6	343	3.8	156	15.7	3,191	7.1
	Tier II	7,861	22.3	774	8.7	252	25.4	8,887	19.7
	Tier III	24,557	69.7	7,797	87.4	583	58.8	32,937	73.0
	Other (Special Condition)	35	0.1	2	0.0	-	0.0	37	0.1
	Juvenile	1,859	5.3	137	1.5	41	4.1	2,037	4.5
	Adult	33,376	94.7	8,782	98.5	950	95.9	43,108	95.5
	Public	31,632	89.8	8,520	95.5	-	0.0	40,152	88.9
	Nonpublic	3,603	10.2	399	4.5	991	100.0	4,993	11.1
Economic Statistics	Currently Employed	19,230	54.6	N/A		N/A		N/A	
	Currently Unhoused	1,082	3.1	N/A		N/A		N/A	
	Ever Unhoused	3,764	10.7	N/A		N/A		N/A	

Table 2

Cumulative Sexual Recidivism Rates for 5-Year Cohorts.

5-year Cohorts, Release Date	Cohort Size	5-year		10-year		15-year		20-year		All Recidivism	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1995–1999	8,210	406	4.9	588	7.2	733	8.9	848	10.3	928	11.3
2000–2004	7,681	346	4.5	507	6.6	653	8.5	-	-	758	9.9
2005–2009	6,458	238	3.7	367	5.7	-	-	-	-	492	7.6
2010–2014	5,227	151	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	247	4.7

Table 3

Five-Year Hazard Rates for Sexual Recidivism

5-year Cohorts, Release Date	Cohort Size	Years 0–5		Years 5–10		Years 10–15		Years 15–20	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1995–1999	8,210	406	4.9	182	2.2	145	1.8	115	1.4
2000–2004	7,681	346	4.5	161	2.1	146	1.9	-	-
2005–2009	6,458	238	3.7	129	2.0	-	-	-	-
2010–2014	5,227	151	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 4

Static-99R Risk Levels by Michigan SOR Tier Level

Static-99R Risk Level	Tier I		Tier II		Tier III		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Level I - Very Low Risk	2	1.2	9	2.0	317	7.9	328	7.1
Level II - Below Average Risk	15	8.7	37	8.4	845	21.0	897	19.3
Level III - Average Risk	47	27.3	202	45.7	1,742	43.2	1,991	42.8
Level IV a - Above Average Risk	69	40.1	131	29.6	829	20.6	1,029	22.1
Level IV b - Well Above Average Risk	39	22.7	63	14.3	301	7.5	403	8.7
Total with Static-99R Scores	172		442		4,034		4,648	

Table 5

Time Offense Free in the Community by Tier Level

Time Offense Free in Community	Tier I		Tier II		Tier III		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0–2 years	365	13.6	563	7.2	1,351	5.5	2,279	6.5
2–5 years	668	24.9	965	12.3	2,582	10.6	4,215	12.0
5–10 years	954	35.5	1,511	19.3	3,836	15.7	6,301	18.0
10–15 years	693	25.8	1,579	20.1	3,928	16.1	6,200	17.7
15–20 years	4	0.2	1,654	21.1	3,485	14.2	5,143	14.7
More than 20 years	4	0.2	1,575	20.1	9,293	38.0	10,872	31.0
Total	2,688		7,847		24,475		35,010	100.0

Table 6.

Number of Individuals in the In Community Group Who Are Very Low Risk For Sexual Recidivism (Lifetime Rate of < 2%) Assuming No New Nonsexual Convictions.

		Minimum Time in Community						
Risk Level Static-99R	Frequency	At release	2 years	5 years	10 years	15 years	20 years	
-3	0.027	62	114	170	168	139	294	
-2	0.03	0	127	189	187	155	327	
-1	0.079	0	0	499	491	408	861	
0	0.103	0	0	0	640	531	1,122	
1	0.157	0	0	0	976	810	1,711	
2	0.175	0	0	0	1,088	903	1,907	
3	0.172	0	0	0	0	887	1,874	
4	0.107	0	0	0	0	552	1,166	
5	0.074	0	0	0	0	0	806	
6	0.036	0	0	0	0	0	392	
7	0.025	0	0	0	0	0	272	
8	0.012	0	0	0	0	0	131	
9	0.0028	0	0	0	0	0	31	
10+	0.0002	0	0	0	0	0	2	Total
Number very low risk		62	241	858	3,550	4,385	10,897	19,994
Total		2,299	4,222	6,311	6,218	5,159	10,897	35,106

Table 7.

Number of Individuals in the In Community Group Who Are Very Low Risk For Sexual Recidivism (Lifetime Rate of < 2%) Assuming All Registrants Have At Least One New Nonsexual Conviction.

		Minimum Time in Community						
Risk Level Static-99R	Frequency	Within 1 year	2 years	5 years	10 years	15 years	20 years	
-3	0.027	0	0	170	168	139	294	
-2	0.03	0	0	189	187	155	327	
-1	0.079	0	0	0	491	408	861	
0	0.103	0	0	0	640	531	1,122	
1	0.157	0	0	0	0	810	1,711	
2	0.175	0	0	0	0	903	1,907	
3	0.172	0	0	0	0	887	1,874	
4	0.107	0	0	0	0	0	1,166	
5	0.074	0	0	0	0	0	806	
6	0.036	0	0	0	0	0	392	
7	0.025	0	0	0	0	0	272	
8	0.012	0	0	0	0	0	131	
9	0.0028	0	0	0	0	0	31	
10+	0.0002	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
Number very low risk		0	0	360	1,486	3,833	10,895	16,574
Total		2,299	4,222	6,311	6,218	5,159	10,897	35,106