



**STATE OF VERMONT**  
JOINT FISCAL OFFICE

**MEMORANDUM**

To: James Reardon, Commissioner of Finance & Management  
From: Nathan Lavery, Fiscal Analyst  
Date: December 19, 2008  
Subject: JFO #2352, #2353, #2354, #2355, #2356, #2357, #2360, #2361, #2362,  
#2363, #2364, #2365, #2366

At the December 19, 2008 meeting of the Joint Fiscal Committee, the following grant requests were approved:

**JFO #2352** — \$807,500 grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to the Vermont Agency of Human Services - Department of Health.

**JFO #2353** — \$9,000 grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to the Agency of Natural Resource – Environmental Conservation.

**JFO #2354** — \$161,407 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice to the Department of Corrections.

**JFO #2355** — \$20,000 grant from the State Justice Institute to the Judiciary – Vermont Supreme Court.

**JFO #2356** — \$333,002 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice to the Judiciary – Court Administrator's Office.

**JFO #2357** — \$212,408 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice to the Judiciary – Court Administrator's Office.

**JFO #2360** — \$2,000,000 grant from Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to the Agency of Human Services – Department of Mental Health.

**JFO #2361** — \$21,000 grant from the State Justice Institute to the Judiciary.

**JFO #2362** — \$32,125 grant from the U.S. Department of Education to the Vermont Department of Education.

**JFO #2363** — \$166,160 grant from the Center for Applied and Special Technology to the Vermont Department of Education.

**JFO #2364** — \$12,000 grant from the National Governor's Association to the Agency of Human Services – Department of Children and Families. **This grant was approved with the understanding that expenditure of the \$9,885 in state funds, as originally proposed, was no longer considered necessary and would not occur.**

**JFO #2365** — \$19,140 donation from the Vermont Veterinary Medical Association (VVMA) to the Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets.

**JFO #2366** — \$500,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to the Agency of Transportation – Department of Motor Vehicles.

In accordance with 32 V.S.A. §5, these grants were placed on the Joint Fiscal Committee agenda and subsequently approved by vote of the Committee. We ask that you inform the Secretary of Administration and your staff of this action.

cc: Robert Hofmann, Secretary  
Wendy Davis, Commissioner  
Michael Hartman, Commissioner  
Stephen Dale, Commissioner  
Andrew Pallito, Acting Commissioner  
Armando Vilaseca, Commissioner  
Lee Suskin, Court Administrator  
Roger Allbee, Secretary  
David Dill, Secretary  
Bonnie Rutledge, Commissioner  
George Crombie, Secretary  
Laura Pelosi, Commissioner



**STATE OF VERMONT**  
JOINT FISCAL OFFICE

**MEMORANDUM**

To: Representative Alice Emmons

From: Nathan Lavery

Date: December 3, 2008

Subject: JFO #2354 (Accuracy of sex offender treatment model)

Representatives Michael Obuchowski and Shap Smith asked that I forward to you a copy of the enclosed request and cover memo. They are requesting you provide them with your observations regarding the enclosed item.

cc: Rep. Michael Obuchowski  
Rep. Shap Smith  
Stephen Klein



**STATE OF VERMONT**  
JOINT FISCAL OFFICE

**MEMORANDUM**

To: Representative William Lippert

From: Nathan Lavery

Date: December 3, 2008

Subject: JFO #2354 (Accuracy of sex offender treatment model)

Representatives Michael Obuchowski and Shap Smith asked that I forward to you a copy of the enclosed request and cover memo. They are requesting you provide them with your observations regarding the enclosed item.

cc: Rep. Michael Obuchowski  
Rep. Shap Smith  
Stephen Klein



**STATE OF VERMONT**  
JOINT FISCAL OFFICE

**MEMORANDUM**

To: Joint Fiscal Committee Members  
From: Nathan Lavery, Fiscal Analyst  
Date: December 3, 2008  
Subject: Grant Requests

Enclosed please find two (2) requests which the Joint Fiscal Office recently received from the Administration:

**JFO #2353** — \$9,000 grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to the Agency of Natural Resource – Environmental Conservation. These grant funds will be used to conduct outreach to ethnic and tribal communities regarding mercury in fish.  
[JFO received 12/03/08]

**JFO #2354** — \$161,407 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to the Department of Corrections. These grant funds will be used to study the accuracy of DOC's sex offender treatment model and determine if combining the model's components with other risk factors would improve the accuracy of the model.  
[JFO received 12/03/08]

The Joint Fiscal Office has reviewed this submission and determined that all appropriate forms bearing the necessary approvals are in order.

In accordance with the procedures for processing such requests, we ask you to review the enclosed and notify the Joint Fiscal Office (Nathan Lavery at 802/828-1488; [nlavery@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:nlavery@leg.state.vt.us) or Stephen Klein at 802/828-5769; [sklein@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:sklein@leg.state.vt.us)) if you have questions or would like an item held for Joint Fiscal Committee review. Unless we hear from you to the contrary by December 17 we will assume that you agree to consider as final the Governor's acceptance of this request.

cc: James Reardon, Commissioner  
George Crombie, Secretary  
Laura Pelosi, Commissioner  
Robert Hoffman, Secretary  
Andy Pallito, Commissioner

SFO 2354

STATE OF VERMONT  
GRANT ACCEPTANCE FORM

GRANT SUMMARY: This grant is to study the sex offender treatment needs and progress scale (TPS) that DOC developed and uses as a dynamic risk assessment instrument and see if they can improve the accuracy of this model by using some additional data on risk assessment.

TITLE OF GRANT: A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment.

FEDERAL CATALOG No.: 2008-DD-BX-0013

GRANTOR / DONOR: United States Department of Justice  
Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs  
Washington, DC 20531

DATE: 8/18/08

DEPARTMENT: Department of Corrections (DOC)

GRANT / DONATION: This grant will allow DOC to analyze the program it has to do sex offender risk assessment and see if combining its components with other risk factor indicators would improve the accuracy of DOC's model.

AMOUNT / VALUE: \$161,407.00

POSITIONS REQUESTED: None

GRANT PERIOD: 7/1/08 to 7/31/10

COMMENTS:

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT:  
SECRETARY OF ADMINISTRATION  
SENT TO JOINT FISCAL OFFICE:

(INITIAL) 8/19/08  
(INITIAL) 8/19/08  
DATE: 11/25/08







**State of Vermont**  
**Department of Corrections**  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05671-1001  
[www.doc.state.vt.us](http://www.doc.state.vt.us)

[phone] 802-241-2263  
[fax] 802-241-2565

*Agency of Human Services*

August 14, 2008

Cynthia D. LaWare, Secretary  
Agency of Human Services  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05671-0203

Dear Secretary LaWare,

This memo serves to introduce the Federal grant entitled "A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment" (SORA) recently awarded to the Vermont Department of Corrections (DOC) by the office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance.


The grant was applied for by Dr. Robert McGrath on behalf of the DOC's Vermont Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Assault (VCPTSA). It should be noted that Dr. McGrath is not a DOC/State employee, but is the sole proprietor of McGrath Psychological Services and is a nationally recognized expert in the field of sex offender treatment. McGrath Psychological Services is currently under contract with DOC to provide clinical supervision of the sex offender treatment programs

In December of 2007, the SORA grant was conditionally approved by the AHS IRB. Due to Dr. McGrath's expert qualifications in his field, as well as his knowledge of the aforementioned grant, DOC will seek approval for a sole-source contract for Dr. McGrath to perform the duties of Project Director for the SORA grant. Dr. McGrath's current contract comprises of a maximum of 1,504 hours of service on an annual basis. The position of Project Director of the SORA grant will require an estimated 450 additional hours annually.

Please contact me directly if you should have any other questions regarding this grant.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Hofmann  
Commissioner

 8/14/08  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature                      Date

Cc: Jim Giffin, AHS Chief Fiscal Officer  
Toni Hartrich, Finance and Management  
Georgia Cumming, Director, VCTPSA



STATE OF VERMONT  
 REQUEST FOR GRANT ACCEPTANCE  
 (USE ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS NEEDED)

1. Agency: AHS
2. Department: Corrections
3. Program: Sex Offender Treatment
4. Legal Title of Grant: A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment
5. Federal Catalog No.: 2008-DD-BX-0013
6. Grantor and Office Address: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Washington, DC 20531
7. Grant Period: From: 07/01/08 To: 7/31/2010

8. Purpose of Grant: (attach additional sheets if needed)  
To improve the Vermont DOC's ability to assess sex offender risk

9. Impact on Existing Programs if Grant is not Accepted:  
N/A

10. Budget Information:	(1ST State FY) FY 2009	(2nd State FY) FY 2010	(3rd State FY) FY 2011
<b>EXPENDITURES:</b>			
Personal Services	\$ 68,160	\$ 73,840	
Operating Expenses	\$ 13,497	\$ 5,910	
Grants	\$ -	\$ -	
In Kind	\$ -	\$ -	
Indirect	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 81,657</b>	<b>\$ 79,750</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>REVENUES:</b>			
State Funds:			
Cash (using existing staff and grants)	\$0	\$0	\$0
In-Kind	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds:			
(Direct Costs)	\$81,657	\$79,750	
(Statewide Indirect)	\$0		
(Department Indirect)	\$ -		
Other Funds:			
(Source)	\$0		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$81,657</b>	<b>\$79,750</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Grant will be allocated to these appropriation expenditure accounts:	Appropriation No.	Amounts
	<b>3480004000</b>	81,657 FY 2009
		79,750 FY 2010
		<b>161,407 TOTAL</b>

Over

REC'D AUG 18 2008



11. Will grant monies be spent by one or more personal services contracts?

YES  NO

If YES, signature of appointing authority here indicates intent to follow current guidelines on bidding.

*[Handwritten Signature]*

X \_\_\_\_\_

12a. Please list any requested Limited Service positions: No positions required

Titles	Number of Positions
--------	---------------------

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_

12b. Equipment and space for these positions: N/A

Is presently available in  
 Can be obtained with available funds.

13. Signature of Appointing Authority

I certify that no funds have been expended or committed in anticipation of Joint Fiscal Committee approval of this grant.

*[Handwritten Signature]*

(Signature)

*8/13/08*

(Date)

*Commissioner*

(Title)

(Date)

Signature of AHS Secretary

*Cynthia D. Lawrence*

(Signature)

*8/14/08*

(Date)

*SECRETARY*

(Title)

(Date)

*ok rec'd*

14. Action by Governor:

Approved  
 Rejected

*[Handwritten Signature]*

(Signature)

*9/24/08*

(Date)

15. Secretary of Administration:

request to JFO  
 Information to JFO

*Ronda P. Melnick*

(Signature)

*8/19/08*

(Date)

16. Action by Joint Fiscal Committee: (Dates)

- Request to be placed on JFC agenda
- Approved (not placed on agenda in 30 days)
- Approved by JFC
- Rejected by JFC
- Approved by Legislature

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(Signature)

(Date)



---

**Agency of Human Services**

103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05671-0203  
www.humanservices.vermont.gov

*Operations and Planning*

[phone] 802-241-2234  
[fax] 802-241-4461

December 14, 2007

Robert J. McGrath, Clinical Director  
VT Department of Corrections  
105 Happy Valley Road  
Middlebury, VT 05753

Dear Mr. McGrath:

I am writing in response to your application to the AHS IRB regarding the research project – A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment. Your study was reviewed during our December 4, 2007 meeting and approved with the following conditions:

1. Protocol is revised to separate quality assurance activities from research study , or
2. Protocol is revised to use only original scores (as opposed to both corrected and original scores).

The proposal, having been conditionally approved, does not need to come back to the full committee for review. Instead, please make the above changes to your application materials and submit the final documents to me as soon as possible. I will make sure that they are forwarded to the primary and secondary reviewers assigned to your application. As soon as the two reviewers are satisfied that all conditions have been met, I will send you a final approval letter.

Sincerely,

Shawn E. Skaflestad, Ph.D.  
Chair, AHS IRB

Please note that IRB approval does not supersede state law, as such it will up to the individual departments involved in your study to assure that the access that your team requests meets all applicable Vermont state law and practices.



**Department of Justice**  
**Office of Justice Programs**  
**Office for Civil Rights**

*Washington, D.C. 20531*

July 1, 2008

Commissioner Robert Hofman  
Vermont Department of Corrections  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05671

Dear Commissioner Hofman:

Congratulations on your recent award. In establishing financial assistance programs, Congress linked the receipt of Federal funding to compliance with Federal civil rights laws. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice is responsible for ensuring that recipients of financial aid from OJP, its component offices and bureaus, the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) comply with applicable Federal civil rights statutes and regulations. We at OCR are available to help you and your organization meet the civil rights requirements that come with Justice Department funding.

**Ensuring Access to Federally Assisted Programs**

As you know, Federal laws prohibit recipients of financial assistance from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or disability in funded programs or activities, not only in respect to employment practices but also in the delivery of services or benefits. Federal law also prohibits funded programs or activities from discriminating on the basis of age in the delivery of services or benefits.

**Providing Services to Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Individuals**

In accordance with Department of Justice Guidance pertaining to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, recipients of Federal financial assistance must take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to their programs and activities for persons with limited English proficiency (LEP). For more information on the civil rights responsibilities that recipients have in providing language services to LEP individuals, please see the website at <http://www.lep.gov>.

**Ensuring Equal Treatment for Faith-Based Organizations**

The Department of Justice has published a regulation specifically pertaining to the funding of faith-based organizations. In general, the regulation, Participation in Justice Department Programs by Religious Organizations; Providing for Equal Treatment of all Justice Department Program Participants, and known as the Equal Treatment Regulation 28 C.F.R. part 38, requires State Administering Agencies to treat these organizations the same as any other applicant or recipient. The regulation prohibits State Administering Agencies from making award or grant administration decisions on the basis of an organization's religious character or affiliation, religious name, or the religious composition of its board of directors.

The regulation also prohibits faith-based organizations from using financial assistance from the Department of Justice to fund inherently religious activities. While faith-based organizations can engage in non-funded inherently religious activities, they must be held separately from the Department of Justice funded program, and customers or beneficiaries cannot be compelled to participate in them. The Equal Treatment Regulation also makes clear that organizations participating in programs funded by the Department of Justice are not permitted to discriminate in the provision of services on the basis of a beneficiary's religion. For more information on the regulation, please see OCR's website at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ocr/etfbo.htm>.



Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs

---

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20531

July 1, 2008

Commissioner Robert Hofman  
Vermont Department of Corrections  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05671

Dear Commissioner Hofman:

On behalf of Attorney General Michael B. Mukasey, it is my pleasure to inform you that the Office of Justice Programs has approved your application for funding under the Sex Offenders Solicitation in the amount of \$161,407 for Vermont Department of Corrections. The project title is "A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment."

Enclosed you will find the Grant Award and Special Conditions documents. This award is subject to all administrative and financial requirements, including the timely submission of all financial and programmatic reports, resolution of all interim audit findings, and the maintenance of a minimum level of cash-on-hand. Should you not adhere to these requirements, you will be in violation of the terms of this agreement and the award will be subject to termination for cause or other administrative action as appropriate.

If you have questions regarding this award, please contact:

- Program Questions, Marlene Beckman, Program Manager at (202) 616-3562; and
- Financial Questions, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Customer Service Center (CSC) at (800) 458-0786, or you may contact the CSC at [ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov](mailto:ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov).

Congratulations, and we look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jeffrey L. Sedgwick".

Jeffrey L. Sedgwick  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

Enclosures

State Administering Agencies and faith-based organizations should also note that the Safe Streets Act, as amended; the Victims of Crime Act, as amended; and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, as amended, contain prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of religion in employment. These employment provisions have been specifically incorporated into 28 C.F.R. Part 38.1(f) and 38.2(f). Consequently, in many circumstances, it would be impermissible for faith-based organizations seeking or receiving funding authorized by these statutes to have policies or practices that condition hiring and other employment-related decisions on the religion of applicants or employees. Programs subject to these nondiscrimination provisions may be found on OCR's website at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ocr/>. Questions about the regulation or the statutes that prohibit discrimination in employment may be directed to this Office.

### **Enforcing Civil Rights Laws**

All recipients of Federal financial assistance, regardless of the particular funding source, the amount of the grant award, or the number of employees in the workforce, are subject to the prohibitions against unlawful discrimination. Accordingly, OCR investigates recipients that are the subject of discrimination complaints from both individuals and groups. In addition, based on regulatory criteria, OCR selects a number of recipients each year for compliance reviews, audits that require recipients to submit data showing that they are providing services equitably to all segments of their service population and that their employment practices meet equal employment opportunity standards.

### **Complying with the Safe Streets Act or Program Requirements**

In addition to these general prohibitions, an organization which is a recipient of financial assistance subject to the nondiscrimination provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (Safe Streets Act) of 1968, 42 U.S.C. § 3789d(c), or other Federal grant program requirements, must meet two additional requirements: (1) complying with Federal regulations pertaining to the development of an Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (EEOP), 28 C.F.R. § 42.301-.308, and (2) submitting to OCR Findings of Discrimination (see 28 C.F.R. §§ 42.205(5) or 31.202(5)).

#### **1) Meeting the EEOP Requirement**

In accordance with Federal regulations, Assurance No. 6 in the Standard Assurances, COPS Assurance No. 8.B, or certain Federal grant program requirements, your organization must comply with the following EEOP reporting requirements:

If your organization has received an award for \$500,000 or more and has 50 or more employees (counting both full- and part-time employees but excluding political appointees), then it has to prepare an EEOP and submit it to OCR for review within 60 days from the date of this letter. For assistance in developing an EEOP, please consult OCR's website at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ocr/eeop.htm>. You may also request technical assistance from an EEOP specialist at OCR by dialing (202) 616-3208.

If your organization received an award between \$25,000 and \$500,000 and has 50 or more employees, your organization still has to prepare an EEOP, but it does not have to submit the EEOP to OCR for review. Instead, your organization has to maintain the EEOP on file and make it available for review on request. In addition, your organization has to complete Section B of the Certification Form and return it to OCR. The Certification Form can be found at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ocr/eeop.htm>.

If your organization received an award for less than \$25,000; or if your organization has less than 50 employees, regardless of the amount of the award; or if your organization is a medical institution, educational institution, nonprofit organization or Indian tribe, then your organization is exempt from the EEOP requirement. However, your organization must complete Section A of the Certification Form and return it to OCR. The Certification Form can be found at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ocr/eeop.htm>.

#### **2) Submitting Findings of Discrimination**

In the event a Federal or State court or Federal or State administrative agency makes an adverse finding of discrimination against your organization after a due process hearing, on the ground of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex, your organization must submit a copy of the finding to OCR for review.

**Ensuring the Compliance of Subrecipients**

If your organization makes subawards to other agencies, you are responsible for assuring that subrecipients also comply with all of the applicable Federal civil rights laws, including the requirements pertaining to developing and submitting an BEOP, reporting Findings of Discrimination, and providing language services to LEP persons. State agencies that make subawards must have in place standard grant assurances and review procedures to demonstrate that they are effectively monitoring the civil rights compliance of subrecipients.

If we can assist you in any way in fulfilling your civil rights responsibilities as a recipient of Federal funding, please call OCR at (202) 307-0690 or visit our website at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ocr/>.

Sincerely,



Michael L. Alston  
Director

cc: Grant Manager  
Financial Analyst



The Vermont Department of Corrections (DOC) developed such a dynamic risk assessment instrument in 2001 through a grant from the U. S. Department of Justice. The instrument, the Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale (TPS; McGrath & Cumming, 2003), consists of 22 dynamic risk factors linked to sexual offending.

Since 2001, the Vermont DOC's statewide network of community-based sex offender treatment providers have scored every adult male sex offender that they serve on the TPS at intake and every six months thereafter. Providers have used this information for treatment planning, probation and parole officers have used it for case management, and DOC has retained it for research purposes. The DOC now has multiple TPS scores on over 1,100 sex offenders. This data base also contains demographic data on each of these sex offenders and their scores on three other commonly used sex offender risk measures, the Static-99, RRASOR, and VASOR.

Recent research indicates that combining static and dynamic risk factors may better predict sexual offending than either static or dynamic instruments alone. Consequently, this prospective study will examine how the TPS and Static-99, the most commonly used sex offender risk instruments used in the United States, can be combined into an overall model of risk assessment. Analyses will also be conducted to determine if RRASOR and VASOR scores will improve the predictive accuracy of the model.

Recidivism data on approximately 950 adult male sex offenders will be analyzed at three-year fixed follow-up periods for all new charges for sexual, violent, and other offenses. An empirically derived decision matrix will be created to provide guidance to administrators and service providers about how to allocate and deliver services based on an individual's risk to sexually reoffend using a model that integrates offenders' scores on static and dynamic risk measures.

ca/nef



**Department of Justice**  
Office of Justice Programs  
*National Institute of Justice*

---

Washington, D.C. 20531

**Memorandum To:** Official Grant File

**From:** Marlene Beckman, Program Manager

**Subject:** Categorical Exclusion for Vermont Department of Corrections

The Recipient agrees to comply with all Federal, State, and local environmental laws and regulations applicable to the development and implementation of the activities to be funded under this award. Categorical Exclusions: Based upon the information provided by the Recipient in its application for these funds, NIJ has determined and the Recipient understands that the proposed activities meet the definition of a categorical exclusion, as defined in the Department of Justice' Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act found at 28 CFR Part 61. A categorical exclusion is an action that because of the proposed activities' very limited and predictable potential environmental impacts, both on an individual and a cumulative basis, does not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Consequently, no further environmental impact analysis is necessary under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, for these categorically excluded activities. Modifications: Throughout the term of this award, the Recipient agrees that for any activities that are the subject of this categorical exclusion, it will inform NIJ of any change(s) that it is considering making to the previously assessed activities that may be relevant to the environmental impacts of the activities. The Recipient will not implement a proposed change until NIJ, with the assistance of the Recipient, has completed any applicable environmental impact review requirements necessitated by the proposed change and NIJ has concurred in the proposed change. This approval will not be unreasonably withheld as long as any requested modification(s) is consistent with eligible program purposed and found acceptable under an NIJ conducted environmental impact review process.



Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
National Institute of Justice

**GRANT MANAGER'S MEMORANDUM, PT. I:  
PROJECT SUMMARY**

**Grant**

PROJECT NUMBER  
2008-DD-BX-0013

PAGE 1 OF 1

This project is supported under FY07(BJA - Byrne Discretionary) Pub. L. No. 110-5. emb. secs. 101-104; Pub. L. No. 109-108, 119 Stat. 2290, 2300; 42 USC 3760 - 3762a as in effect on Sept. 30, 2006

**1. STAFF CONTACT (Name & telephone number)**

Marlene Beckman  
(202) 616-3562

**2. PROJECT DIRECTOR (Name, address & telephone number)**

John G. Perry  
Director of Planning  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05671  
(802) 241-2307

**3a. TITLE OF THE PROGRAM**

NJI FY 07 ORE Sex Offenders

**3b. POMS CODE (SEE INSTRUCTIONS  
ON REVERSE)**

**4. TITLE OF PROJECT**

A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment

**5. NAME & ADDRESS OF GRANTEE**

Vermont Department of Corrections  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05671

**6. NAME & ADDRESS OF SUBGRANTEE**

**7. PROGRAM PERIOD**

FROM: 07/01/2008 TO: 07/31/2010

**8. BUDGET PERIOD**

FROM: 07/01/2008 TO: 07/31/2010

**9. AMOUNT OF AWARD**

\$ 161,407

**10. DATE OF AWARD**

07/01/2008

**11. SECOND YEAR'S BUDGET**

**12. SECOND YEAR'S BUDGET AMOUNT**

**13. THIRD YEAR'S BUDGET PERIOD**

**14. THIRD YEAR'S BUDGET AMOUNT**

**15. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (See instruction on reverse)**

During the last decade, researchers have developed several risk instruments for adult male sex offenders that predict with moderate accuracy their long term risk of sexual reoffending. But because most of these instruments are composed of static, that is unchangeable, risk factors, they are not useful for predicting an individual's short term risk to reoffend or how to reduce or measure changes in that risk. This requires instruments composed of dynamic, that is changeable, risk factors.



Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
National Institute of Justice

Grant

PAGE 1 OF 5

1. RECIPIENT NAME AND ADDRESS (Including Zip Code) Vermont Department of Corrections 103 South Main Street Waterbury, VT 05671		4. AWARD NUMBER: 2008-DD-BX-0013	
		5. PROJECT PERIOD: FROM 07/01/2008 TO 07/31/2010 BUDGET PERIOD: FROM 07/01/2008 TO 07/31/2010	
1A. GRANTEE IRS/VENDOR NO. 036000276		6. AWARD DATE 07/01/2008	7. ACTION Initial
		8. SUPPLEMENT NUMBER 00	
		9. PREVIOUS AWARD AMOUNT \$ 0	
3. PROJECT TITLE A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment		10. AMOUNT OF THIS AWARD \$ 161,407	
		11. TOTAL AWARD \$ 161,407	
12. SPECIAL CONDITIONS THE ABOVE GRANT PROJECT IS APPROVED SUBJECT TO SUCH CONDITIONS OR LIMITATIONS AS ARE SET FORTH ON THE ATTACHED PAGE(S).			
13. STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR GRANT This project is supported under FY07(BJA - Byrne Discretionary) Pub. L. No. 110-5. emb. secs. 101-104; Pub. L. No. 109-108, 119 Stat. 2290, 2300; 42 USC 3760 - 3762a as in effect on Sept. 30, 2006			
15. METHOD OF PAYMENT PAPRS			
AGENCY APPROVAL		GRANTEE ACCEPTANCE	
16. TYPED NAME AND TITLE OF APPROVING OFFICIAL Jeffrey L. Sedgwick Acting Assistant Attorney General		18. TYPED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED GRANTEE OFFICIAL Robert Hofman Commissioner	
17. SIGNATURE OF APPROVING OFFICIAL 		19. SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED RECIPIENT OFFICIAL	19A. DATE
AGENCY USE ONLY			
20. ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION CODES FISCAL FUND BUD. DIV. YEAR CODE ACT. OFC. REG. SUB. POMS AMOUNT X B D6 60 00 00 161407		21. GD6BGT2002	

OJP FORM 4000/2 (REV. 5-87) PREVIOUS EDITIONS ARE OBSOLETE.

OJP FORM 4000/2 (REV. 4-88)



Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
Office of the Chief Financial Officer

Washington, D.C. 20531

July 1, 2008

Commissioner Robert Hofman  
Vermont Department of Corrections  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05671

Reference Grant Number: 2008-DD-BX-0013

Dear Commissioner Hofman:

I am pleased to inform you that my office has approved the following budget categories for the aforementioned grant award in the cost categories identified below:

Category	Budget
Personnel	\$0
Fringe Benefits	\$0
Travel	\$13,907
Equipment	\$0
Supplies	\$5,500
Construction	\$0
Contractual	\$142,000
Other	\$0
Total Direct Cost	\$161,407
Indirect Cost	\$0
Total Project Cost	\$161,407
Federal Funds Approved:	\$161,407
Non-Federal Share:	\$0
Program Income:	\$0

Match is not required for this grant program.

If you have questions regarding this award, please contact:

- Program Questions, Marlene Beckman, Program Manager at (202) 616-3562
- Financial Questions, the Office of Chief Financial Officer, Customer Service Center(CSC) at (800) 458-0786, or you may contact the CSC at [ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov](mailto:ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov).

Congratulations, and we look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,



Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
National Institute of Justice

**AWARD CONTINUATION  
SHEET**  
**Grant**

PAGE 2 OF 5

PROJECT NUMBER 2008-DD-BX-0013

AWARD DATE 07/01/2008

*SPECIAL CONDITIONS*

1. The recipient agrees to comply with the financial and administrative requirements set forth in the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Financial Guide.
2. The recipient acknowledges that failure to submit an acceptable Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (if recipient is required to submit one pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Section 42.302), that is approved by the Office for Civil Rights, is a violation of its Certified Assurances and may result in suspension or termination of funding, until such time as the recipient is in compliance.
3. The recipient agrees to comply with the organizational audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations, as further described in the current edition of the OJP Financial Guide, Chapter 19.
4. Recipient understands and agrees that it cannot use any federal funds, either directly or indirectly, in support of the enactment, repeal, modification or adoption of any law, regulation or policy, at any level of government, without the express prior written approval of OJP.
5. The recipient agrees to submit quarterly financial status reports to the Office of Justice Programs using Standard Form SF 269A on the Internet at <https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov>. These reports shall be submitted on-line not later than 45 days after the end of each calendar quarter. The final report shall be submitted not later than 90 days following the end of the grant period.
6. The recipient shall submit semiannual progress reports. Progress reports shall be submitted within 30 days after the end of the reporting periods, which are June 30 and December 31, for the life of the award. These reports will be submitted to the Office of Justice Programs, on line-through the Internet at <https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov/>.
7. The recipient agrees to submit a final report at the end of this award documenting all relevant project activities during the entire period of support under this award. This report will include detailed information about the project(s) funded, including, but not limited to, information about how the funds were actually used for each purpose area, data to support statements of progress, and data concerning individual results and outcomes of funded projects reflecting project successes and impacts. The final report is due no later than 90 days following the close of this award period or the expiration of any extension periods. Recipient shall submit an original and one copy of the report.
8. The award recipient shall provide all products specified in the proposal. In addition, the recipient will comply with the following requirements. Ninety (90) days prior to the end of the project period, the recipient shall submit to NIJ the following grant products: (a) An original and three unbound copies of a Draft Final Technical Report. The Draft Final Technical Report shall describe the project's activities in sufficient detail to permit replication of the design, including a review of relevant literature, methods including detailed description of data collection and analysis procedures, modifications to or problems with the original research design, findings, and conclusions. (b) An original and three copies of a 2,500 to 4,000 word Draft Summary suitable for publication and/or dissemination which describes results, findings and conclusions from the project including implications for criminal justice operations. (c) A Draft 400 word Abstract. The abstract should serve as a succinct and accurate description of the project. Research goals and objectives, research design, and methods for achieving the goals and objectives should be concisely described. The abstract should include statement of purpose, description of research subjects, methods, results and conclusions. The Draft Final Technical Report, Abstract and Summary will, with few exceptions, be submitted to peer review. The recipient shall be responsive to peer reviewers' comments and other issues raised in the review and understand that the review process has implications with respect to publication and dissemination decisions made by NIJ. The recipient shall make appropriate revisions to these documents based on the reviewers' comments and/or any comments from NIJ.



Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
National Institute of Justice

AWARD CONTINUATION  
SHEET  
Grant

PAGE 3 OF 5

PROJECT NUMBER 2008-DD-BX-0013

AWARD DATE 07/01/2008

*SPECIAL CONDITIONS*

9. (a) The recipient agrees to deliver to NIJ, by the termination of the award period, an original and three unbound paper copies of the Final Technical Report, Abstract and Summary. Final Technical Reports, Abstracts, and Summaries shall be submitted on 3.5" high density diskettes, or CD's. Preferred, word processing software is WordPerfect or Microsoft Word. Graphic files should be provided in Adobe Illustrator, Macro media Freehand, Corel Draw or Delta Graph. Included images should adhere to GIFF, JPEG, PICT, and TIFF format standards, with GIFF and PICT images preferred. These reports are, in general, made available to the public through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service and may be electronically posted in the NCJRS Virtual library. (b) To support NIJ in its mission to make available data and documentation from all NIJ-funded research, the recipient agrees to deliver to NIJ by termination of the award period: 1) the Final Technical Report, Abstract and Summary, as described in the preceding paragraph; 2) a machine-readable copy of each data set generated in conjunction with this project (SPSS portable files preferred; SAS transport, dBASE, Lotus or ASCII files acceptable with appropriate documentation); 3) a description of the general technical characteristics of the transmittal medium (CD-ROM, zip disk, diskette, tape, or cartridge) and a description of the format and version, where applicable, of each file; 4) a codebook listing the data variables, variable labels, codes, code labels, and missing value designations (Portable Document Format (PDF) or MS Word preferred; WordPerfect, Rich Text Format (RTF), ASCII acceptable); 5) a machine-readable and hard copy version of each data collection instrument (see above list for preferred formats); 6) a frequency count or other appropriate description for each variable; 7) a printed copy of the first five and last five records of each data set; 8) any specialized programs necessary to replicate the original data analysis. Recipients should consult the Handbook "Depositing Data with the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice" for further guidance. The recipient shall make no guarantee, without prior NIJ approval, that the data generated as part of this project will not be transferred or released (Such guarantee would preclude NIJ from archiving and making available all NIJ-funded data). The recipient shall transmit to the grant monitor copies of all official grant-related press releases at least ten (10) working days prior to public release. Advance notice permits time for coordination of release of information by NIJ where appropriate and to respond to press or public inquiries.
10. To assist in information sharing, the grantee shall provide the grant manager with a copy of all interim and final reports and proposed publications (including those prepared for conferences and other presentations) resulting from this agreement. Submission of such materials prior to or simultaneous with their public release aids NIJ in responding to any inquiries that may arise. Any publications (written, visual, or sound) - excluding press releases and newsletters - whether published at the grantee's or government's expense, shall contain the following statement: This project was supported by Award No. \_\_\_\_\_ awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.  
  
NIJ defines publications as any planned, written, visual or sound material substantively based on the project, formally prepared by the grant recipient for dissemination to the public.
11. The recipient shall transmit to the grant monitor copies of all official grant-related press releases at least ten (10) working days prior to public release. Advance notice permits time for coordination of release of information by NIJ where appropriate and to respond to press or public inquiries.
12. The Project Director and key program personnel designated in the application shall be replaced only for compelling reasons and with the concurrence of OJP. OJP will not unreasonably withhold concurrence. All successors to key personnel must be approved, and such approval is contingent upon submission of appropriate information, including, but not limited to, a resume. Changes in other program personnel require only notification to OJP and submission of resumes, unless otherwise designated in the award document.



Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
National Institute of Justice

AWARD CONTINUATION  
SHEET  
Grant

PAGE 4 OF 5

PROJECT NUMBER 2008-DD-BX-0013

AWARD DATE 07/01/2008

*SPECIAL CONDITIONS*

13. Recipient acknowledges that the Office of Justice Programs reserves a royalty-free, non-exclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use, and authorize others to use (in whole or in part, including in connection with derivative works), for Federal purposes: (1) the copyright in any work developed under an award or subaward; and (2) any rights of copyright to which a recipient or subrecipient purchases ownership with Federal support.

Recipient acknowledges that the Office of Justice Programs has the right to (1) obtain, reproduce, publish, or otherwise use the data first produced under an award or subaward; and (2) authorize others to receive, reproduce, publish, or otherwise use such data for Federal purposes.

It is the responsibility of the recipient (and of each subrecipient, if applicable) to ensure that this condition is included in any subaward under this award.

14. Patents and Inventions.

The clauses at 37 C.F.R. section 401.14 (together, the "Patents Rights Clause") are incorporated by reference, with the following modifications.

(1) Where italicized, the terms "contract," "contractor," and "contracting officer" are replaced, respectively, by the terms "award," "award recipient," and "OJP program manager";

(2) Patent Rights Clause paragraph (f) is modified by adding the following at the end:

"(5) The award recipient agrees to provide a report prior to the close out of the award listing all subject inventions or stating that there were none.

(6) The award recipient agrees to provide, upon request, the filing date, patent application number and title; a copy of the patent application; and patent number and issue date for any subject invention in any country in which the award recipient has applied for a patent.";

(3) Patent Rights Clause paragraph (g) is modified to read as follows:

"(g) Subawards and Subcontracts

"The award recipient will include this Patent Rights Clause, suitably modified to identify the parties, in all subawards and subcontracts, regardless of tier, for experimental, developmental, or research work. The subaward recipient or subcontractor will retain all rights provided for the award recipient in this clause, and the award recipient will not, as a part of the consideration for awarding the subaward or subcontract, obtain rights in the subaward recipient's or subcontractor's subject inventions."; and

(4) Patent Rights Clause paragraph (l) is modified to read as follows:

"(l) Communications

"Communications on matters relating to this Patent Rights Clause should be directed to the General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, United States Department of Justice.".

With respect to any subject invention in which the award recipient, or a subaward recipient or subcontractor, retains title, the Federal government shall have a nonexclusive, nontransferable, irrevocable, paid-up license to practice or have practiced for or on behalf of the United States the subject invention throughout the world.





Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
National Institute of Justice

**AWARD CONTINUATION  
SHEET  
Grant**

PAGE 5 OF 5

PROJECT NUMBER 2008-DD-BX-0013

AWARD DATE 07/01/2008

*SPECIAL CONDITIONS*

15. Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Part 18, OJP may suspend or terminate funding under this award, at any time before the completion of the project funded by this award, for the recipient's failure to comply with these special conditions or with the projects goals, plans and methodology set forth in the approved application. The recipient will be unable to draw down funds until OJP determines that the recipient is in compliance.
16. The Recipient agrees to comply with all Federal, State, and local environmental laws and regulations applicable to the development and implementation of the activities to be funded under this award.  
Categorical Exclusions: Based upon the information provided by the Recipient in its application for these funds, NIJ has determined and the Recipient understands that the proposed activities meet the definition of a categorical exclusion, as defined in the Department of Justice' Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act found at 28 CFR Part 61. A categorical exclusion is an action that because of the proposed activities' very limited and predictable potential environmental impacts, both on an individual and a cumulative basis, does not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Consequently, no further environmental impact analysis is necessary under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, for these categorically excluded activities.  
Modifications: Throughout the term of this award, the Recipient agrees that for any activities that are the subject of this categorical exclusion, it will inform NIJ of any change(s) that it is considering making to the previously assessed activities that may be relevant to the environmental impacts of the activities. The Recipient will not implement a proposed change until NIJ, with the assistance of the Recipient, has completed any applicable environmental impact review requirements necessitated by the proposed change and NIJ has concurred in the proposed change. This approval will not be unreasonably withheld as long as any requested modification(s) is consistent with eligible program purposes and found acceptable under an NIJ conducted environmental impact review process.
17. The award recipient agrees to comply with the requirements of 28 CFR Part 46 and all other Department of Justice/Office of Justice Programs policies and procedures regarding the protection of human research subjects, including informed consent procedures and obtainment of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, if appropriate.
18. The award recipient will not be permitted to draw down any funds for any research involving human subjects until (1) it has submitted adequate documentation to demonstrate that it will conduct or perform research involving human subjects in accordance with an approved Federal-wide assurance issued by HHS or a Single Project Assurance issued by OJP/NIJ, and that the research has been determined, by an appropriate IRB (or the Office of the General Counsel/OJP), to be an exempt research activity, or has been reviewed and approved by an appropriate IRB in accordance with the requirements of 28 CFR Part 46, (2) the NIJ Human Subjects Protection Officer has authorized, in writing, removal of this special condition, and (3) a Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN) has been issued removing this special condition.
19. The award recipient agrees, as a condition of award approval, to comply with the requirements of 28 CFR Part 22, including the requirement to submit a properly executed Privacy Certificate that is in compliance with 28 CFR § 22.23 to the National Institute of Justice for approval.
20. The award recipient will not be permitted to draw down any funds for any research or statistical activity or project involving the collection, use, analysis, transfer, or disclosure of information identifiable to a private person until: (1) a Privacy Certificate has been submitted to and approved by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) in accordance with the requirements of 28 CFR Part 22, (2) removal of this special condition has been authorized in writing by the NIJ Human Subjects Protection Officer, and (3) a Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN) has been issued removing this special condition.
21. Recipient agrees that \$8,500 will be withheld until the recipient submits a draft final research/technical report and this report is accepted by NIJ as meeting usual scientific standards for form and content. Approval will be provided through a Grant Adjustment Notice that will clear this special condition.

Vermont Department of Corrections  
SORA Grant-Budget  
August 1, 2008

**SORA Grant Budget**

	<u>Item</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Payroll		
	Salaries	0
	Benefits	0
Contracts	142,000	142,000
Operating		
	Travel	13,907
	Supplies	5,500
		19,407
Grants	0	0
<b>Total Grant</b>		<b>161,407</b>

**Appendix 3: Predictive Validity of the  
Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale (TPS)**

Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers 24<sup>th</sup> Annual Research and Treatment Conference  
November 16-19, 2005 - Salt Lake City, Utah

Robert J. McGrath, Georgia F. Cumming, and Joy Livingston

**Table I. Mean TPS Scores by Stage of Treatment and Completion Status**

Completion Status	TPS Score			
	Beginning of Treatment (n=170)		End of Treatment (n=170)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Completers (n=108)	15.48 <sup>a,b</sup>	10.05	8.69 <sup>a,c</sup>	8.06
Non-completers (n=62)	23.03 <sup>b</sup>	10.74	25.74 <sup>c</sup>	11.52

Note. Means in the same row or column that share a same subscript differ at  $p < .001$ .

**Table II. Item-total Correlations and Interrater Reliability**

Item	<i>r</i> (n=149)	ICC <sub>1</sub> (n=149)	ICC <sub>2</sub> (n=149)
1. Admission of Offense Behavior	.48	.60	.75
2. Acceptance of Responsibility	.53	.51	.68
3. Sexual Interests	.56	.51	.68
4. Sexual Attitudes	.72	.50	.67
5. Sexual Behavior	.40	.66	.80
6. Sexual Risk Management	.67	.46	.63
7. Criminal Attitudes	.64	.45	.62
8. Criminal Behavior	.55	.69	.81
9. Substance Abuse	.37	.57	.73
10. Emotion Management	.64	.41	.59
11. Mental Health Stability	.36	.47	.64
12. Problem Solving	.72	.46	.63
13. Impulsivity	.56	.55	.71
14. Stage of Change	.74	.63	.77
15. Cooperation with Treatment	.78	.71	.83
16. Cooperation with Supervision	.66	.68	.81
17. Employment	.62	.63	.77
18. Residence	.60	.60	.75
19. Finances	.58	.59	.74
20. Adult Love Relationship	.34	.72	.84
21. Social Influences	.72	.45	.62
22. Social Involvement	.42	.44	.61
Total		.83	.91

Note.  $r$  = item-total correlations. For all  $r$ 's,  $p < .01$ . ICC = interclass correlation for a single rating (ICC<sub>1</sub>) and for averaged ratings (ICC<sub>2</sub>). For all ICC's,  $p < .001$ .

**Table III. Predictive Validity for Items and Total Score**

Item	Type of Recidivism AUC (95% confidence interval)				
	Sexual (n=25)	Any Violent (n=40)	Any Criminal (n=75)	Violation of Release (n=238)	Return to Prison (n=182)
1. Admission of offense behavior	.66 (.54-.79)	.65 (.55-.74)	.59 (.52-.66)	.61 (.56-.65)	.59 (.54-.63)
2. Acceptance of responsibility	.64 (.52-.76)	.64 (.54-.73)	.57 (.50-.64)	.60 (.56-.64)	.59 (.55-.64)
3. Sexual Interests	.66 (.54-.77)	.58 (.49-.68)	.55 (.48-.62)	.58 (.54-.61)	.58 (.54-.62)
4. Sexual Attitudes	.75 (.65-.84)	.69 (.60-.78)	.62 (.55-.69)	.66 (.63-.70)	.66 (.61-.70)
5. Sexual Behavior	.68 (.55-.80)	.62 (.52-.72)	.59 (.52-.66)	.61 (.57-.65)	.63 (.59-.68)
6. Sexual Risk Management	.73 (.63-.83)	.69 (.61-.77)	.64 (.57-.71)	.68 (.64-.72)	.68 (.64-.72)
7. Criminal Attitudes	.66 (.54-.78)	.69 (.60-.78)	.68 (.62-.74)	.71 (.68-.75)	.72 (.68-.76)
8. Criminal Behavior	.65 (.53-.77)	.65 (.56-.74)	.68 (.61-.75)	.67 (.65-.72)	.71 (.67-.76)
9. Substance Abuse	.57 (.44-.69)	.57 (.48-.67)	.60 (.53-.67)	.59 (.55-.63)	.57 (.53-.62)
10. Emotion Management	.65 (.54-.76)	.61 (.52-.70)	.65 (.58-.71)	.66 (.62-.70)	.66 (.62-.70)
11. Mental Health Stability	.54 (.42-.66)	.53 (.44-.63)	.52 (.45-.59)	.59 (.55-.63)	.61 (.56-.65)
12. Problem Solving	.63 (.52-.74)	.63 (.55-.72)	.67 (.60-.73)	.71 (.67-.74)	.72 (.69-.76)
13. Impulsivity	.61 (.50-.72)	.63 (.55-.72)	.66 (.59-.72)	.71 (.68-.75)	.71 (.67-.75)
14. Stage of Change	.65 (.54-.76)	.63 (.54-.73)	.63 (.56-.69)	.69 (.66-.73)	.70 (.66-.73)
15. Cooperation with Treatment	.61 (.49-.74)	.63 (.53-.72)	.64 (.57-.71)	.72 (.68-.75)	.71 (.67-.75)
16. Cooperation with Supervision	.57 (.45-.70)	.62 (.53-.71)	.64 (.57-.71)	.70 (.67-.74)	.70 (.66-.75)
17. Employment	.55 (.43-.66)	.60 (.50-.69)	.60 (.53-.67)	.68 (.65-.72)	.70 (.66-.74)
18. Residence	.63 (.51-.75)	.68 (.60-.77)	.64 (.57-.71)	.68 (.64-.72)	.69 (.64-.73)
19. Finances	.58 (.46-.70)	.64 (.55-.73)	.64 (.58-.71)	.70 (.66-.73)	.71 (.67-.75)
20. Adult Love Relationship	.60 (.49-.71)	.55 (.47-.63)	.59 (.53-.66)	.63 (.60-.67)	.64 (.60-.68)
21. Social Influences	.67 (.56-.79)	.66 (.58-.75)	.67 (.61-.73)	.69 (.65-.73)	.71 (.67-.75)
22. Social Involvement	.66 (.56-.76)	.64 (.56-.71)	.63 (.57-.68)	.65 (.62-.69)	.67 (.63-.71)
Total Score	.72 (.62-.82)	.72 (.64-.80)	.72 (.67-.78)	.79 (.76-.81)	.79 (.76-.82)

Note. Recidivism is defined as a charge for a new offense or a reincarceration. Analyses are based on a total  $N$  of 835 participants who were followed up an average of four times each at 6-months intervals for a total of 3,153 6-month follow-up periods.

**Table IV. Recidivism Events by TPS Risk Levels**

Score	Risk Level	6-month Follow-up Periods		Type of Recidivism									
				Sexual		Any Violent		Any Criminal		Violation of Probation		Return to Prison	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0-9	Low	1,258	39.9	5	0.4	7	0.6	10	0.8	19	1.5	13	1.0
10-19	Moderate	1,152	36.6	7	0.6	11	1.0	25	2.3	71	6.2	52	4.5
20-29	High	487	15.4	6	1.2	11	2.3	20	4.1	78	16.0	60	12.3
30+	Very High	256	8.1	7	2.7	11	4.3	20	7.8	70	27.3	57	22.3
Total		3,153	100.0	25	0.8	40	1.3	75	2.4	238	7.5	182	5.8

Note. Analyses are based on a total  $N$  of 835 participants who were followed up an average of four times each at 6-months intervals for a total of 3,153 6-month follow-up periods.

Scale available at [www.csom.org](http://www.csom.org).

Contact information: [rmcgrath@sover.net](mailto:rmcgrath@sover.net).

#### **Appendix 4: Timeline**

Quarter One:

Hiring of staff, design of data collection procedures and recording

Quarters two

Training of Data Collectors

Quarters Three through Six

Data collection

Quarters Seven and Eight

Data Analysis and Review

Report

**Appendix 5: Key Project Personnel**

Georgia Cumming, Director, Vermont Treatment for Sexual Abusers

Robert McGrath, Clinical Director, Vermont Treatment for Sexual Abusers

**A MODEL OF STATIC AND DYNAMIC SEX OFFENDER RISK  
ASSESSMENT**

**Revised 2/11/2008**

**Budget Detail Worksheet**

**June 26, 2007 (Revised 11/15/2007)**

**A. Personnel**

Name/Position	Computation	Cost

**SUB-TOTAL \$-  
Federal Funds - \$ 0  
State Funds \$0**

**B. Fringe Benefits**

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
na		

**SUB-TOTAL \$-**

**C. Travel**

Purpose	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
Data collection	Statewide	Mileage reimbursement	Travel to courts and public records (2 researchers x75 mi x\$0.485 x 50 trips	\$3,587
Project Director	Washington, DC, Other Sites	Air travel, hotel, Meals	3 events @ \$1,500 average round trip TML	\$4,500
Project Director	Statewide	Mileage reimbursement	500 miles/month x 12 months x \$.485 x 2 years	\$5,820

**SUB-TOTAL \$13,907**

**D. Equipment**

Item	Computation	Cost
None		\$0

**SUB-TOTAL \$0**

**E. Supplies**

Item	Computation	Cost
2 Laptop Computers &	State Purchase @ \$1500.00 each	\$3,000
Color Printer	State purchase @\$500.00	500
4 copies SPSS Statistical Analysis Software	\$500 each	2,000

**SUB-TOTAL \$5,500****F. Construction**

Purpose	Description of Work	Cost
None		\$0

**SUB-TOTAL \$0****G. Consultants/Contracts**

Item	Cost
Contracts – Project Director – 20 hrs/mo for 3 mo, Hiring 40 hrs/mo for 3 mo, Training 40 hrs/mo for 12 mos, Data Collection Supervision 40 hrs/mo for 6 mos, Analysis and Report Writing =900 hrs @ \$80/hr	\$72,000
Contract – Data Collection 2-20 hrs /wk for 3 mos, Training 2-20 hrs/ wk for 12 mos, Data Retrieval =2520 hrs @\$24/hr	\$60,4800
Contract – Statistical analysis 100 hours @ \$100/hour	\$10,000
Contract --	

**SUB-TOTAL \$142,000****H. Other Costs**

Description	Computation	Cost
none		

**SUB-TOTAL \$-****I. Indirect Costs**

Description	Computation	Cost
None		\$0

**SUB-TOTAL \$-**



## Budget Summary

<u>Budget Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
A. Personnel	\$0.00
B. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00
C. Travel	\$13,907.00
D. Equipment	\$0.00
E. Supplies	\$5,500.00
F. Construction	\$0.00
G. Consultants/Contracts	\$142,000.00
H. Other	\$0.00
<b>Total Direct Costs</b>	<b>\$161,307.00</b>
I. Indirect Costs	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>\$161,307.00</b>
<b>Total Federal Funds Requested</b>	<b>\$161,307.00</b>
<b>State Funds</b>	

***A MODEL OF STATIC AND DYNAMIC SEX OFFENDER RISK  
ASSESSMENT  
Revised 2/11/2008  
Budget Narrative  
June 26, 2007***

**Project Timeline**

Quarter One:

Hiring of staff, design data collection procedures and recording

Quarters two

Training of Data Collectors and Probation Staff

Quarters Three through Six

Data collection

Quarters Seven and Eight

Data Analysis and Review  
Report

**Narrative**

The first quarter will be spent by the project director and administrative support making arrangements with 13 Vermont District Courts, the Court Administrator's office, and with the Vermont Crime Information Center (VCIC) for access to conviction records and documents at court, to include affidavits. This will involve executing Memoranda Of Understandings with the Vermont Crime Information Center for criminal record checks.

In addition, during this period two data collector personnel will be recruited and hired. Also during this period the Project Director will examine the existing database on some 950 sex offenders and updating information as needed. The result of this activity will be to identify the subject population. A part of the Director's time in the first quarter will involve the design and development of the data collection instrumentation and computer software.

It is estimated that this quarter will involve about 20 hours per month of the Project Director's time, contracted at \$80.00 per hour.

Second quarter will involve training of the data collectors, to include familiarization with the Vermont Criminal Justice Records system and data sources in the Courts, Public Safety, and Corrections. Training for data collectors will focus on scoring the TPS, the Static-99, the VASOR and the RRASOR and establishing inter-rater reliability with instrumentation will be crucial. The Project Director will also train identified Probation Officers on scoring the TPS. The data collectors will begin data retrieval at the conclusion of training. This is estimated to comprise 40 hours per month for three months of the Project Director's time, and involve the two data collectors for 20 hours per week for three months.

Third through sixth quarters will comprise the bulk of the data retrieval work, involving two collectors working 20 hours per week for a year. After data collection, the staff will conduct file reviews and rescore all subjects in the study on all of the instrumentation. A database will be maintained on the nature of scoring discrepancies between original and re-scores. Data will be recorded on laptop computers and downloaded to Project Director's computer for analysis.

Supervision of this activity will require approximately 40 hours per month for the Project Director.

Seventh and Eighth quarters will comprise analysis of data and report writing. Final data retrieval will be completed.

**A. Personnel** **\$.00**

There are no personnel positions associated with this grant. All management coordination and administrative support for the project will be provided by the Vermont Department of Corrections. In addition, Probation officer time for training and scoring on dynamic risk assessment instrumentation is an inkind contribution for the grant.

**B. Fringe Benefits** **\$.00**

There are no personnel positions associated with this grant. All administrative support for the project will be provided by the Vermont Department of Corrections as inkind contribution.

**C. Travel** **\$13,907.00**

Travel expenses include the costs for data retrieval staff to travel to the fourteen district court offices across the state of Vermont, to obtain documents (e.g., affidavits) that are not available electronically. These documents are necessary to provide detailed information for risk assessment.

Travel costs for the project director are also included, based on State of Vermont reimbursement rates. It is also anticipated that during the course of the project, the director and other staff will participate in up to three national conferences on sex offender risk prediction and related topics, both to present findings and to share information.

Costs for travel are estimated as follows: These conferences will likely be the Center for Sex Offender Management or similar conferences in Fall, and Spring during the two year grant period. It is estimated that two persons will attend these conferences, for 2-3 days. The next conference is in Atlanta, and that was used for estimates.

Computation of travel costs

Round trip airfare \$400 x 2 persons x 3 trips	\$2,400
Hotel @150 pn x 2 nites x 2 persons x 3 trips	1,800
Meals VT rates \$32/diem x 2 days x 2 pers x 3 trips	384
Sum	\$4,584

**D. Equipment** **\$0.00**

No equipment is requested for this grant. All office space and equipment will be furnished by the Vermont Department of Corrections.

**E. Supplies** **\$5,500.00**

Two laptop computers are required for the collection of the data from courts and case records. The project will also utilize SPSS as the statistical analysis package, and this will be installed in two new computers as well as the computers of the project director and VTPSA Director.

**F. Construction** **\$0.00**

No construction is associated with this project.

**Consultants/Contracts** **\$142,000.00**

1. Contract for the project director, Robert McGrath, will provide a total of 900 hours during the 2-year period of the grant, @ \$80.00 per hour. This contract will include recruiting and training staff, overseeing data collection, providing data analysis and writing interim and final reports.
2. Contracts will be written to provide two part-time data collectors to accomplish the data retrieval component of the project. Under the direction of the project director, these two persons will receive training on risk assessment instrumentation, and will provide 20 hours per week average each to collect data on some 950 different offenders and rescore each participant on all static risk instruments.
3. Additional consultation for advanced statistical analysis will be contracted with Dr. Timothy Stickle, Department of Psychology, University of Vermont. These costs are estimated at 100 hours, @ \$100 per hour.

**H. Other** **\$0.00**

There are no additional costs.

**A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment**

**Proposal to the National Institute of Justice**

**From**

**The Vermont Department of Corrections**

**July 13, 2007**

## Abstract

During the last decade, researchers have developed several risk instruments for adult male sex offenders that predict with moderate accuracy their long term risk of sexual reoffending. But because most of these instruments are composed of static, that is unchangeable, risk factors, they are not useful for predicting an individual's short term risk to reoffend or how to reduce or measure changes in that risk. This requires instruments composed of dynamic, that is changeable, risk factors.

The Vermont Department of Corrections (DOC) developed such a dynamic risk assessment instrument in 2001 through a grant from the U. S. Department of Justice. The instrument, the Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale (TPS; McGrath & Cumming, 2003), consists of 22 dynamic risk factors linked to sexual offending.

Since 2001, the Vermont DOC's statewide network of community-based sex offender treatment providers have scored every adult male sex offender that they serve on the TPS at intake and every six months thereafter. Providers have used this information for treatment planning, probation and parole officers have used it for case management, and DOC has retained it for research purposes. The DOC now has multiple TPS scores on over 1,100 sex offenders. This data base also contains demographic data on each of these sex offenders and their scores on three other commonly used sex offender risk measures, the Static-99, RRASOR, and VASOR.

Recent research indicates that combining static and dynamic risk factors may better predict sexual offending than either static or dynamic instruments alone. Consequently, this prospective study will examine how the TPS and Static-99, the most commonly used sex offender risk instrument used in the United States, can be combined into an overall model of risk

assessment. Analyses will also be conducted to determine if RRASOR and VASOR scores will improve the predictive accuracy of the model.

Recidivism data on approximately 950 adult male sex offenders will be analyzed at three-year fixed follow-up periods for all new charges for sexual, violent, and other offenses. An empirically derived decision matrix will be created to provide guidance to administrators and service providers about how to allocate and deliver services based on an individual's risk to sexually reoffend using a model that integrates offenders' scores on static and dynamic risk measures.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Table of contents	iv
Purpose, Goals and Objectives	1
Review of Relevant Literature	1
Research Design and Methods	6
Implications for Policy and Practice	12
Management Plan and Organization	13
Dissemination Strategy	14
Appendix 1 – references	15
Appendix 2 – Previous NIJ Grants	19
Appendix 3 – Predictive Validity of the Treatment Progress Scale	20
Appendix 4 – Timeline	22
Appendix 5 – Key Project Personnel	
Vitae	

Robert McGrath

Timothy Stickle



## Purpose, Goals, and Objectives

The purpose of this grant is to improve the ability of corrections and mental health professionals to predict sexual reoffense risk among adult male sex offenders.

The goal is to develop a model of combining static and dynamic risk factors in a manner that better predicts sexual reoffending than using either static or dynamic risk factors alone.

Study objectives are to answer the following questions:

1. What is the best composition and weighting of items that comprise the TPS?
2. What is the best method of combining scores on the Static-99 and TPS to maximize predictive validity?
3. Does use of the RRASOR or VASOR improve the predictive accuracy of the model?
4. Are adjustments to the model necessary for improving its predictive accuracy among offenders who target child versus adult victims?
5. Are there significant differences between field and research reliabilities of the instruments studied?

## Review of Relevant Literature

Of all crimes, sex offenses have arguably provoked the greatest public concern and legislative attention in recent years. State legislators introduced more laws concerning sex offenders during 2006 legislative sessions than during any other period in our nation's history (Bumby, 2007). Recent crime-control efforts targeting sex offenders have included legislation in the areas of sentencing, registration, community notification, residency restrictions, electronic monitoring, and supervision. Some legislation and jurisdictions have applied these and other interventions without regard to variations in sex offenders' risk to reoffend. However, research

on effective correctional practice stresses the importance of moving beyond a “one size fits all” approach.

Not all sex offenders pose the same risk to reoffend. Taking individual differences into consideration and matching the intensity of interventions to the risk level of the offender can have a considerable impact on reducing reoffense rates (Andrews & Bonta, 2006). This strategy is known as the *risk principle*. It now forms the cornerstone of general correctional intervention programs in numerous jurisdictions throughout the world (Hollin, 2002). Those at higher risk to reoffend are allocated to higher intensity supervision and treatment interventions and those with lower risk, to lower intensity services. A recent meta-analysis has supported the applicability of the risk principle in sex offender management as well (Hanson, 2006).

Following the risk principle helps service professionals and policy makers allocate resources in an informed and rational manner, make decisions uniformly, and reduce reoffense rates. It also helps prevent some unintended consequences of some types of correctional intervention activities. Intensive supervision and treatment services imposed on low risk offenders have been associated with increased reoffense rates among the general criminal population (Andrews & Bonta, 2006) and this same negative impact is likely found among sex offenders as well.

Application of the risk principle requires that an offender’s risk level be identified using validated risk instruments. The most commonly used and well-established risk-estimation instruments for adult male sexual offenders are actuarial ones composed primarily of static risk factors (e.g., Static-99, RRASOR, VASOR, and MnSOST-R; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2007; McGrath, Cumming, & Burchard, 2003). Static risk factors are unchangeable historical variables such as the number of prior sexual offense convictions and history of non-sexual criminal

activity. Static risk instruments are effective in predicting the long-term reoffense risk of offenders, but because they are composed of unchangeable risk factors, do not provide probation and parole officers, treatment providers, or policy makers direction about how to help offenders reduce their risk or assess how successful they have been in doing so.

To identify targets for supervision and treatment intervention, as well as measure change in reoffense risk, knowledge of dynamic risk factors, sometimes called criminogenic needs, is required. These are potentially changeable offense-related aspects of an individual's functioning, such as pro-offending attitudes and lifestyle stability variables. Correctional programs that focus on helping offenders change these types of problems that are causally linked to the offending behavior are more successful than those that do not. This is called the *need principle*, a second major principle of effective correctional practice (Andrews & Bonta, 2006; Hanson, 2006).

Unfortunately, research on dynamic risk factors, as well as the development of dynamic risk instruments for use with sex offenders, has been limited. However, a few promising dynamic instruments exist. The Stable 2007 and Acute 2007 have been designed for use by probation and parole officers (Hansen & Harris, 2007; Harris, 2007) and the Structured Risk Assessment (Knight & Thornton, 2007; Thornton, 2002) has been designed for use by clinicians.

As research on dynamic risk measures has increased, so has interest in how combining static and dynamic risk factors may better predict sexual offending than either static or dynamic measures alone. Evidence from several preliminary studies suggests that this combined approach may be the most effective (Beech, Friendship, Erikson, & Hanson, 2002; Hanson & Harris, 2000; Harris, 2007; Knight & Thornton, 2007; Thornton, 2002). In these studies, the predictive accuracy of static actuarial instruments were improved when selected dynamic risk factors were added to the prediction scheme.

Of further importance is whether changes in the number and severity of dynamic risk factors results in predictable changes in reoffense risk. Although a recent meta-analysis found that assessments of progress in treatment had little relationship to reoffense rates (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005), other studies have found that some empirically-based approaches to assessing treatment gains have a moderate relationship to sexual reoffending. (Beech, Erikson, Friendship, & Ditchfield, 2001; Marques, Wiederanders, Day, Nelson, & VanOmmeren, 2005).

Clearly, empirically-based approaches to assessing risk and treatment progress hold the greatest promise. Considerable research indicates that actuarial methods of prediction outperform clinical ones (Grove & Meehl, 1996; Hanson, 2006) and, more to the point, that the clinical adjustment of actuarial instruments is more likely than not to reduce accuracy than to enhance it (Grove & Meehl, 1996; Grove, Zald, Lebow, Snitz, & Nelson, 2000).

Of the two most promising actuarial models that integrate static and dynamic risk factors, the Structured Risk Assessment has focused on how a clinician scored scale can improve the prediction of long-term risk of reoffending (Knight & Thornton, 2007; Thornton, 2002). In contrast, the Stable 2007 and Acute 2007 are designed to improve the prediction of short-term risk of reoffending. It is intended to help supervising officers recalibrate an individual's risk level at intervals of between one and six months. Encouraging results of research on these newly revised scales is just beginning to be disseminated (e.g., Harris, 2007).

The focus of the present study is the Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale (TPS; McGrath & Cumming, 2003). It is a provider-administered dynamic measure designed to aid clinicians and probation and parole officers in identifying and monitoring the treatment needs, supervision needs, and progress of adult male sex offenders. Hanson (2006) has categorized the TPS as "conceptual-actuarial" instrument because items were conceptually

derived on the basis of professional consensus, literature review, and theory, have defined scoring rules, and total scores are used in an actuarial manner. The scale is composed of 22 dynamic risk factors.

Each risk factor is detailed in a manual and scored using a 6-month recency time frame on a 4-point scale ranging from *minimal to no need for improvement* to *very considerable need for improvement*. Scores are recorded on a scoring sheet and summed to yield a total score. It is designed to score clients at intake and thereafter every six months. Item scores are intended to reflect an individual's relative treatment and supervision need on each factor. The total score is intended to provide an estimation of an individual's overall level of need for supervision and treatment. A preliminary report (see Appendix 3; McGrath, Cumming, & Livingston, 2005) indicates that it has acceptable psychometric properties. It can be scored reliably. The interclass correlation for a single rating was .83 and for averaged ratings was .91. The total score predicted sexual reoffending with moderate accuracy (AUC = .72; CI = .62-.82).

The purpose of the present study is to advance risk assessment of sexual offenders by developing a method by which static and dynamic risk factors can be combined into an overall evaluation of risk. We hypothesize that a combination of the TPS and Static-99 will better predict sexual offending than either instrument alone. We hope that this approach will enhance the ability of treatment providers, probation and parole officers, and policy makers to predict sex offender's risk to reoffend over the short term, and design rational risk management and reduction programs based on individual risks and needs.

## **Research Design and Methods**

### **Setting**

Vermont is a state of small cities, towns and rural areas with a population of approximately 623,908 (U. S. Census Bureau, 2007). The Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Abusers (VTPSA) is the state's integrated network of three prison and 13 outpatient programs operated by the Vermont Department of Corrections (DOC). The program utilizes a primarily cognitive-behavioral, group treatment model and treatment providers and supervision officers work as a collaborative team (McGrath, 1995; McGrath, Cumming, Livingston, & Hoke, 2003; McGrath, Hoke, & Vojtisek, 1998).

### **Subjects**

The subjects in this study will be the exhaustive sample of approximately 950 adult male sex offenders who were in the community on probation or parole and participated in a Vermont DOC sponsored sex offender treatment program between April 1, 2001 and October 31, 2006. Approximately 350 of these subjects were in treatment for various lengths of time at the start date of the study and the other approximately 600 subjects first entered treatment on or after that date.

Each subject has an index sexual offense involving a non-consenting adult or child victim. Excluded from the study will be individuals whose only sexual offense was statutory rape, child pornography possession, or other sexually-related offenses that precluded them from being scored on the Static-99. Based on an analysis of the current sample and definitions established by the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (Gordon et al., 1998), we expect the final sample to be composed of approximately 25% rapists, 15% non-contact sex offenders, 10% incest offenders, 50% child molesters.

## Measures

Four measures will be used, each of which is described below. The primary focus of this study will be how the TPS, a dynamic risk instrument, and the Static-99, a static risk instrument, can be combined into an overall model of risk assessment. A secondary focus of the study will be on whether the RRASOR or VASOR will contribute to the overall prediction model.

**Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale Sex Offender (TPS)** (McGrath & Cumming, 2003). The TPS is a provider-administered dynamic measure designed to aid clinicians and probation and parole officers in identifying and monitoring the treatment needs, supervision needs, and progress of adult male sex offenders. Hanson (2006) has categorized the TPS as “conceptual-actuarial” instrument because items were conceptually derived on the basis of professional consensus, literature review, and theory, have defined scoring rules, and total scores are used in an actuarial manner. The scale is composed of 22 dynamic risk factors. Each risk factor is detailed in a manual and scored using a 6-month recency time frame on a 4-point scale ranging from *minimal to no need for improvement* to *very considerable need for improvement*. Scores are recorded on a scoring sheet and summed to yield a total score. It is designed to score clients at intake and thereafter every six months. Item scores are intended to reflect an individual's relative treatment and supervision need on each factor. The total score is intended to provide an estimation of an individual's overall level of need for supervision and treatment. A preliminary report (see Appendix A; McGrath, Cumming, & Livingston, 2005) indicates that it has acceptable psychometric properties. It can be scored reliably. The interclass correlation for a single rating was .83 and for averaged ratings was .91. The total score predicted sexual reoffending with moderate accuracy (AUC = .72; CI = .62-.82).

**Static-99** (Hanson & Thornton, 2000; Harris et al., 2003). The Static-99 is a 10-item actuarial risk measure used to aid in assessing sexual recidivism risk among adult males who have been convicted of committing sexual offenses. The Static-99 was chosen for use in the current project because it commonly used and this will make it easier for programs throughout the United States to implement practical findings resulting from this study. A recent nationwide survey found that the Static-99 is used by 54 percent of community programs for adult male sex offenders (McGrath, Cumming, & Burchard, 2003). As well, it is in the public domain and it has good psychometric properties. The ten items which comprise the Static-99 are: number of prior charges or convictions for sexual offenses, age at placement in the community, any male victims, any unrelated victims, any stranger victims, prior sentencing dates, any convictions for non-contact sexual offenses, index offense of a non-sexual violent nature, prior non-sexual violent offense, and lack of a substantial cohabitation history. Scores fall into one of seven levels reflecting the probability of sexual reoffending at five-, 10-, and 15-year intervals. The Static-99 has shown moderate accuracy in the prediction of sexual reoffending in multiple studies throughout North America and Europe, as well as in Vermont. Across 42 samples involving 13,288 sex offenders the average  $d$  was .70 (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2007).

**The Rapid Risk Assessment for Sex Offense Recidivism (RRASOR; Hanson, 1997)** is a 4-item actuarial risk measure used to aid in assessing sexual recidivism risk among adult males who have been convicted of committing sexual offenses. The four RRASOR items are also found in the Static-99. These are number of prior charges or convictions for sexual offenses, age at placement in the community, any male victims, and any unrelated victims. Scores fall into one of six levels reflecting the probability of sexual reoffending at five- and 10-year intervals.



**Vermont Assessment of Sex Offender Risk (VASOR;** McGrath & Hoke, 2001) is a risk scale designed to aid probation and parole officers in making placement and supervision decisions about adult males who have been convicted of committing sexual offenses. A 13-item re-offense risk scale is composed of many of the unchangeable risk factors found on the Static-99 as well as several changeable risk factors, such as alcohol and drug use, residence and employment stability, and treatment cooperation. Scores on this scale fall into one of three levels reflecting the probability of sexual reoffending at five years. The six-item violence scale concerns the individual's violence history and offense severity.

### **Outcome Measures**

Recidivism data will be obtained for each subject for all new charges for sexual, any violent, and any criminal offense, as well as violation of supervision charges and re-incarcerations. Charges will be based on criminal record checks in the states where each participant was known to have resided during the study period. The Vermont DOC computer database will be used to identify violation of supervision charges and re-incarcerations.

### **Procedure**

A DOC data base containing information on approximately 950 sex offenders who meet criteria for inclusion in the study (see "Subject" section above) will be updated and analyzed. Current data on each subject includes demographic information, initial scores on the TPS, Static-99, RRASOR, and VASOR, and reassessment scores on the TPS at six month intervals. The DOC network of contracted community sex offender treatment providers has collected this data for treatment, supervision, and research purposes as part of their routine assessment practice since 2001. To ensure the largest possible sample size, six-month TPS reassessment scores will continue to be entered into the data base during the first 14 months of the grant period.

Although all treatment providers who have submitted information to the data base have received training on how to score instruments used in the study, it is important to ensure the accuracy of these scores. As Campbell (2004) has observed, there are often differences between the field reliabilities and research reliabilities of actuarial instruments. Research reliability refers to the inter-rater reliabilities obtained from researchers who are well trained with a given instrument and field reliability refers to the inter-rater reliabilities obtained by community practitioners providing services in the field. Consequently, project staff will conduct file reviews and rescore all subjects on the Static-99, RRASOR, and VASOR and maintain a data base on the nature and type of scoring discrepancies. In cases in which scoring discrepancies exist, a third staff member will help reconcile the differences. All scorers will be blinded to subjects' recidivism data.

Retrospective inter-rater reliability analyses of TPS scores would be difficult to conduct. Each TPS score is suppose to reflect an individual's functioning using a 6-month recency time frame and typically past records do not document all the necessary scoring data. Consequently, during the grant period, 100 consecutive cases scored by subjects' treatment providers during the normal course of services will be independently scored by the subjects' probation or parole officers. Selected probation and parole officers will be trained on how to score the TPS, will have supervised the offender for a period of six or more months, and will have agreed to participate in the study.

Reoffense data for all subjects at a fixed three-year follow-up period will be collected and analyzed for the five types of recidivism events described in the "Outcome Measures" section above.

## **Analyses**

Standard descriptive statistics will be used to describe study subjects.

Inter-rater reliability for a single rating and for the average of multiple independent ratings will be computed using multiple methods, but primarily using a one-way, random-effects ANOVA model intraclass correlation coefficient.

Univariate analyses will compare recidivists and non-recidivists on each of the five outcome criteria at fixed three-year follow-up periods. These are new charges for sexual, any violent, and any criminal offenses, as well as violation of supervision charges and re-incarcerations. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) statistic will be used measure the predictive accuracy of each item on the TPS and total scores of each of the other risk instruments. AUC values are the recommended index of predictive accuracy for relatively low base rate phenomena such as sexual reoffending. Because each subject will have multiple TPS scores, each representing their functioning for a previous six-month period, we will examine the best method of combining TPS scores and using different cut-off points.

Survival analyses techniques, primarily the Kaplan-Meier statistic, will be used to analyze the length of time between subject's placement in the community and any recidivism events.

Cox Regression analyses will be used to examine the relationship of various risk factors their interactions to risk of recidivism at a particular time.

We will use the results of these analyses to create an empirically derived decision matrix that integrates offenders' scores on the selected static and dynamic risk measures into an overall risk assessment model. Table 1 in the next section shows an example of such a matrix, although this example was clinically derived.

### **Implication for Policy and Practice**

We hope that this study will advance risk assessment of sexual offenders by developing a model by which static and dynamic risk factors can be combined into an overall evaluation of risk.

The policy implications of such a model are that it would help jurisdictions: (1) allocate resources in an informed and rational manner, (2) make decisions about level of supervision and intervention in an efficient manner, (3) make decisions uniformly, and (4) reduce the risk of re-offense.

In terms of practice implications, we hope that the study results will provide treatment providers and probation and parole officers with a simple, friendly, face valid, and empirically supported decision making matrix that will guide them in delivering services to sex offenders.

Table 1 shows an example of such a model that we hope will result from this study. It is the decision matrix that we are currently testing and using in Vermont to provide guidance to administrators and service providers about how to allocate and deliver services. To illustrate, an offender whose Static-99 risk level is low and TPS risk level is moderate-high would be considered to need a moderate-low level of supervision and treatment. Depending upon an offender's sentence structure, this would help determine the prison treatment program to which he would be assigned (i.e., low, moderate, or high intensity program) and the length of his outpatient treatment program. It would also help determine his level of community supervision. Changes in his scores on the TPS at six-month reassessment would influence changes in his supervision level. Based on a recent analysis of the data base that will be used in this study, of 835 sex offenders on probation or parole in Vermont in 2006, this matrix classified 40% as low risk/need, 40% moderate-low risk/need, 14% moderate-high risk/need, and 6% high risk/need.

The model would offer a standardized empirically-derived assessment process for identifying sex offenders' risk level and treatment and supervision needs. Additionally, providers and administrators could use it to assess progress, recalibrate services, anchor decision making, increase accountability, assess intermediate outcomes, and inform program planning and development.

**Table 1. Example of a Matrix for Matching Supervision and Treatment Intensity to Offender Risk and Need**

		Dynamic Risk Level			
		Low TPS = 0-9	Moderate-Low TPS = 10-19	Moderate-High TPS = 20-29	High TPS = 30<
Static Risk Level					
<b>Low</b>	Static-99 = 0-1	low	low	moderate-low	moderate-high
<b>Moderate-Low</b>	Static-99 = 2-3	low	moderate-low	moderate-high	moderate-high
<b>Moderate-High</b>	Static-99 = 4-5	low	moderate-low	moderate-high	high
<b>High</b>	Static-99 = 6-12	moderate-low	moderate-high	high	high

**Management Plan and Organization**

The administration of grant funds will be managed by the Vermont Department of Corrections, Fiscal Office. The overall management of grant activities will be accomplished by the Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Abusers (VTPSA), a program of the Vermont Department of Corrections, under the administration of Georgia Cumming. The Project Director, Robert McGrath, has been the clinical director with the VTPSA for 23 years.

### **Dissemination Strategy**

The results of the study will be disseminated through multiple sources. The current TPS manual will be revised based on the findings in this study and it will be made available to interested parties. For example, as is the current manual, we plan make the revised manual available on the Center for Sex Offender Management's web site. We will submit proposals to the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers to present the results of the study at their annual treatment and research conference. One or more research papers will be submitted to refereed journals in the criminal justice field.

## Appendix 1

### References

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (4th ed.). Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Beech, A., Erikson, M., Friendship, C., & Ditchfield, J. (2001). *A six-year follow-up of men going through probation-based sex offender treatment programmes* (Findings #144). London, U.K.: Home Office.
- Beech, A., Friendship, C., Erikson, M., & Hanson, R. K. (2002). The relationship between static and dynamic risk factors and reconviction in a sample of U.K. child abusers. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14, 155-167.
- Bumby, K. (2007, January). *Legislative trends: an overview of state laws targeting sex offender*. Paper presented at the National Legislative Briefing on Sex Offender Management Policy in the States. January 27, 2007. Little Rock, AK.
- Campbell, T.W. (2004). *Assessing sex offenders: Problems and pitfalls*. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.
- Gordon, A., Harris, A., Murphy, W., Seto, M., Hanson, R. K., Marques, J. K., & Quinsey, V. L. (1998, July). *Collaborative data base of sex offender treatment outcome*. Beaverton, OR: Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers.
- Grove, W. M., & Meehl, P. E. (1996). Comparative efficiency of informal (subjective, impressionistic) and formal (mechanical, algorithmic) prediction procedures: The clinical-statistical controversy. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 2, 293-323.
- Grove, W. M., Zald, D. H., Lebow, B. S., Snitz, B. E., & Nelson, C. (2000). Clinical versus mechanical prediction: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 12, 19-30.

- Hanson, R. K. (1997). *The development of a brief actuarial risk scale for sexual offense recidivism* (User Rep. 97-04). Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Hanson, R. J. (2006, September). *What Works: The Principles of Effective Interventions with Offenders*. Presentation at the 25th Annual Convention of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago, September 29, 2006.
- Hanson, R. K. (2005). Stability and change: Dynamic risk factors for sexual offenders. In W. L. Marshall, Y. M. Fernandez, L. E. Marshall, & G. A. Serran (Eds.), *Sexual offender treatment: Issues and controversies* (pp. 17-31). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley.
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussière, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 348-362.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2000). Where should we intervene? Dynamic predictors of sex offense recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27*, 6-35.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2001). A structured approach to evaluating change among sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 13*, 105-122.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*, 1154-1163.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2007). *The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sexual offenders: A meta-analysis* (Corrections User Report No 2007-01). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving risk assessments for sex offenders: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*, 119-136.
- Harris, A. J. R. (2007). *Dynamic Risk Assessment: STABLE-2007 and ACUTE-2007 Training*.



- Workshop presentation at North American Correctional and Criminal Justice Psychology Conference. June 7-9, 2007. Ottawa.
- Hollin, C. R. (2002) Risk-need assessment and allocation to offender programmes. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *Offender rehabilitation and treatment: Effective programmes and policies to reduce re-offending* (pp. 309–332). West Sussex, England: Wiley.
- Knight, R. A., & Thornton, D. (2007, March). *Evaluating and improving risk assessment schemes for sexual recidivism: A long-term follow-up of convicted sexual offenders* (Document No.: 217618). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Marques, J. K., Wiederanders, M., Day, D. M., Nelson, C., & van Ommeren, A. (2005). Effects of a relapse prevention program on sexual recidivism: Final results from California's Sex Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project (SOTEP). *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 17*, 79-107.
- McGrath, R. J., & Cumming, G. F. (2003). *The Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale*. Middlebury, VT: Author.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., & Livingston, J. A. (2005). *Predictive validity of the Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Salt Lake City.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., & Burchard, B. L. (2003). *Current practices and trends in sexual abuser management: The Safer Society 2002 Nationwide Survey*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society.
- McGrath, R. J. (Ed.). (1995). *Vermont clinical practices guide for the assessment and treatment of adult sex offenders*. Williston, VT: Vermont Center for Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Abuse.

McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., & Burchard, B. L. (2003). *Current practices and trends in sexual abuser management: The Safer Society 2002 nationwide survey*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.

McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G., Livingston, J. A., & Hoke, S. E. (2003). Outcome of a treatment program for adult sex offenders: From prison to community. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 3-17.

McGrath, R. J., & Hoke, S. E. (2001). *Vermont Assessment of Sex Offender Risk Manual*. Middlebury, VT: Author.

McGrath, R. J., Hoke, S. E., & Vojtisek, J. E. (1998). Cognitive-behavioral treatment of sex offenders: A treatment comparison and long-term follow-up study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 25*, 203-225.

Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Interclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 420-428.

Thornton, D. (2002). Constructing and testing a framework for dynamic risk assessment. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 14*, 139-153.

## Appendix 2

### List of Previous and Current NIJ Awards

1. 2001 – Grant #2001-WP-BX-0019 Robert McGrath, Principal Investigator, Office of Justice Programs, grant to Vermont Department of Developmental Disabilities,
2. 2002 -- “Development of sex offender treatment needs and progress scale for adult sex offenders.” Grant #1000-Wp-VX-0001 from the U. S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, Robert McGrath, Principal Investigator.

**Appendix 3: Predictive Validity of the  
Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale (TPS)**

Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers 24<sup>th</sup> Annual Research and Treatment Conference  
November 16-19, 2005 - Salt Lake City, Utah

Robert J. McGrath, Georgia F. Cumming, and Joy Livingston

**Table I. Mean TPS Scores by Stage of Treatment and Completion Status**

Completion Status	TPS Score			
	Beginning of Treatment (n=170)		End of Treatment (n=170)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Completers (n=108)	15.48 <sup>a,b</sup>	10.05	8.69 <sup>a,c</sup>	8.06
Non-completers (n=62)	23.03 <sup>b</sup>	10.74	25.74 <sup>c</sup>	11.52

Note. Means in the same row or column that share a same subscript differ at  $p < .001$ .

**Table II. Item-total Correlations and Interrater Reliability**

Item	<i>r</i> (n=149)	ICC <sub>1</sub> (n=149)	ICC <sub>2</sub> (n=149)
1. Admission of Offense Behavior	.48	.60	.75
2. Acceptance of Responsibility	.53	.51	.68
3. Sexual Interests	.56	.51	.68
4. Sexual Attitudes	.72	.50	.67
5. Sexual Behavior	.40	.66	.80
6. Sexual Risk Management	.67	.46	.63
7. Criminal Attitudes	.64	.45	.62
8. Criminal Behavior	.55	.69	.81
9. Substance Abuse	.37	.57	.73
10. Emotion Management	.64	.41	.59
11. Mental Health Stability	.36	.47	.64
12. Problem Solving	.72	.46	.63
13. Impulsivity	.56	.55	.71
14. Stage of Change	.74	.63	.77
15. Cooperation with Treatment	.78	.71	.83
16. Cooperation with Supervision	.66	.68	.81
17. Employment	.62	.63	.77
18. Residence	.60	.60	.75
19. Finances	.58	.59	.74
20. Adult Love Relationship	.34	.72	.84
21. Social Influences	.72	.45	.62
22. Social Involvement	.42	.44	.61
Total		.83	.91

Note.  $r$  = item-total correlations. For all  $r$ 's,  $p < .01$ . ICC = interclass correlation for a single rating (ICC<sub>1</sub>) and for averaged ratings (ICC<sub>2</sub>). For all ICC's,  $p < .001$ .

**Table III. Predictive Validity for Items and Total Score**

Item	Type of Recidivism AUC (95% confidence interval)				
	Sexual (n=25)	Any Violent (n=40)	Any Criminal (n=75)	Violation of Release (n=238)	Return to Prison (n=182)
1. Admission of offense behavior	.66 (.54-.79)	.65 (.55-.74)	.59 (.52-.66)	.61 (.56-.65)	.59 (.54-.63)
2. Acceptance of responsibility	.64 (.52-.76)	.64 (.54-.73)	.57 (.50-.64)	.60 (.56-.64)	.59 (.55-.64)
3. Sexual Interests	.66 (.54-.77)	.58 (.49-.68)	.55 (.48-.62)	.58 (.54-.61)	.58 (.54-.62)
4. Sexual Attitudes	.75 (.65-.84)	.69 (.60-.78)	.62 (.55-.69)	.66 (.63-.70)	.66 (.61-.70)
5. Sexual Behavior	.68 (.55-.80)	.62 (.52-.72)	.59 (.52-.66)	.61 (.57-.65)	.63 (.59-.68)
6. Sexual Risk Management	.73 (.63-.83)	.69 (.61-.77)	.64 (.57-.71)	.68 (.64-.72)	.68 (.64-.72)
7. Criminal Attitudes	.66 (.54-.78)	.69 (.60-.78)	.68 (.62-.74)	.71 (.68-.75)	.72 (.68-.76)
8. Criminal Behavior	.65 (.53-.77)	.65 (.56-.74)	.68 (.61-.75)	.67 (.65-.72)	.71 (.67-.76)
9. Substance Abuse	.57 (.44-.69)	.57 (.48-.67)	.60 (.53-.67)	.59 (.55-.63)	.57 (.53-.62)
10. Emotion Management	.65 (.54-.76)	.61 (.52-.70)	.65 (.58-.71)	.66 (.62-.70)	.66 (.62-.70)
11. Mental Health Stability	.54 (.42-.66)	.53 (.44-.63)	.52 (.45-.59)	.59 (.55-.63)	.61 (.56-.65)
12. Problem Solving	.63 (.52-.74)	.63 (.55-.72)	.67 (.60-.73)	.71 (.67-.74)	.72 (.69-.76)
13. Impulsivity	.61 (.50-.72)	.63 (.55-.72)	.66 (.59-.72)	.71 (.68-.75)	.71 (.67-.75)
14. Stage of Change	.65 (.54-.76)	.63 (.54-.73)	.63 (.56-.69)	.69 (.66-.73)	.70 (.66-.73)
15. Cooperation with Treatment	.61 (.49-.74)	.63 (.53-.72)	.64 (.57-.71)	.72 (.68-.75)	.71 (.67-.75)
16. Cooperation with Supervision	.57 (.45-.70)	.62 (.53-.71)	.64 (.57-.71)	.70 (.67-.74)	.70 (.66-.75)
17. Employment	.55 (.43-.66)	.60 (.50-.69)	.60 (.53-.67)	.68 (.65-.72)	.70 (.66-.74)
18. Residence	.63 (.51-.75)	.68 (.60-.77)	.64 (.57-.71)	.68 (.64-.72)	.69 (.64-.73)
19. Finances	.58 (.46-.70)	.64 (.55-.73)	.64 (.58-.71)	.70 (.66-.73)	.71 (.67-.75)
20. Adult Love Relationship	.60 (.49-.71)	.55 (.47-.63)	.59 (.53-.66)	.63 (.60-.67)	.64 (.60-.68)
21. Social Influences	.67 (.56-.79)	.66 (.58-.75)	.67 (.61-.73)	.69 (.65-.73)	.71 (.67-.75)
22. Social Involvement	.66 (.56-.76)	.64 (.56-.71)	.63 (.57-.68)	.65 (.62-.69)	.67 (.63-.71)
Total Score	.72 (.62-.82)	.72 (.64-.80)	.72 (.67-.78)	.79 (.76-.81)	.79 (.76-.82)

*Note.* Recidivism is defined as a charge for a new offense or a reincarceration. Analyses are based on a total *N* of 835 participants who were followed up an average of four times each at 6-months intervals for a total of 3,153 6-month follow-up periods.

**Table IV. Recidivism Events by TPS Risk Levels**

Score	Risk Level	6-month Follow-up Periods		Type of Recidivism									
				Sexual		Any Violent		Any Criminal		Violation of Probation		Return to Prison	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0-9	Low	1,258	39.9	5	0.4	7	0.6	10	0.8	19	1.5	13	1.0
10-19	Moderate	1,152	36.6	7	0.6	11	1.0	25	2.3	71	6.2	52	4.5
20-29	High	487	15.4	6	1.2	11	2.3	20	4.1	78	16.0	60	12.3
30+	Very High	256	8.1	7	2.7	11	4.3	20	7.8	70	27.3	57	22.3
Total		3,153	100.0	25	0.8	40	1.3	75	2.4	238	7.5	182	5.8

*Note.* Analyses are based on a total *N* of 835 participants who were followed up an average of four times each at 6-months intervals for a total of 3,153 6-month follow-up periods.

Scale available at [www.csom.org](http://www.csom.org).

Contact information: [rncgrath@sover.net](mailto:rncgrath@sover.net).

**A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment**

**Proposal to the National Institute of Justice**

**From**

**The Vermont Department of Corrections**

**July 13, 2007**

## **Abstract**

During the last decade, researchers have developed several risk instruments for adult male sex offenders that predict with moderate accuracy their long term risk of sexual reoffending. But because most of these instruments are composed of static, that is unchangeable, risk factors, they are not useful for predicting an individual's short term risk to reoffend or how to reduce or measure changes in that risk. This requires instruments composed of dynamic, that is changeable, risk factors.

The Vermont Department of Corrections (DOC) developed such a dynamic risk assessment instrument in 2001 through a grant from the U. S. Department of Justice. The instrument, the Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale (TPS; McGrath & Cumming, 2003), consists of 22 dynamic risk factors linked to sexual offending.

Since 2001, the Vermont DOC's statewide network of community-based sex offender treatment providers have scored every adult male sex offender that they serve on the TPS at intake and every six months thereafter. Providers have used this information for treatment planning, probation and parole officers have used it for case management, and DOC has retained it for research purposes. The DOC now has multiple TPS scores on over 1,100 sex offenders. This data base also contains demographic data on each of these sex offenders and their scores on three other commonly used sex offender risk measures, the Static-99, RRASOR, and VASOR.

Recent research indicates that combining static and dynamic risk factors may better predict sexual offending than either static or dynamic instruments alone. Consequently, this prospective study will examine how the TPS and Static-99, the most commonly used sex offender risk instrument used in the United States, can be combined into an overall model of risk

assessment. Analyses will also be conducted to determine if RRASOR and VASOR scores will improve the predictive accuracy of the model.

Recidivism data on approximately 950 adult male sex offenders will be analyzed at three-year fixed follow-up periods for all new charges for sexual, violent, and other offenses. An empirically derived decision matrix will be created to provide guidance to administrators and service providers about how to allocate and deliver services based on an individual's risk to sexually reoffend using a model that integrates offenders' scores on static and dynamic risk measures.



Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Table of contents	iv
Purpose, Goals and Objectives	1
Review of Relevant Literature	1
Research Design and Methods	6
Implications for Policy and Practice	12
Management Plan and Organization	13
Dissemination Strategy	14
Appendix 1 – references	15
Appendix 2 – Previous NIJ Grants	19
Appendix 3 – Predictive Validity of the Treatment Progress Scale	20
Appendix 4 – Timeline	22
Appendix 5 – Key Project Personnel	
Vitae	

Robert McGrath

Timothy Stickle

## Purpose, Goals, and Objectives

The purpose of this grant is to improve the ability of corrections and mental health professionals to predict sexual reoffense risk among adult male sex offenders.

The goal is to develop a model of combining static and dynamic risk factors in a manner that better predicts sexual reoffending than using either static or dynamic risk factors alone.

Study objectives are to answer the following questions:

1. What is the best composition and weighting of items that comprise the TPS?
2. What is the best method of combining scores on the Static-99 and TPS to maximize predictive validity?
3. Does use of the RRASOR or VASOR improve the predictive accuracy of the model?
4. Are adjustments to the model necessary for improving its predictive accuracy among offenders who target child versus adult victims?
5. Are there significant differences between field and research reliabilities of the instruments studied?

## Review of Relevant Literature

Of all crimes, sex offenses have arguably provoked the greatest public concern and legislative attention in recent years. State legislators introduced more laws concerning sex offenders during 2006 legislative sessions than during any other period in our nation's history (Bumby, 2007). Recent crime-control efforts targeting sex offenders have included legislation in the areas of sentencing, registration, community notification, residency restrictions, electronic monitoring, and supervision. Some legislation and jurisdictions have applied these and other interventions without regard to variations in sex offenders' risk to reoffend. However, research

on effective correctional practice stresses the importance of moving beyond a “one size fits all” approach.

Not all sex offenders pose the same risk to reoffend. Taking individual differences into consideration and matching the intensity of interventions to the risk level of the offender can have a considerable impact on reducing reoffense rates (Andrews & Bonta, 2006). This strategy is known as the *risk principle*. It now forms the cornerstone of general correctional intervention programs in numerous jurisdictions throughout the world (Hollin, 2002). Those at higher risk to reoffend are allocated to higher intensity supervision and treatment interventions and those with lower risk, to lower intensity services. A recent meta-analysis has supported the applicability of the risk principle in sex offender management as well (Hanson, 2006).

Following the risk principle helps service professionals and policy makers allocate resources in an informed and rational manner, make decisions uniformly, and reduce reoffense rates. It also helps prevent some unintended consequences of some types of correctional intervention activities. Intensive supervision and treatment services imposed on low risk offenders have been associated with increased reoffense rates among the general criminal population (Andrews & Bonta, 2006) and this same negative impact is likely found among sex offenders as well.

Application of the risk principle requires that an offender’s risk level be identified using validated risk instruments. The most commonly used and well-established risk-estimation instruments for adult male sexual offenders are actuarial ones composed primarily of static risk factors (e.g., Static-99, RRASOR, VASOR, and MnSOST-R; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2007; McGrath, Cumming, & Burchard, 2003). Static risk factors are unchangeable historical variables such as the number of prior sexual offense convictions and history of non-sexual criminal

activity. Static risk instruments are effective in predicting the long-term reoffense risk of offenders, but because they are composed of unchangeable risk factors, do not provide probation and parole officers, treatment providers, or policy makers direction about how to help offenders reduce their risk or assess how successful they have been in doing so.

To identify targets for supervision and treatment intervention, as well as measure change in reoffense risk, knowledge of dynamic risk factors, sometimes called criminogenic needs, is required. These are potentially changeable offense-related aspects of an individual's functioning, such as pro-offending attitudes and lifestyle stability variables. Correctional programs that focus on helping offenders change these types of problems that are causally linked to the offending behavior are more successful than those that do not. This is called the *need principle*, a second major principle of effective correctional practice (Andrews & Bonta, 2006; Hanson, 2006).

Unfortunately, research on dynamic risk factors, as well as the development of dynamic risk instruments for use with sex offenders, has been limited. However, a few promising dynamic instruments exist. The Stable 2007 and Acute 2007 have been designed for use by probation and parole officers (Hansen & Harris, 2007; Harris, 2007) and the Structured Risk Assessment (Knight & Thornton, 2007; Thornton, 2002) has been designed for use by clinicians.

As research on dynamic risk measures has increased, so has interest in how combining static and dynamic risk factors may better predict sexual offending than either static or dynamic measures alone. Evidence from several preliminary studies suggests that this combined approach may be the most effective (Beech, Friendship, Erikson, & Hanson, 2002; Hanson & Harris, 2000; Harris, 2007; Knight & Thornton, 2007; Thornton, 2002). In these studies, the predictive accuracy of static actuarial instruments were improved when selected dynamic risk factors were added to the prediction scheme.

Of further importance is whether changes in the number and severity of dynamic risk factors results in predictable changes in reoffense risk. Although a recent meta-analysis found that assessments of progress in treatment had little relationship to reoffense rates (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005), other studies have found that some empirically-based approaches to assessing treatment gains have a moderate relationship to sexual reoffending. (Beech, Erikson, Friendship, & Ditchfield, 2001; Marques, Wiederanders, Day, Nelson, & VanOmmeren, 2005).

Clearly, empirically-based approaches to assessing risk and treatment progress hold the greatest promise. Considerable research indicates that actuarial methods of prediction outperform clinical ones (Grove & Meehl, 1996; Hanson, 2006) and, more to the point, that the clinical adjustment of actuarial instruments is more likely than not to reduce accuracy than to enhance it (Grove & Meehl, 1996; Grove, Zald, Lebow, Snitz, & Nelson, 2000).

Of the two most promising actuarial models that integrate static and dynamic risk factors, the Structured Risk Assessment has focused on how a clinician scored scale can improve the prediction of long-term risk of reoffending (Knight & Thornton, 2007; Thornton, 2002). In contrast, the Stable 2007 and Acute 2007 are designed to improve the prediction of short-term risk of reoffending. It is intended to help supervising officers recalibrate an individual's risk level at intervals of between one and six months. Encouraging results of research on these newly revised scales is just beginning to be disseminated (e.g., Harris, 2007).

The focus of the present study is the Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale (TPS; McGrath & Cumming, 2003). It is a provider-administered dynamic measure designed to aid clinicians and probation and parole officers in identifying and monitoring the treatment needs, supervision needs, and progress of adult male sex offenders. Hanson (2006) has categorized the TPS as "conceptual-actuarial" instrument because items were conceptually

derived on the basis of professional consensus, literature review, and theory, have defined scoring rules, and total scores are used in an actuarial manner. The scale is composed of 22 dynamic risk factors.

Each risk factor is detailed in a manual and scored using a 6-month recency time frame on a 4-point scale ranging from *minimal to no need for improvement* to *very considerable need for improvement*. Scores are recorded on a scoring sheet and summed to yield a total score. It is designed to score clients at intake and thereafter every six months. Item scores are intended to reflect an individual's relative treatment and supervision need on each factor. The total score is intended to provide an estimation of an individual's overall level of need for supervision and treatment. A preliminary report (see Appendix 3; McGrath, Cumming, & Livingston, 2005) indicates that it has acceptable psychometric properties. It can be scored reliably. The interclass correlation for a single rating was .83 and for averaged ratings was .91. The total score predicted sexual reoffending with moderate accuracy (AUC = .72; CI = .62-.82).

The purpose of the present study is to advance risk assessment of sexual offenders by developing a method by which static and dynamic risk factors can be combined into an overall evaluation of risk. We hypothesize that a combination of the TPS and Static-99 will better predict sexual offending than either instrument alone. We hope that this approach will enhance the ability of treatment providers, probation and parole officers, and policy makers to predict sex offender's risk to reoffend over the short term, and design rational risk management and reduction programs based on individual risks and needs.

## **Research Design and Methods**

### **Setting**

Vermont is a state of small cities, towns and rural areas with a population of approximately 623,908 (U. S. Census Bureau, 2007). The Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Abusers (VTPSA) is the state's integrated network of three prison and 13 outpatient programs operated by the Vermont Department of Corrections (DOC). The program utilizes a primarily cognitive-behavioral, group treatment model and treatment providers and supervision officers work as a collaborative team (McGrath, 1995; McGrath, Cumming, Livingston, & Hoke, 2003; McGrath, Hoke, & Vojtisek, 1998).

### **Subjects**

The subjects in this study will be the exhaustive sample of approximately 950 adult male sex offenders who were in the community on probation or parole and participated in a Vermont DOC sponsored sex offender treatment program between April 1, 2001 and October 31, 2006. Approximately 350 of these subjects were in treatment for various lengths of time at the start date of the study and the other approximately 600 subjects first entered treatment on or after that date.

Each subject has an index sexual offense involving a non-consenting adult or child victim. Excluded from the study will be individuals whose only sexual offense was statutory rape, child pornography possession, or other sexually-related offenses that precluded them from being scored on the Static-99. Based on an analysis of the current sample and definitions established by the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (Gordon et al., 1998), we expect the final sample to be composed of approximately 25% rapists, 15% non-contact sex offenders, 10% incest offenders, 50% child molesters.

## Measures

Four measures will be used, each of which is described below. The primary focus of this study will be how the TPS, a dynamic risk instrument, and the Static-99, a static risk instrument, can be combined into an overall model of risk assessment. A secondary focus of the study will be on whether the RRASOR or VASOR will contribute to the overall prediction model.

**Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale Sex Offender (TPS)** (McGrath & Cumming, 2003). The TPS is a provider-administered dynamic measure designed to aid clinicians and probation and parole officers in identifying and monitoring the treatment needs, supervision needs, and progress of adult male sex offenders. Hanson (2006) has categorized the TPS as “conceptual-actuarial” instrument because items were conceptually derived on the basis of professional consensus, literature review, and theory, have defined scoring rules, and total scores are used in an actuarial manner. The scale is composed of 22 dynamic risk factors. Each risk factor is detailed in a manual and scored using a 6-month recency time frame on a 4-point scale ranging from *minimal to no need for improvement* to *very considerable need for improvement*. Scores are recorded on a scoring sheet and summed to yield a total score. It is designed to score clients at intake and thereafter every six months. Item scores are intended to reflect an individual's relative treatment and supervision need on each factor. The total score is intended to provide an estimation of an individual's overall level of need for supervision and treatment. A preliminary report (see Appendix A; McGrath, Cumming, & Livingston, 2005) indicates that it has acceptable psychometric properties. It can be scored reliably. The interclass correlation for a single rating was .83 and for averaged ratings was .91. The total score predicted sexual reoffending with moderate accuracy (AUC = .72; CI = .62-.82).



**Static-99** (Hanson & Thornton, 2000; Harris et al., 2003). The Static-99 is a 10-item actuarial risk measure used to aid in assessing sexual recidivism risk among adult males who have been convicted of committing sexual offenses. The Static-99 was chosen for use in the current project because it commonly used and this will make it easier for programs throughout the United States to implement practical findings resulting from this study. A recent nationwide survey found that the Static-99 is used by 54 percent of community programs for adult male sex offenders (McGrath, Cumming, & Burchard, 2003). As well, it is in the public domain and it has good psychometric properties. The ten items which comprise the Static-99 are: number of prior charges or convictions for sexual offenses, age at placement in the community, any male victims, any unrelated victims, any stranger victims, prior sentencing dates, any convictions for non-contact sexual offenses, index offense of a non-sexual violent nature, prior non-sexual violent offense, and lack of a substantial cohabitation history. Scores fall into one of seven levels reflecting the probability of sexual reoffending at five-, 10-, and 15-year intervals. The Static-99 has shown moderate accuracy in the prediction of sexual reoffending in multiple studies throughout North America and Europe, as well as in Vermont. Across 42 samples involving 13,288 sex offenders the average  $d$  was .70 (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2007).

**The Rapid Risk Assessment for Sex Offense Recidivism (RRASOR;** Hanson, 1997) is a 4-item actuarial risk measure used to aid in assessing sexual recidivism risk among adult males who have been convicted of committing sexual offenses. The four RRASOR items are also found in the Static-99. These are number of prior charges or convictions for sexual offenses, age at placement in the community, any male victims, and any unrelated victims. Scores fall into one of six levels reflecting the probability of sexual reoffending at five- and 10-year intervals.

**Vermont Assessment of Sex Offender Risk (VASOR;** McGrath & Hoke, 2001) is a risk scale designed to aid probation and parole officers in making placement and supervision decisions about adult males who have been convicted of committing sexual offenses. A 13-item re-offense risk scale is composed of many of the unchangeable risk factors found on the Static-99 as well as several changeable risk factors, such as alcohol and drug use, residence and employment stability, and treatment cooperation. Scores on this scale fall into one of three levels reflecting the probability of sexual reoffending at five years. The six-item violence scale concerns the individual's violence history and offense severity.

### **Outcome Measures**

Recidivism data will be obtained for each subject for all new charges for sexual, any violent, and any criminal offense, as well as violation of supervision charges and re-incarcerations. Charges will be based on criminal record checks in the states where each participant was known to have resided during the study period. The Vermont DOC computer database will be used to identify violation of supervision charges and re-incarcerations.

### **Procedure**

A DOC data base containing information on approximately 950 sex offenders who meet criteria for inclusion in the study (see "Subject" section above) will be updated and analyzed. Current data on each subject includes demographic information, initial scores on the TPS, Static-99, RRASOR, and VASOR, and reassessment scores on the TPS at six month intervals. The DOC network of contracted community sex offender treatment providers has collected this data for treatment, supervision, and research purposes as part of their routine assessment practice since 2001. To ensure the largest possible sample size, six-month TPS reassessment scores will continue to be entered into the data base during the first 14 months of the grant period.

Although all treatment providers who have submitted information to the data base have received training on how to score instruments used in the study, it is important to ensure the accuracy of these scores. As Campbell (2004) has observed, there are often differences between the field reliabilities and research reliabilities of actuarial instruments. Research reliability refers to the inter-rater reliabilities obtained from researchers who are well trained with a given instrument and field reliability refers to the inter-rater reliabilities obtained by community practitioners providing services in the field. Consequently, project staff will conduct file reviews and rescore all subjects on the Static-99, RRASOR, and VASOR and maintain a data base on the nature and type of scoring discrepancies. In cases in which scoring discrepancies exist, a third staff member will help reconcile the differences. All scorers will be blinded to subjects' recidivism data.

Retrospective inter-rater reliability analyses of TPS scores would be difficult to conduct. Each TPS score is suppose to reflect an individual's functioning using a 6-month recency time frame and typically past records do not document all the necessary scoring data. Consequently, during the grant period, 100 consecutive cases scored by subjects' treatment providers during the normal course of services will be independently scored by the subjects' probation or parole officers. Selected probation and parole officers will be trained on how to score the TPS, will have supervised the offender for a period of six or more months, and will have agreed to participate in the study.

Reoffense data for all subjects at a fixed three-year follow-up period will be collected and analyzed for the five types of recidivism events described in the "Outcome Measures" section above.

## **Analyses**

Standard descriptive statistics will be used to describe study subjects.

Inter-rater reliability for a single rating and for the average of multiple independent ratings will be computed using multiple methods, but primarily using a one-way, random-effects ANOVA model intraclass correlation coefficient.

Univariate analyses will compare recidivists and non-recidivists on each of the five outcome criteria at fixed three-year follow-up periods. These are new charges for sexual, any violent, and any criminal offenses, as well as violation of supervision charges and re-incarcerations. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) statistic will be used measure the predictive accuracy of each item on the TPS and total scores of each of the other risk instruments. AUC values are the recommended index of predictive accuracy for relatively low base rate phenomena such as sexual reoffending. Because each subject will have multiple TPS scores, each representing their functioning for a pervious six-month period, we will examine the best method of combining TPS scores and using different cut-off points.

Survival analyses techniques, primarily the Kaplan-Meier statistic, will be used to analyze the length of time between subject's placement in the community and any recidivism events.

Cox Regression analyses will be used to examine the relationship of various risk factors their interactions to risk of recidivism at a particular time.

We will use the results of these analyses to create an empirically derived decision matrix that integrates offenders' scores on the selected static and dynamic risk measures into an overall risk assessment model. Table 1 in the next section shows an example of such a matrix, although this example was clinically derived.

### **Implication for Policy and Practice**

We hope that this study will advance risk assessment of sexual offenders by developing a model by which static and dynamic risk factors can be combined into an overall evaluation of risk.

The policy implications of such a model are that it would help jurisdictions: (1) allocate resources in an informed and rational manner, (2) make decisions about level of supervision and intervention in an efficient manner, (3) make decisions uniformly, and (4) reduce the risk of re-offense.

In terms of practice implications, we hope that the study results will provide treatment providers and probation and parole officers with a simple, friendly, face valid, and empirically supported decision making matrix that will guide them in delivering services to sex offenders.

Table 1 shows an example of such a model that we hope will result from this study. It is the decision matrix that we are currently testing and using in Vermont to provide guidance to administrators and service providers about how to allocate and deliver services. To illustrate, an offender whose Static-99 risk level is low and TPS risk level is moderate-high would be considered to need a moderate-low level of supervision and treatment. Depending upon an offender's sentence structure, this would help determine the prison treatment program to which he would be assigned (i.e., low, moderate, or high intensity program) and the length of his outpatient treatment program. It would also help determine his level of community supervision. Changes in his scores on the TPS at six-month reassessment would influence changes in his supervision level. Based on a recent analysis of the data base that will be used in this study, of 835 sex offenders on probation or parole in Vermont in 2006, this matrix classified 40% as low risk/need, 40% moderate-low risk/need, 14% moderate-high risk/need, and 6% high risk/need.

The model would offer a standardized empirically-derived assessment process for identifying sex offenders’ risk level and treatment and supervision needs. Additionally, providers and administrators could use it to assess progress, recalibrate services, anchor decision making, increase accountability, assess intermediate outcomes, and inform program planning and development.

**Table 1. Example of a Matrix for Matching Supervision and Treatment Intensity to Offender Risk and Need**

		Dynamic Risk Level			
		Low	Moderate-Low	Moderate-High	High
Static Risk Level		TPS = 0-9	TPS = 10-19	TPS = 20-29	TPS = 30<
<b>Low</b>	Static-99 = 0-1	low	low	moderate-low	moderate-high
<b>Moderate-Low</b>	Static-99 = 2-3	low	moderate-low	moderate-high	moderate-high
<b>Moderate-High</b>	Static-99 = 4-5	low	moderate-low	moderate-high	high
<b>High</b>	Static-99 = 6-12	moderate-low	moderate-high	high	high

**Management Plan and Organization**

The administration of grant funds will be managed by the Vermont Department of Corrections, Fiscal Office. The overall management of grant activities will be accomplished by the Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Abusers (VTPSA), a program of the Vermont Department of Corrections, under the administration of Georgia Cumming. The Project Director, Robert McGrath, has been the clinical director with the VTPSA for 23 years.

### **Dissemination Strategy**

The results of the study will be disseminated through multiple sources. The current TPS manual will be revised based on the findings in this study and it will be made available to interested parties. For example, as is the current manual, we plan make the revised manual available on the Center for Sex Offender Management's web site. We will submit proposals to the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers to present the results of the study at their annual treatment and research conference. One or more research papers will be submitted to refereed journals in the criminal justice field.

## Appendix 1

### References

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (4th ed.). Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Beech, A., Erikson, M., Friendship, C., & Ditchfield, J. (2001). *A six-year follow-up of men going through probation-based sex offender treatment programmes* (Findings #144). London, U.K.: Home Office.
- Beech, A., Friendship, C., Erikson, M., & Hanson, R. K. (2002). The relationship between static and dynamic risk factors and reconviction in a sample of U.K. child abusers. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14, 155-167.
- Bumby, K. (2007, January). *Legislative trends: an overview of state laws targeting sex offender*. Paper presented at the National Legislative Briefing on Sex Offender Management Policy in the States. January 27, 2007. Little Rock, AK.
- Campbell, T.W. (2004). *Assessing sex offenders: Problems and pitfalls*. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.
- Gordon, A., Harris, A., Murphy, W., Seto, M., Hanson, R. K., Marques, J. K., & Quinsey, V. L. (1998, July). *Collaborative data base of sex offender treatment outcome*. Beaverton, OR: Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers.
- Grove, W. M., & Meehl, P. E. (1996). Comparative efficiency of informal (subjective, impressionistic) and formal (mechanical, algorithmic) prediction procedures: The clinical-statistical controversy. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 2, 293-323.
- Grove, W. M., Zald, D. H., Lebow, B. S., Snitz, B. E., & Nelson, C. (2000). Clinical versus mechanical prediction: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 12, 19-30.



- Hanson, R. K. (1997). *The development of a brief actuarial risk scale for sexual offense recidivism* (User Rep. 97-04). Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Hanson, R. J. (2006, September). *What Works: The Principles of Effective Interventions with Offenders*. Presentation at the 25th Annual Convention of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago, September 29, 2006.
- Hanson, R. K. (2005). Stability and change: Dynamic risk factors for sexual offenders. In W. L. Marshall, Y. M. Fernandez, L. E. Marshall, & G. A. Serran (Eds.), *Sexual offender treatment: Issues and controversies* (pp. 17-31). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley.
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussière, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 348-362.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2000). Where should we intervene? Dynamic predictors of sex offense recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27*, 6-35.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2001). A structured approach to evaluating change among sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 13*, 105-122.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*, 1154-1163.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2007). *The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sexual offenders: A meta-analysis* (Corrections User Report No 2007-01). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving risk assessments for sex offenders: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*, 119-136.
- Harris, A. J. R. (2007). *Dynamic Risk Assessment: STABLE-2007 and ACUTE-2007 Training*.

- Workshop presentation at North American Correctional and Criminal Justice Psychology Conference. June 7-9, 2007. Ottawa.
- Hollin, C. R. (2002) Risk-need assessment and allocation to offender programmes. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *Offender rehabilitation and treatment: Effective programmes and policies to reduce re-offending* (pp. 309–332). West Sussex, England: Wiley.
- Knight, R. A., & Thornton, D. (2007, March). *Evaluating and improving risk assessment schemes for sexual recidivism: A long-term follow-up of convicted sexual offenders* (Document No.: 217618). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Marques, J. K., Wiederanders, M., Day, D. M., Nelson, C., & van Ommeren, A. (2005). Effects of a relapse prevention program on sexual recidivism: Final results from California's Sex Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project (SOTEP). *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 17, 79-107.
- McGrath, R. J., & Cumming, G. F. (2003). *The Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale*. Middlebury, VT: Author.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., & Livingston, J. A. (2005). *Predictive validity of the Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Salt Lake City.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., & Burchard, B. L. (2003). *Current practices and trends in sexual abuser management: The Safer Society 2002 Nationwide Survey*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society.
- McGrath, R. J. (Ed.). (1995). *Vermont clinical practices guide for the assessment and treatment of adult sex offenders*. Williston, VT: Vermont Center for Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Abuse.

McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., & Burchard, B. L. (2003). *Current practices and trends in sexual abuser management: The Safer Society 2002 nationwide survey*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.

McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G., Livingston, J. A., & Hoke, S. E. (2003). Outcome of a treatment program for adult sex offenders: From prison to community. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 3-17.

McGrath, R. J., & Hoke, S. E. (2001). *Vermont Assessment of Sex Offender Risk Manual*. Middlebury, VT: Author.

McGrath, R. J., Hoke, S. E., & Vojtisek, J. E. (1998). Cognitive-behavioral treatment of sex offenders: A treatment comparison and long-term follow-up study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 25*, 203-225.

Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Interclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 420-428.

Thornton, D. (2002). Constructing and testing a framework for dynamic risk assessment. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 14*, 139-153.

## Appendix 2

### List of Previous and Current NIJ Awards

1. 2001 – Grant #2001-WP-BX-0019 Robert McGrath, Principal Investigator, Office of Justice Programs, grant to Vermont Department of Developmental Disabilities,
2. 2002 -- “Development of sex offender treatment needs and progress scale for adult sex offenders.” Grant #1000-Wp-VX-0001 from the U. S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, Robert McGrath, Principal Investigator.

**Appendix 3: Predictive Validity of the  
Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale (TPS)**

Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers 24<sup>th</sup> Annual Research and Treatment Conference  
November 16-19, 2005 - Salt Lake City, Utah

Robert J. McGrath, Georgia F. Cumming, and Joy Livingston

**Table I. Mean TPS Scores by Stage of Treatment and Completion Status**

Completion Status	TPS Score			
	Beginning of Treatment (n=170)		End of Treatment (n=170)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Completers (n=108)	15.48 <sup>a,b</sup>	10.05	8.69 <sup>a,c</sup>	8.06
Non-completers (n=62)	23.03 <sup>b</sup>	10.74	25.74 <sup>c</sup>	11.52

Note. Means in the same row or column that share a same subscript differ at  $p < .001$ .

**Table II. Item-total Correlations and Interrater Reliability**

Item	<i>r</i> (n=149)	ICC <sub>1</sub> (n=149)	ICC <sub>2</sub> (n=149)
1. Admission of Offense Behavior	.48	.60	.75
2. Acceptance of Responsibility	.53	.51	.68
3. Sexual Interests	.56	.51	.68
4. Sexual Attitudes	.72	.50	.67
5. Sexual Behavior	.40	.66	.80
6. Sexual Risk Management	.67	.46	.63
7. Criminal Attitudes	.64	.45	.62
8. Criminal Behavior	.55	.69	.81
9. Substance Abuse	.37	.57	.73
10. Emotion Management	.64	.41	.59
11. Mental Health Stability	.36	.47	.64
12. Problem Solving	.72	.46	.63
13. Impulsivity	.56	.55	.71
14. Stage of Change	.74	.63	.77
15. Cooperation with Treatment	.78	.71	.83
16. Cooperation with Supervision	.66	.68	.81
17. Employment	.62	.63	.77
18. Residence	.60	.60	.75
19. Finances	.58	.59	.74
20. Adult Love Relationship	.34	.72	.84
21. Social Influences	.72	.45	.62
22. Social Involvement	.42	.44	.61
Total		.83	.91

Note.  $r$  = item-total correlations. For all  $r$ 's,  $p < .01$ . ICC = interclass correlation for a single rating (ICC<sub>1</sub>) and for averaged ratings (ICC<sub>2</sub>). For all ICC's,  $p < .001$ .

**Table III. Predictive Validity for Items and Total Score**

Item	Type of Recidivism AUC (95% confidence interval)				
	Sexual (n=25)	Any Violent (n=40)	Any Criminal (n=75)	Violation of Release (n=238)	Return to Prison (n=182)
1. Admission of offense behavior	.66 (.54-.79)	.65 (.55-.74)	.59 (.52-.66)	.61 (.56-.65)	.59 (.54-.63)
2. Acceptance of responsibility	.64 (.52-.76)	.64 (.54-.73)	.57 (.50-.64)	.60 (.56-.64)	.59 (.55-.64)
3. Sexual Interests	.66 (.54-.77)	.58 (.49-.68)	.55 (.48-.62)	.58 (.54-.61)	.58 (.54-.62)
4. Sexual Attitudes	.75 (.65-.84)	.69 (.60-.78)	.62 (.55-.69)	.66 (.63-.70)	.66 (.61-.70)
5. Sexual Behavior	.68 (.55-.80)	.62 (.52-.72)	.59 (.52-.66)	.61 (.57-.65)	.63 (.59-.68)
6. Sexual Risk Management	.73 (.63-.83)	.69 (.61-.77)	.64 (.57-.71)	.68 (.64-.72)	.68 (.64-.72)
7. Criminal Attitudes	.66 (.54-.78)	.69 (.60-.78)	.68 (.62-.74)	.71 (.68-.75)	.72 (.68-.76)
8. Criminal Behavior	.65 (.53-.77)	.65 (.56-.74)	.68 (.61-.75)	.67 (.65-.72)	.71 (.67-.76)
9. Substance Abuse	.57 (.44-.69)	.57 (.48-.67)	.60 (.53-.67)	.59 (.55-.63)	.57 (.53-.62)
10. Emotion Management	.65 (.54-.76)	.61 (.52-.70)	.65 (.58-.71)	.66 (.62-.70)	.66 (.62-.70)
11. Mental Health Stability	.54 (.42-.66)	.53 (.44-.63)	.52 (.45-.59)	.59 (.55-.63)	.61 (.56-.65)
12. Problem Solving	.63 (.52-.74)	.63 (.55-.72)	.67 (.60-.73)	.71 (.67-.74)	.72 (.69-.76)
13. Impulsivity	.61 (.50-.72)	.63 (.55-.72)	.66 (.59-.72)	.71 (.68-.75)	.71 (.67-.75)
14. Stage of Change	.65 (.54-.76)	.63 (.54-.73)	.63 (.56-.69)	.69 (.66-.73)	.70 (.66-.73)
15. Cooperation with Treatment	.61 (.49-.74)	.63 (.53-.72)	.64 (.57-.71)	.72 (.68-.75)	.71 (.67-.75)
16. Cooperation with Supervision	.57 (.45-.70)	.62 (.53-.71)	.64 (.57-.71)	.70 (.67-.74)	.70 (.66-.75)
17. Employment	.55 (.43-.66)	.60 (.50-.69)	.60 (.53-.67)	.68 (.65-.72)	.70 (.66-.74)
18. Residence	.63 (.51-.75)	.68 (.60-.77)	.64 (.57-.71)	.68 (.64-.72)	.69 (.64-.73)
19. Finances	.58 (.46-.70)	.64 (.55-.73)	.64 (.58-.71)	.70 (.66-.73)	.71 (.67-.75)
20. Adult Love Relationship	.60 (.49-.71)	.55 (.47-.63)	.59 (.53-.66)	.63 (.60-.67)	.64 (.60-.68)
21. Social Influences	.67 (.56-.79)	.66 (.58-.75)	.67 (.61-.73)	.69 (.65-.73)	.71 (.67-.75)
22. Social Involvement	.66 (.56-.76)	.64 (.56-.71)	.63 (.57-.68)	.65 (.62-.69)	.67 (.63-.71)
Total Score	.72 (.62-.82)	.72 (.64-.80)	.72 (.67-.78)	.79 (.76-.81)	.79 (.76-.82)

*Note.* Recidivism is defined as a charge for a new offense or a reincarceration. Analyses are based on a total *N* of 835 participants who were followed up an average of four times each at 6-months intervals for a total of 3,153 6-month follow-up periods.

**Table IV. Recidivism Events by TPS Risk Levels**

Score	Risk Level	Type of Recidivism											
		6-month Follow-up Periods		Sexual		Any Violent		Any Criminal		Violation of Probation		Return to Prison	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0-9	Low	1,258	39.9	5	0.4	7	0.6	10	0.8	19	1.5	13	1.0
10-19	Moderate	1,152	36.6	7	0.6	11	1.0	25	2.3	71	6.2	52	4.5
20-29	High	487	15.4	6	1.2	11	2.3	20	4.1	78	16.0	60	12.3
30+	Very High	256	8.1	7	2.7	11	4.3	20	7.8	70	27.3	57	22.3
Total		3,153	100.0	25	0.8	40	1.3	75	2.4	238	7.5	182	5.8

*Note.* Analyses are based on a total *N* of 835 participants who were followed up an average of four times each at 6-months intervals for a total of 3,153 6-month follow-up periods.

Scale available at [www.csom.org](http://www.csom.org).

Contact information: [rmcgrath@sover.net](mailto:rmcgrath@sover.net).

**A MODEL OF STATIC AND DYNAMIC SEX OFFENDER RISK  
ASSESSMENT**

**Revised 2/11/2008**

**Budget Detail Worksheet**

**June 26, 2007 (Revised 11/15/2007)**

**A. Personnel**

Name/Position	Computation	Cost

**SUB-TOTAL \$-  
Federal Funds - \$ 0  
State Funds \$0**

**B. Fringe Benefits**

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
na		

**SUB-TOTAL \$-**

**C. Travel**

Purpose	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
Data collection	Statewide	Mileage reimbursement	Travel to courts and public records (2 researchers x75 mi x\$0.485 x 50 trips	\$3,587
Project Director	Washington, DC, Other Sites	Air travel, hotel, Meals	3 events @ \$1,500 average round trip TML	\$4,500
Project Director	Statewide	Mileage reimbursement	500 miles/month x 12 months x \$.485 x 2 years	\$5,820

**SUB-TOTAL \$13,907**

**D. Equipment**

Item	Computation	Cost
None		\$0

**SUB-TOTAL \$0**

**E. Supplies**

Item	Computation	Cost
2 Laptop Computers &	State Purchase @ \$1500.00 each	\$3,000
Color Printer	State purchase @\$500.00	500
4 copies SPSS Statistical Analysis Software	\$500 each	2,000

**SUB-TOTAL \$5,500****F. Construction**

Purpose	Description of Work	Cost
None		\$0

**SUB-TOTAL \$0****G. Consultants/Contracts**

Item	Cost
Contracts – Project Director – 20 hrs/mo for 3 mo, Hiring 40 hrs/mo for 3 mo, Training 40 hrs/mo for 12 mos, Data Collection Supervision 40 hrs/mo for 6 mos, Analysis and Report Writing =900 hrs @ \$80/hr	\$72,000
Contract – Data Collection 2-20 hrs /wk for 3 mos, Training 2-20 hrs/ wk for 12 mos, Data Retrieval =2520 hrs @\$24/hr	\$60,4800
Contract – Statistical analysis 100 hours @ \$100/hour	\$10,000
Contract --	

**SUB-TOTAL \$142,000****H. Other Costs**

Description	Computation	Cost
none		

**SUB-TOTAL \$-****I. Indirect Costs**

Description	Computation	Cost
None		\$0

**SUB-TOTAL \$-**



## Budget Summary

<u>Budget Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
A. Personnel	\$0.00
B. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00
C. Travel	\$13,907.00
D. Equipment	\$0.00
E. Supplies	\$5,500.00
F. Construction	\$0.00
G. Consultants/Contracts	\$142,000.00
H. Other	\$0.00
<b>Total Direct Costs</b>	<b>\$161,307.00</b>
I. Indirect Costs	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>\$161,307.00</b>
<b>Total Federal Funds Requested</b>	<b>\$161,307.00</b>
<b>State Funds</b>	

***A MODEL OF STATIC AND DYNAMIC SEX OFFENDER RISK  
ASSESSMENT  
Revised 2/11/2008  
Budget Narrative  
June 26, 2007***

**Project Timeline**

Quarter One:

Hiring of staff, design data collection procedures and recording

Quarters two

Training of Data Collectors and Probation Staff

Quarters Three through Six

Data collection

Quarters Seven and Eight

Data Analysis and Review  
Report

**Narrative**

The first quarter will be spent by the project director and administrative support making arrangements with 13 Vermont District Courts, the Court Administrator's office, and with the Vermont Crime Information Center (VCIC) for access to conviction records and documents at court, to include affidavits. This will involve executing Memoranda Of Understandings with the Vermont Crime Information Center for criminal record checks.

In addition, during this period two data collector personnel will be recruited and hired. Also during this period the Project Director will examine the existing database on some 950 sex offenders and updating information as needed. The result of this activity will be to identify the subject population. A part of the Director's time in the first quarter will involve the design and development of the data collection instrumentation and computer software.

It is estimated that this quarter will involve about 20 hours per month of the Project Director's time, contracted at \$80.00 per hour.

Second quarter will involve training of the data collectors, to include familiarization with the Vermont Criminal Justice Records system and data sources in the Courts, Public Safety, and Corrections. Training for data collectors will focus on scoring the TPS, the Static-99, the VASOR and the RRASOR and establishing inter-rater reliability with instrumentation will be crucial. The Project Director will also train identified Probation Officers on scoring the TPS. The data collectors will begin data retrieval at the conclusion of training. This is estimated to comprise 40 hours per month for three months of the Project Director's time, and involve the two data collectors for 20 hours per week for three months.

Third through sixth quarters will comprise the bulk of the data retrieval work, involving two collectors working 20 hours per week for a year. After data collection, the staff will conduct file reviews and rescore all subjects in the study on all of the instrumentation. A database will be maintained on the nature of scoring discrepancies between original and re-scores. Data will be recorded on laptop computers and downloaded to Project Director's computer for analysis.

Supervision of this activity will require approximately 40 hours per month for the Project Director.

Seventh and Eighth quarters will comprise analysis of data and report writing. Final data retrieval will be completed.

**A. Personnel** **\$.00**

There are no personnel positions associated with this grant. All management coordination and administrative support for the project will be provided by the Vermont Department of Corrections. In addition, Probation officer time for training and scoring on dynamic risk assessment instrumentation is an inkind contribution for the grant.

**B. Fringe Benefits** **\$.00**

There are no personnel positions associated with this grant. All administrative support for the project will be provided by the Vermont Department of Corrections as inkind contribution.

**C. Travel** **\$13,907.00**

Travel expenses include the costs for data retrieval staff to travel to the fourteen district court offices across the state of Vermont, to obtain documents (e.g., affidavits) that are not available electronically. These documents are necessary to provide detailed information for risk assessment.

Travel costs for the project director are also included, based on State of Vermont reimbursement rates. It is also anticipated that during the course of the project, the director and other staff will participate in up to three national conferences on sex offender risk prediction and related topics, both to present findings and to share information.

Costs for travel are estimated as follows: These conferences will likely be the Center for Sex Offender Management or similar conferences in Fall, and Spring during the two year grant period. It is estimated that two persons will attend these conferences, for 2-3 days. The next conference is in Atlanta, and that was used for estimates.

Computation of travel costs

Round trip airfare \$400 x 2 persons x 3 trips	\$2,400
Hotel @150 pn x 2 nites x 2 persons x 3 trips	1,800
Meals VT rates \$32/diem x 2 days x 2 pers x 3 trips	<u>384</u>
Sum	\$4,584

**D. Equipment** **\$0.00**

No equipment is requested for this grant. All office space and equipment will be furnished by the Vermont Department of Corrections.

**E. Supplies** **\$5,500.00**

Two laptop computers are required for the collection of the data from courts and case records. The project will also utilize SPSS as the statistical analysis package, and this will be installed in two new computers as well as the computers of the project director and VTPSA Director.

**F. Construction** **\$0.00**

No construction is associated with this project.

**Consultants/Contracts** **\$142,000.00**

1. Contract for the project director, Robert McGrath, will provide a total of 900 hours during the 2-year period of the grant, @ \$80.00 per hour. This contract will include recruiting and training staff, overseeing data collection, providing data analysis and writing interim and final reports.
2. Contracts will be written to provide two part-time data collectors to accomplish the data retrieval component of the project. Under the direction of the project director, these two persons will receive training on risk assessment instrumentation, and will provide 20 hours per week average each to collect data on some 950 different offenders and rescore each participant on all static risk instruments.
3. Additional consultation for advanced statistical analysis will be contracted with Dr. Timothy Stickle, Department of Psychology, University of Vermont. These costs are estimated at 100 hours, @ \$100 per hour.

**H. Other** **\$0.00**

There are no additional costs.

## Curriculum Vita

**ROBERT J. McGRATH**

### ADDRESS

105 Happy Valley Road  
Middlebury, VT 05753  
Work Phone: (802) 236-7540  
Home Phone: (802)-388-6576  
Facsimile: (802) 388-6013  
E-mail: rmcgrath@sover.net

### LICENSURE/CERTIFICATION

Licensed Psychologist-Master, State of Vermont #047-0000203 1982 to present

### EDUCATION

M.A.	Counseling Psychology	Antioch University	1978
B.S.	Education	Springfield College	1973

### CURRENT POSITION

**Clinical Director, Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Abusers**, Vermont Department of Corrections. Program comprised of a 48-bed intensive sexual offender treatment program at the Northwest State Correctional Center, St. Albans, Vermont; a 32-bed short-term sexual offender treatment program at the Southern State Correctional Center, Springfield, Vermont; a statewide network of 12 outpatient program sites (coordinator of outpatient network since 1987). 1996 to present.

**Director, Adult Sex Offender Program**, Developed, direct, and provide direct services in an outpatient treatment program for adult sex offenders. Middlebury, Vermont. 1984 to present.

**President, McGrath Psychological Services, P.C.** Provide consultation and training services to mental health, corrections, and criminal justice organizations concerning sex-offender assessment, treatment, program development, and program evaluation. Services provided onsite in over 40 states in the United States and throughout Canada, Taiwan, and the United Kingdom. As McGrath Psychological Services, P.C. since 1996.

### PAST WORK EXPERIENCE

**Clinical Director of Mental Health Services (9/91-4/96); Director of Adult Outpatient and Substance Abuse Programs (8/85-9/91); Director of Adult Sex Offender Program (1984 to 2004); Substance Abuse Coordinator (3/77-8/85).** Counseling Service of Addison County, Middlebury, VT. A community mental health center employing approximately 180 staff with an annual budget of approximately 8 million dollars.

**Clinician**, Monadnock Family and Mental Health Service, Keene, NH. Provided direct clinical services to adult and adolescent outpatients. Intern 9/76 - 6/77. Staff 12/77 - 2/78.

**Clinician**, Mental Health Services of Southeastern Vermont, Bellows Falls, VT. Provided direct clinical services to adult inpatients with severe and persistent mental illness. Intern 9/77 - 12/77.

**Health Educator**, Somerset Public Schools, Somerset, MA. 9/73 - 6/76.

### **RECENT SELECTED PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES**

**National Resource Site.** The Center for Sex Offender Management (CSOM) selected the State of Vermont as a National Resource Site for its innovative sex offender management and supervision practices. Under this CSOM designation, Vermont serves as a resource to other jurisdictions throughout the United States. 1997 to present.

**International Sex Offender Treatment Program Advisory Panel Member, Her Majesty's Prison Service.** Monitor and conduct quality improvement activities for the United Kingdom's national prison-based Sex Offender Treatment Programme. London, England. 2003 to present.

**International Accreditation Panel Member, Correctional Service of Canada.** Evaluate and accredit Canadian federal prison and community-based sex offender treatment programs. 2000 to present.

**Treatment Advisory Board Member, Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center.** Consultant for program development and evaluation of the State of Wisconsin's treatment program for civilly committed sexually violent predators. 2002 to present.

**Treatment Advisory Board Member, Florida Civil Commitment Center.** Consultant for program development and evaluation of the State of Florida's treatment program for civilly committed sexually violent predators. 2005 to present.

**Consultant, Vermont Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities.** Consult to and conduct a monthly continuing education group for the statewide network of professionals who provide community management services to individuals with developmentally disabilities who have committed sex offenses. 6/97 to present.

**Consultant, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.** Development of the seminars "Treatment Skills for Professionals Working with Sex Offenders", "Presenting Sex Offender Treatment Issues", and "Sex Offender Treatment Skills". Conducted over 20 five-day seminars for teams of correctional and mental health staff representing over 40 states and four branches of the military. 1989 to present.

**Consultant, Center for Sex Offender Management.** Developed the training manual *Assessment of sex offenders for sentencing, supervision, and treatment* for probation and parole officers; provide training and technical assistance services; member of Curriculum Development committee; member of committee to develop a program evaluation instrument. 6/98 to present.

**President, Board of Directors, Safer Society Foundation, Inc.** A national non-profit research, advocacy, referral, and education foundation dedicated to the prevention and treatment of sexual abuse. President 7/95 - 4/98. Board member 9/94 to 9/05.

**Principle Investigator.** Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Grant to the Vermont Department of Developmental Disabilities to development of a treatment needs, placement, and progress scale for sexual offenders. 2002 to 2005.

**Principle Investigator.** Safer Society Foundation, Inc. Developed and conducted the *2002 Nationwide Survey of Sex Offender Programs and Models* (with Georgia Cumming & Brenda Bouchard). 5/02 to 10/03.

**Member, Professional Issues Committee, Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers.** Review and revise the *Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Standards and Principles for the Management of Sexual Abusers*. 2002 to 2005.

**Principle Investigator.** Violence Against Women Office, U.S. Department of Justice. Grant to the Vermont Department of Corrections to development of a treatment progress scale for adult male sexual offenders under community supervision. 11/99 to 12/01.

**Guest Reviewer.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Safer Society Press, Sage Publications, *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*.

**Field Supervisor.** Antioch University, St. Michaels College, and University of Vermont.

**Board of Directors.** Behavioral Health Network of Vermont, a non-profit managed behavioral health care organization composed of over 12 behavioral health clinics and community hospitals throughout Vermont. 4/95 - 3/96.

**Chairperson.** Clinical Practice Standards Committee, Behavioral Health Network of Vermont. Resulted in the publication of *Preferred Clinical Practice Guide, Version 1*; May 1994. *Version 2*, May 1995. 3/94 - 3/96.

**Co-director.** Training center. Co-developed and implemented a training and supervision program that assisted in the establishment of a statewide network of eight adolescent sex offender treatment programs throughout Vermont. Vermont Department of Mental Health and Federal Bureau of Justice Assistance, 3-year grant. 2/86 - 6/89.

## **RECENT SELECTED PRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS**

***Program Evaluation and Consultation.*** Conducted a program evaluation and consultation site visit to the Florida Civil Commitment Center program for sexually dangerous persons as a member of the center's Treatment Advisory Board (with W. Murphy and B. Johnson). May 9-11, 2007. Arcadia, Florida.

***Adult Sex Offenders: Assessment and Treatment.*** Two Two-day workshops sponsored by the University of Maine, Department of Psychology and the Maine Department of Corrections. April 9-12, 2007. Orono and South Portland, Maine.

***Assessing Risk and Supervising Sex Offenders.*** A two-day workshop sponsored by the New Mexico Department of Corrections. March 28-29, 2007. Santa Fe, New Mexico.

***Assessing Sex Offenders' Risk and Treatment Needs.*** A two-day workshop sponsored by the Relapse Intervention for Sex Crimes (RISC) Program of Dutchess County New York. March 22-23, 2007. Poughkeepsie, New York.

***Current Practices in Sex Offender Risk Assessment Understanding and Sex Offender Treatment: Current Practices and Effectiveness.*** A general session keynote and a workshop presented at the Association of Paroling Authorities International 2007 Conference. March 19, 2007. Chicago, Illinois.

**Sex Offender Risk Assessment.** A one-day workshop sponsored by the New Hampshire Department of Corrections. March 1, 2007. Concord, New Hampshire.

**Understanding Sex Offenders: Implication for Legislative Policy and Civil Commitment of Sexually Violent Predators: Issues and Strategies for Identification and Assessment.** Two plenary presentations for legislators, mental health professionals, and attorneys sponsored by the New Hampshire Department of Corrections. March 2, 2007. Concord, New Hampshire.

**Sex Offenders 101: Understanding a Diverse Population.** A plenary presentation at the National Legislative Briefing on Sex Offender Management Policy sponsored by the U.S. Office of Justice Programs and the Council of State Governments (with M. Carter). January 27-28, 2006. Little Rock, Arkansas.

**Community Supervision and Treatment of Sexual Abusers who are Developmentally Disabled.** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Vermont Department of Aging and Independent Living and Howard Community Services. January 12, 2007. Randolph, Vermont.

**International Sex Offender Treatment Program Advisory Panel Member.** Monitored and conducted quality improvement activities for Her Majesty's Prison Service Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (with W. Murphy). December 11-14, 2006. London, England.

**Post Conviction Polygraph Testing with Sex Offenders: Current Practices and Outcomes**  
A presentation to Her Majesty's Prison Service Sex Offender Treatment Program Managers. December 14, 2006. London, England.

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Conducted a program evaluation and consultation site visit to the Florida Civil Commitment Center program for sexually dangerous persons as a member of the center's Treatment Advisory Board (with W. Murphy and B. Johnson). November 8-10, 2006. Arcadia, Florida.

**Sex Offender Management: Overview of Programs and Research Basis.** Presentation at the Vermont Psychiatric Association Bi-annual Meeting. October 14, 2006. Vergennes, Vermont

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Member of Treatment Advisory Board, Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center Sexually Violent Predator Program (with J. Haaven, S. Hucker, & W. Murphy). Conducted program evaluation and consultation site visit. October 9-11, 2006. Mauston, Wisconsin.

**Adult Sexual Abuser Treatment "101".** A one-day pre-conference seminar at the 25th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference. September 27-30, 2006. Chicago, Illinois.

**Identifying Treatment Needs and Measuring Progress Using a Risk-Based Scale.** A workshop presented at the 25th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming). September 27-30, 2006. Chicago, Illinois.

**The Impact of Polygraph Maintenance Testing on the Recidivism of Adult male Sex Offenders: Preliminary Findings.** A poster session presented at the 25th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming, S. Hoke, & M. Bonn-Miller). September 27-30, 2006. Chicago, Illinois.

**Outcome of a Statewide Program for Sex Offenders with Intellectual Disabilities.** A poster session presented at the 25th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Falk). September 27-30, 2006. Chicago, Illinois.



***Understanding Sex Offenders and Their Victims and Specialized Assessment, Supervision, and Treatment of Adult Sex Offenders.*** Presentations given at seminar for the New Hampshire Judiciary. Sponsored by the New Hampshire Department of Corrections. September 15, 2006. Bedford, New Hampshire.

***Program Evaluation and Consultation.*** Conducted a program evaluation and consultation site visit to the Florida Civil Commitment Center program for sexually dangerous persons as a member of the center's Treatment Advisory Board. July 6-7, 2006. Arcadia, Florida.

***Understanding Sex Offenders and Sex Offender Management.*** Workshop presented at the First Annual Conference of the New York State Coalition Against Sexual Assault. June 26, 2006. Buffalo, New York.

***Characteristics, Assessment, and Treatment of Sexual Offenders.*** Presentation at the Vermont Judicial College. June 14, 2006. Ripton, Vermont.

***Adult Sex Offenders and Their Victims: What We Know (and Don't Know).*** A presentation given at Supervision and Management of Sex Offenders in the Community: A Training for Probation and Parole Officers, sponsored by the New Hampshire Department of Corrections. June 1, 2006. Bedford, New Hampshire.

***Current Practices and Trends in Working with Sex Offenders who are Developmentally Disabled.*** Four one-day workshops sponsored by the Arizona Division of Developmental Disabilities. May 8-11, 2006. Flagstaff, Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona.

***Translating Research on "What Works" into Everyday Practice.*** A one-day pre-conference workshop at the Minnesota Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers 10th Annual Conference. April 5, 2006. Brooklyn Park, Minnesota.

***Using Sex Offender Risk Assessments in Decision Making.*** Two half-day workshops sponsored by the St. Lawrence County Sex Offender Management Project. February 23-24, 2006. Canton, New York.

***Assessment and Treatment of the Adult Sex Offender.*** A two-day workshop sponsored by the New York Department of Corrections. February 16-17, 2006. Marcy, New York.

***Program Evaluation and Consultation.*** Conducted a program evaluation and consultation site visit to the Minnesota Sex Offender Program, Minnesota's civil commitment program for sexually dangerous persons (with W. Murphy). February 7-10, 2006. Moose Lake and St. Peter, Minnesota.

***International Sex Offender Treatment Program Advisory Panel Member.*** Monitored and conducted quality improvement activities for Her Majesty's Prison Service Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (with W. Marshall & W. Murphy). December 12-15, 2005. London, England.

***From Prison to Community: The Reintegration Process.*** A presentation to Her Majesty's Prison Service Sex Offender Treatment Program Managers. December 15, 2005. London, England.

***Predictive Validity of the Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale.*** A poster session presented at the 24th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming & J. Livingston). November 16-19, 2005. Salt Lake City, Utah.

***The Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale.*** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Idaho Department of Corrections. November 17, 2005. Boise, Idaho.

***Program Evaluation and Consultation.*** Member of Treatment Advisory Board, Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center Sexually Violent Predator Program (with J. Haaven, J. Marques, & W. Murphy). Conducted program evaluation and consultation site visit. October 3-5, 2005. Mauston, Wisconsin.

**Community Supervision of Sex Offenders.** Two one-day workshops sponsored by the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals and the West Virginia Division of Corrections (with Georgia Cumming). September 29-30, 2005. Charleston, West Virginia.

**Managing Sex Offenders with Developmental Disabilities in the Community.** Presentation at the live teleconference "Supporting Criminal Offenders with Lifelong Disabilities" sponsored by the National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services (with G. Falk). September 15, 2005. Alexandria, Virginia.

**Program Development Consultation.** Site visit and consultation to Atlantic Shores Healthcare, Inc., and the GEO Group, Inc. to develop a proposal to operate the treatment program at the Florida Civil Commitment Center for Sexually Violent Predators. August 4 to October 8, 2005, Arcadia, Florida.

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Two-day program review and consultation to the Iowa Sexually Violent Predator Treatment Program (with W. Murphy). June 22-23, 2005. Cherokee, Iowa.

**Consultation.** Center for Sex Offender Management. Met with representatives from 9 jurisdictions concerning field tests of the "Comprehensive Assessment Protocol" program evaluation instrument (with CSOM staff and consultants). Elicited feedback and recommended revisions. June 8-9, 2005. Washington, DC.

**Sex Offender Sentencing Issues for Judges.** A presentation to Dutchess County, NY judiciary. June 3, 2005. Poughkeepsie, New York.

**Scoring and Interpreting the "Static-99" and the "Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale."** A one-day skills workshop presented to the Dutchess County Probation Office and the Relapse Intervention for Sex Crimes (RISC) Program. June 2, 2005. Poughkeepsie, New York.

**Motivational Interviewing with Sex Offenders.** One-day workshop presented for the Pennsylvania Sexual Offenders Assessment Board. May 13, 2005. New Cumberland, Pennsylvania.

**What Do We Know About "What Works" in Sex Offender Management? and Sex Offender Risk Assessment.** A keynote and a workshop presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> New York State Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference. (with G. Cumming). May 5-6, 2005, White Plains, New York.

**International Sex Offender Treatment Program Advisory Panel Member.** Monitored and conducted quality improvement activities for Her Majesty's Prison Service Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (with W. Murphy). December 6-9, 2004. London, England.

**Managing Sex Offenders in the Community.** Three one-day workshops on sex offender community notification (with K. Chandler & R. Shilling). Sponsored by the Vermont Department of Public Safety. November 3-5, 2004. Montpelier, Brattleboro, and Killington, VT.

**Introduction to Sexual Abuser Assessment, Treatment, and Supervision.** A 12-hour introductory seminar presented at the 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming). October 27-30, 2004. Albuquerque, New Mexico.

**Introduction to Sexual Abuser Assessment, Treatment, and Supervision.** A 10-hour introductory seminar presented at the 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on Sex Offender Registration, Community Notification, and Sex Offense Related Issues (with G. Cumming). Sponsored by National Community Notification Information and Education Services, Inc. September 20-22, 2004. Seattle, Washington.

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Member of Treatment Advisory Board, Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center Sexually Violent Predator Program (with J. Haaven, J. Marques, & W. Murphy). Conducted program evaluation and consultation site visit. September 15-17, 2004. Mauston, Wisconsin.

**Managing Sexual Aggressors through a Continuum of Care and Conducting Sexual Offender Risk Assessments.** A keynote address and a one-day workshop presented at the Towards a Safer Society Second International Conference sponsored by the Scottish Prison Service and Glasgow Caladonian University. August 31 - September 3, 2004. Edinburgh, Scotland.

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Two-day program review and consultation to the Kansas Sexual Predator Treatment Program (with J. Haavan & W. Murphy). June 17-18, 2004. Larned, Kansas.

**What Works and What Doesn't in Sex Offender Management.** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Oregon Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abuses. June 4, 2004. Portland, Oregon.

**Best Practices in Offender Management and Treatment, Risk Factors and Typologies of Sexual Assault Offenders, and What Components Comprise Effective Treatments for Offenders.** A plenary and two workshops presented at the Oregon Attorney General's Sexual Assault Task Force Second Annual Conference. June 3, 2004. Eugene, Oregon.

**International Accreditation Panel Member.** Evaluate prison and community-based sex offender treatment programs for accreditation for the Canadian government. Correctional Service of Canada International Accreditation Panel (with D. Clark, G. Gaes, K. Hanson, W. Murphy, & E. Wosniak). May 24-32, 2004. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

**Sex Offenders: What Do We Know About Them (with K. Bumby), Specialized Assessment of Sex Offenders, and Strategies to Interact with Sex Offenders More Effectively: A Workshop on Motivational Interviewing.** Plenaries and workshops presented at two three-day conferences, Effective Management of Sex Offenders in the Community, sponsored by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Parole Division and the Center for Sex Offender Management. April 21-23, 2004. Dallas, Texas. April 28-30, 2004. Houston, Texas.

**A Comprehensive Approach to Managing Adult and Juvenile Sex Offenders in the Community** Two one-day workshops sponsored by the Capitol District Center for Sex Offender Management (with G. Burns-Smith). April 15-16, 2004. Albany, New York.

**Consultation.** Consultation to North Dakota Governor John Hoeven and his staff regarding sex offender management strategies (with P. Burke & R. Stoker). March 10-11, 2004. Bismark, North Dakota.

**International Sex Offender Treatment Program Advisory Panel Member.** Monitored and conducted quality improvement activities for Her Majesty's Prison Service Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (with W. Marshall & W. Murphy). December 8-11, 2003. London, England.

**Assessment of Adult Sex Offenders: Principles of Practice and Institutional Community-Based Treatment: Best Practices with Adult and Juvenile Sex Offenders (with K. Bumby).** Presentations to the Rhode Island Sex Offender Management Task Force. October 24, 2003. Newport, Rhode Island.

**Introduction to Sexual Abuser Assessment, Treatment, and Supervision.** A pilot 12-hour introductory seminar presented at the 22nd Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming). October 8-11, 2003. St. Louis, Missouri.

**The Safer Society 2002 Nationwide Survey of Program Methods and Models.** A poster session presented at the 22nd Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming & B. Burchard). October 8-11, 2003. St. Louis, Missouri.

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Member of Treatment Advisory Board, Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center Sexually Violent Predator Program (with J. Haaven & W. Murphy). Conducted program evaluation and consultation site visit. September 22-24, 2003. Mauston, Wisconsin.

**Specialized Sex Offender Assessment: Crafting Differentiated Management Strategies for Adult and Juvenile Sex Offenders** (with K. Bumby), **Advanced Case Planning and Management for Adult Sex Offenders** (with G. Cumming), **Specialized Assessment of Adult Sex Offenders, Sex Offender-specific Treatment for Adults, and The Critical Roles of the Research Coordinator in the Work of the Grantee Site Teams** (with L. Morris). Plenary and workshop presentations at the Comprehensive Approaches to Sex Offender Management Grant Program, 2002 Implementation/Enhancement Grantee Sites Workshop. Sponsored by the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. May 28-30, 2003. Washington, DC.

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Evaluate prison, transitional, and community-based sex offender treatment programs for Alaska Department of Corrections (with M. Carter) through a grant from the Center for Sex Offender Management. March 30 - April 4, 2003. Anchorage, Bethel, and Hooper Bay, Alaska.

**Assessing Treatment, Supervision Needs, and Progress of Sex Offenders.** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Indiana Sex Offender Management and Monitoring Program, Liberty Behavioral Health Corporation. April 24, 2003. New Castle, Indiana.

**Innovations in Sex Offender Risk Assessment, What is "Best Practice" in Sex Offender Treatment?, and Treatment Planning with Sexual Offenders: Practical Clinical Strategies.** Workshops given at the 2nd Annual Eastern Conference on child Sexual Abuse. Sponsored by the University of Wisconsin. March 12-14, 2003. Arlington, Virginia.

**International Accreditation Panel Member.** Evaluated prison and community-based sex offender treatment programs for accreditation for the Canadian government. Correctional Service of Canada International Accreditation Panel (with K. Hanson, R. Mann, W. Murphy, E. Wosniak, & E. Zamble). October 21-25, 2002. Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

**Development of a "Sex Offender Program Evaluation Instrument".** Consultant and committee member to develop a "Sex Offender Program Evaluation Instrument" (with K. Bumby, M. Carter, G. Cumming, D. D'Amora, S. Matson), & T. Talbot). Center for Sex Offender Management. October 5-6, 2002. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

**Using Best Practice Guidelines for Developing and Evaluating Treatment Programs.** A paper presented at the 21st Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference. October 2-5, 2002. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

**Development of a Treatment Needs and Progress Scale for Adult Sex Offenders.** A poster session presented at the 21st Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming and J. Livingston). October 2-5, 2002. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Member of Treatment Advisory Board, Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center (with J. Haaven, J. Marques, and W. Murphy). Conducted program evaluation and consultation site visit. September 9-11, 2002. Mauston, Wisconsin.

**Supervised Release Planning and Aftercare of Sexually Violent Persons.** Presentation at the Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center. September 10, 2002. Mauston, Wisconsin.

**Program Evaluation and Consultation.** Assessed the State of Texas' sex offender management policies and practices for parolees for the Parole Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice through a grant from the Center for Sex Offender Management (with M. Carter, G. Cumming, S. Matson, and T. Talbot). September 3-6, 2002. Austin, Dallas, and Hunstville, Texas.

***Thirty Years of Progress and What Lies Ahead?* and *Risk Assessment Tools: What are they Good For?*** A keynote address and a workshop presentation at the Past Perspectives and Future Horizons: Treatment, Policy and Management of Sex Offenders Conference sponsored by the Illinois Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers and the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. May 9-10, 2002. Normal, Illinois.

***Program Evaluation and Consultation.*** Presentation of program evaluation findings (evaluation conducted January 2002) and consultation to the Illinois Fourth Judicial District Probation Departments and Treatment Programs. May 3, 2002. Vandalia, Illinois.

***Motivational Interviewing* and *Data Collection and Analysis.*** Workshops at the Comprehensive Approaches to Sex Offender Management Grant Program, 2001 Implementation/Enhancement Grantee Sites Workshop. Sponsored by the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. April 11-12, 2002. Washington, DC.

***Therapeutic Intervention with Sex Offenders.*** A two-day workshop sponsored by the Indiana Sex Offender Management and Monitoring Program, Liberty Behavioral Health Corporation. March 14-15, 2002. New Castle, Indiana.

***Program Development Consultation.*** One-day program development consultation to the St. Lawrence County Criminal Justice Council. February 22, 2002. Canton, New York.

***Evaluation of Eight Community-Based Adult Sex Offender Treatment Programs in the Fourth Judicial District of the State of Illinois.*** Conducted program evaluations including program questionnaires, review of program materials, observation of treatment groups, treatment provider interviews, and interviews with judges, probation officers, victim advocates, and other criminal justice professionals for the Directors of Court Services in the nine county Fourth Judicial District, State of Illinois. Included a 5-day site visit. January, 2002. Centralia, Flora, Hillsboro, Mattoon, Mt. Vernon, Newton, Shelbyville, and Taylorville, Illinois.

***Sex Offenders: Why Do They Perpetrate Sexual Abuse and Who Are They?* and *Specialized Sex Offender Assessment and Treatment.*** Plenary presentations at the Effective Management of Sex Offenders in the Community training sponsored by the West Virginia Parole Services and the Office of Justice Programs. December 4, 2001. Elkins, West Virginia.

***The Vermont Assessment of Sex-Offender Risk (VASOR): An initial reliability and validity study.*** A poster session presented at the 20th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with S. Hoke, J. Livingston, & G. Cumming). November 7-10, 2001. San Antonio, Texas.

***Development of a Treatment Manual for Prison-Based Sex Offender Programs.*** A collaborative project of the Vermont, Minnesota, and Washington Departments of Corrections (with R. Goldman & M. Christopher). January 24-28, 2000; May 5-13, 2001; June 20-24, 2001; September 27-30, 2001. St. Paul, Minnesota.

***Program Evaluation of Dutchess County, New York Community-Based Sex Offender Programs.*** Follow-up program evaluation of the Relapse Intervention for Sex Crimes (RISC) Program for the Dutchess County Legislature and the Dutchess County Criminal Justice Council. June 2001. Poughkeepsie, New York.

***Treatment Standards Review Panel Member.*** Reviewer for program theory and logic model submissions by residential sex offender treatment programs regulated under Minnesota Rules Chapters 2955 and 2965. March 2000. Minnesota Department of Corrections.

**Videoconference "Sex Offender Treatment Skills for Corrections Professionals".** A live four-day satellite/internet videoconference sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections (with K. Bumby, F. Cohen, R. Goldman, P. Heil, G. Hover, and E. Wolahan). March 12-15, 2001. Long Beach, California.

**Videoconference "Sex Offender Treatment Skills: Facilitator's Training".** A live two-day satellite/internet videoconference sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections (with K. Bumby, R. Goldman, P. Heil, G. Hover, and E. Wolahan). December 13-14, 2000. Long Beach, California.

**The Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Aggressors: An Evaluation of a Prison-Based Treatment Program.** A poster session presented at the 19th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming, J. Livingston, S. Hoke). November 1-4, 2000. San Diego, California.

**Evaluating Sexual Offenders: Practical Clinical Strategies, Comprehensive Treatment of Sexual Offenders: Practical Clinical Strategies, Recent Innovations in Sex Offender Risk Prediction, and What Makes a Good Sex Offender Treatment Program.** Two one-day pre-conference institutes and two workshops presented at the 16<sup>th</sup> annual Midwest Conference on child Sexual Abuse and Incest. October 23-26, 2000. Madison, Wisconsin.

**Characteristics of Sex Offenders and Treatment for Sex Offenders.** Presentations at the Supporting People with Developmental Disabilities Who Are Sex Offenders Conference sponsored by the Vermont Department of Developmental Disabilities and Mental Health Services. September 8, 2000. Montpelier, Vermont.

**International Accreditation Panel Member.** Evaluated two national and two regional prison-based sex offender treatment programs for the Canadian government. Correctional Service of Canada International Accreditation Panel (with K. Hanson, B. Neilson, R. Mann, W. Murphy, A. Thurber, and E. Wosniak). August 27-28, 2000. Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada. August 29 - September 1, 2000. Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

**Development of the Videoconference "Sex Offender Treatment Skills".** A live satellite/internet videoconference sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections (with K. Bumby, R. Goldman, P. Heil, G. Hover, and E. Wolahan). August 24-25, 2000. Longmont, Colorado.

**Program Evaluation of Dutchess County, New York Community-Based Sex Offender Programs.** Program evaluation of the Relapse Intervention for Sex Crimes (RISC) Program for the Dutchess County Legislature and the Dutchess County Criminal Justice Council. February to August, 2000. Poughkeepsie, New York.

**Developing a Systems Approach to Assessing and Managing Sex Offenders.** Two two-day workshops for mental health professionals, judges, prosecutors, prison administrators, probation officers, parole officers, and government planners sponsored by the Taiwan, Republic of China, Ministry of Interior. June 19-20, 2000. Kaohsiung, Taiwan. June 21-22, 2000. Taipei, Taiwan.

**Sex Offender Risk Assessment.** Presentation and consultation to the Maryland Parole Commission on developing a risk assessment protocol for making release decisions concerning sex offenders. May 12, 2000. Baltimore, Maryland

**Allegations of Risk of Child Sexual Abuse: Assessing the Sexual Offender.** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. March 24, 2000. Waterbury, Vermont.

**Recent Innovations in Actuarial Risk Assessment: Theory, Instruments, and Case Studies.** A half-day workshop presentation at the Vermont Network of Sex Offender Treatment Providers' Annual Conference. March 16-17, 2000. Burlington, Vermont.

**Developing a Comprehensive Approach to Sex Offender Management.** A panel presentation at the Violence Against Woman Act Implementation and Enhancement Grantee Sites Meeting (with A. Boyd, G. Burnes-Smith, G. Cumming, D. D'Amora, & E. Varela). February 16-18, 2000. Washington, DC.

**Program Evaluation of the State of Wisconsin's Community-Based Adult Sex Offender Treatment Programs.** Conducted a 4-day site visit and program review. February 1-4, 2000. LaCrosse, Madison, and Waukesha, Wisconsin.

**Assessing and Managing Risk for Sex Offenders.** A two-day workshop sponsored by Solutions 2000. October 14-15, 1999. Austin, Texas

**The Roles of Probation and Parole Officers in Outpatient Sex Offender Treatment Programs: A National Survey.** A poster session presented at the 18th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with G. Cumming & J. Holt). September 22-25, 1999. Lake Buena Vista, Florida.

**Offender Characteristics and Behavior.** Paper presented at the National Symposium on Non-Stranger Sexual Assault. September 15-17, 1999. Estes Park, Colorado.

**Current Approaches to Risk Assessment.** A plenary presentation at the Center for Sex Offender Management Resource Sites Meeting (with David D'Amora). July 28-31, 1999. Boston, Massachusetts.

**The Role of Probation and Parole Officers in Sex Offender Treatment Groups.** A discussion session at the Center for Sex Offender Management Resource Sites Meeting (with Georgia Cumming ). July 28-31, 1999. Boston, Massachusetts.

**Sex Offender Treatment Skills.** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the New Hampshire Department of Corrections (with J. Johnson, K. Peterson, L. Messinger, and E. Wolahan). June 21-25, 1999. Manchester, New Hampshire.

**Curriculum Development Committee.** Center for Sex Offender Management. Review and critique training curricula on sex offender assessment, treatment, and supervision. June 3-4, 1999. Washington, DC.

**Characteristics of Sex Offenders and Treatment for Sex Offenders.** Presentations at the Supporting People with Developmental Disabilities Who Are Sex Offenders conference sponsored by the Vermont Department of Developmental Disabilities and Mental Health Services. April 30, 1999. Sherburne, Vermont.

**Allegations of Risk of Child Sexual Abuse: Assessing the Sexual Offender.** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. March 26, 1999. Waterbury, Vermont.

**Sex Offender Treatment Skills.** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (with J. Johnson, K. Peterson, L. Messinger, and E. Wolahan). March 15-19, 1999. Huntsville, Texas.

**Sex Offender Risk Assessment.** Presentation at a one-day seminar sponsored by the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts and the Center for Sex Offender Management (with G. Cumming, R. Freeman-Longo, S. Matson, & B. Ney). March 4, 1999. Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

**Assessment of Sex Offenders for Sentencing, Supervision, and Treatment.** A live satellite/internet videoconference broadcast to over 12,000 participants at over 550 sites. Sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Center for Sex Offender Management (with R. Coyn, D. Doren, K. English, & L. Scott). February 10, 1999. Long Beach, California.

**Sex Offender Treatment Skills.** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Kentucky Department of Corrections (with J. Johnson, K. Peterson, L. Messinger, and E. Wolahan). January 10-15, 1999. Louisville, Kentucky.

**Development of the videoconference "Assessment of Sex Offenders for Sentencing, Supervision, and Treatment".** A live satellite/internet videoconference sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Center for Sex Offender Management (with P. Burke, D. Doren., G. Keiser, L. Scott, T. Talbot, and E. Wolahan). December 16-17, 1999. Silver Spring, Maryland.

**Risk Assessment.** Panel presentation at the Center for Sex Offender Management Resource Sites Meeting (with B. Schwartz). Sponsored by the Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Corrections, State Justice Institute, and the Center for Sex Offender Management. December 7-9, 1998. Baltimore, Maryland.

**Development of the Seminar "Sex Offender Treatment Skills".** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections (with J. Johnson, K. Peterson, L. Messinger, and E. Wolahan). November 11-12, 1998. Longmont, Colorado.

**Actuarial Assessment of Sex Offender Risk.** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Michigan Department of Corrections. October 22, 1998. Lansing, Michigan.

**Moving Through denial: Why Child Molesters Admit.** A poster session presented at the 17th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference (with B. Gilbar). October 14-17, 1998. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

**Program Evaluation.** Evaluation of the Alaska Department of Corrections' sex offender treatment programs pursuant to a Federal Court order to reduce prison overcrowding. 9/28/98 to 3/24/99. State of Alaska.

**Sex Offender Assessment, Treatment, and Program Development.** A two-day seminar and program development consultation to the Louisiana Department of Public Safety (with A. Streveler). September 17-18, 1998. Alexandria, Louisiana.

**Supervising and Treating the Sex Offender.** A four-day seminar for mental health and corrections staff from the New England states sponsored by the New England Institute and the Vermont Corrections Institute (with M. Buell, M. Bellmay, L. Roberto, B. Scott). Conference plenary *Effective Supervision and Treatment of Sex Offenders*. July 28-31, 1998. Randolph Center, Vermont.

**Sex Offender Treatment Skills.** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Wisconsin Department of Corrections (with M. Alexander, A. Salter, T. Stevelar, S. Tupper, & E. Wolahan). July 19-24, 1998. Oshkosh, Wisconsin.

**The Polygraph: A Supervision Tool for Sex Offenders.** Presentation at the Vermont Judicial College. June 1-2, 1998. Ripton, Vermont.

**The Polygraph: A Supervision Tool for Sex Offenders.** Presentation at the Vermont State' Attorney's Summer Training Institute. June 3-4, 1998. Fairlee, Vermont.

**Allegations of Risk of Child Sexual Abuse: Assessing the Sexual Offender.** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. May 22, 1998. Rutland, Vermont.



***Overview of Sex Offender Treatment, Conducting a Sex History, and Relapse Prevention***

***Supervision.*** A one-day plenary workshop at the Sex Offender Intensive Supervision Training Conference sponsored by the Wisconsin Department of Corrections. May 5-7, 1998. Stevens Point, Wisconsin.

***Sex Offender Treatment Skills.*** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Colorado Department of Corrections (with R. Bresciani, L. Smith, P. Tedeschi, & K. Vigil). April 5-10, 1998. Longmont, Colorado.

***What are the Essential Elements of Treatment Standards.*** Panel presentation at the Center for Sex Offender Management Resource Sites Meeting (with D. D'Amora, M. Haine, & L. Sinclair). Sponsored by the Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Corrections, State Justice Institute, and the Center for Sex Offender Management. February 22-24, 1998. Phoenix, Arizona.

***Sex Offender Treatment Skills.*** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Vermont Department of Corrections (with M. Alexander, R. Sobo, & E. Wolahan). February 8-13, 1998. Burlington, Vermont.

***Development of the Seminar "Sex Offender Treatment Skills".*** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections (with R. Bresciani, R. Sobo, A. Streveler, K. Virgil, and E. Wolahan). December 18-19, 1997. Longmont, Colorado.

***Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Offenders: Practical Clinical Strategies.*** A two-day workshop sponsored by the New Hampshire Department of Corrections and the New Hampshire Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers. November 13-14, 1997. Concord, New Hampshire.

***Principles of Effective Correctional Treatment and Sex Offender Risk Assessment.*** A presentation at the Vermont Sex Offender Network Training sponsored by the Vermont Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Abuse. October 30-31, 1997. Burlington, Vermont.

***Cognitive-behavioral Treatment of Adult Sex Offenders: A treatment comparison study.*** A poster session presented at the 16th Annual Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference. October 15-18, 1997. Arlington, Virginia.

***Treating Child Molesters: Strategies and Outcomes.*** Workshop presented at the First Annual New England Conference on Child Sexual Abuse. September 22-23, 1997. Burlington, Vermont.

***Sex Offender Treatment Skills.*** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the Minnesota Department of Corrections and the National Institute of Corrections (with R. Goldman, A. Gordon, and E. Wolahan). August 24-29, 1997. St. Paul, Minnesota.

***Sex Offender Treatment Skills.*** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the Washington State Department of Corrections and the National Institute of Corrections (with R. Bresciani, R. Goldman, and A. Gordon). May 18-23, 1997. Seattle, Washington.

***Sex Offender Treatment Skills.*** A 36-hour seminar sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Vermont Department of Corrections (with R. Bresciani, R. Goldman, A. Gordon, and E. Wolahan). April 13-18, 1997. Burlington, Vermont.

***Sex offender assessment.*** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Florida Department of Corrections. June 10, 1996. Orlando, Florida.

***The sex offender: Practical strategies for assessment.*** A one-day workshop sponsored by the Alaska Department of Corrections. May 20, 1996. Anchorage, Alaska.

***Assessing and treating adult sex offenders: Practical clinical strategies.*** A three-day workshop sponsored by the University of California Davis School of Medicine and the California Department of Corrections. May 15-17, 1996. Diamond Bar, California.

***The sex offender: Practical strategies for assessment and treatment.*** A one-day workshop sponsored by the North Dakota Alliance for Sexual Abuse Prevention and Treatment and the North Dakota State Penitentiary. April 19, 1996. Bismarck, North Dakota.

**OTHER SELECTED ONSITE PRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS SPONSORED BY THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS (1986 - PRESENT)**

(Detailed citations available upon request)

Alabama Department of Corrections  
 Alaska Department of Corrections  
 American Probation and Parole Association  
 American Association of Sex Educators, Therapists, and Counselors  
 Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers  
 Association of Paroling Authorities International  
 Atlantic Shores Healthcare, Inc.  
 Arizona Division of Developmental Disabilities  
 California Department of Corrections  
 Capitol District Center for Sex Offender Management (Albany, New York)  
 Center for Sex Offender Management, Office of Justice Programs  
 Colorado Department of Corrections  
 Connecticut Community Providers Association  
 Correctional Service of Canada  
 Council of State Governments  
 Dartmouth Medical School, Department of Psychiatry  
 Dutchess County (New York) Legislature and Dutchess County Criminal Justice Council  
 Erie County (Pennsylvania) Mental Health and Mental Retardation Program  
 Essex County (New York) Association for Retarded Citizens  
 Florida Civil Commitment Center  
 Florida Department of Corrections  
 Florida Office of the State Courts Administrator  
 GEO Care, Inc, Boca Raton, Florida  
 Harder and Associates Counseling Services (Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada)  
 Hawaii Department of Corrections  
 Hawaii Judiciary  
 Hawaii Parole Authority  
 Her Majesty's Prison Service, London, England  
 Idaho Department of Corrections  
 Illinois Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers  
 Illinois Department of Corrections  
 Illinois Fourth Judicial Circuit Probation Departments  
 Illinois, Office of the Court Administrator  
 Indiana Sex Offender Management and Monitoring Program  
 Institute for Behavioral Healthcare (Tiburon, California)  
 Iowa Department of Human Services  
 Kansas Department of Corrections  
 Kentucky Department of Corrections  
 Liberty Behavioral Health Corporation  
 Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections  
 Maine Department of Corrections  
 Maricopa County (Arizona) Probation Department  
 Maryland Division of Corrections

Maryland Parole Commission  
Michigan Department of Corrections  
Middle Atlantic Correctional Association  
Midwest Conference on Child Sexual Abuse and Incest (Madison, Wisconsin)  
Midwest Regional Network for Intervention with Sex Offenders (Indianapolis, Indiana)  
Minnesota Department of Corrections  
Minnesota Sex Offender Program for Sexually Dangerous Persons  
National Center for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder  
National Children's Advocacy Center (Huntsville, Alabama)  
National Community Mental Healthcare Council  
New England Council of Community Mental Health Centers  
New England Institute of Alcohol Studies  
New Hampshire Department of Corrections  
New Hampshire Perpetrators Treatment Network  
New Hampshire Supreme Court Committee on Character and Fitness  
New Mexico Department of Corrections  
New York Department of Corrections  
New York State Coalition Against Sexual Assault  
North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts  
North Dakota Alliance for Sexual Abuse Prevention and Treatment  
North Dakota Governor John Hoeven and staff  
North Dakota State Penitentiary  
Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice  
Oregon Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers  
Oregon Attorney General's Sexual Assault Task Force  
Red Deer Family Therapy Group (Red Deer, Alberta, Canada)  
Rhode Island Sex Offender Management Task Force  
Safer Society Training Institute (Brandon, Vermont)  
Scottish Prison Service  
Sexual Assault Interagency Council (Denver, Colorado)  
Solutions 2000, Inc. (Houston, Texas)  
South Carolina Association for the Treatment of Sexual Aggressors  
South Dakota Department of Corrections  
St. Lawrence Community Justice Council (Canton, NY)  
Taiwan, Republic of China, Ministry of Interior  
Texas Department of Criminal Justice  
University of California Davis School of Medicine Office of Continuing Medical Education  
University of Alabama Medical School, Department of Psychiatry  
U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections  
U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs  
Vermont Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Abuse  
Vermont Department of Corrections  
Vermont Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation  
Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services  
Vermont House Judiciary Committee  
Vermont Judicial College  
Vermont Law Enforcement Task Force  
Vermont State's Attorney's Association  
Virginia Department of Corrections  
Virginia Sex Offender Treatment Association  
Washington State Department of Corrections  
West Virginia Division of Corrections  
Wisconsin Department of Corrections  
Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services, Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center

## **SELECTED PUBLICATIONS**

- McGrath, R. J., Livingston, J. A. & Falk, G. (in press). Community management of sexual abusers with intellectual disabilities: Characteristics, services, and outcome of a statewide program. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*.
- Murphy, W. D., McGrath, R. J. & Christopher, M. G. (in press). Evidence for the development of the ATSA Practice Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Adult Male Sexual Abusers. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*.
- McGrath, R. J., Livingston, J. A. & Falk, G. (2007). A structure method of assessing dynamic risk factors among sexual abusers with intellectual disabilities. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 112, 221-229.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., Hoke, S. E., & Bonn-Miller, M. O. (2007). *Outcomes in a community sex offender treatment program: A comparison between polygraphed and matched non-polygraphed offenders*. Manuscript submitted.
- Cumming G. F., & McGrath, R. J. (2005). *Supervision of the sex offender: Community management, risk assessment, and treatment* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.
- Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (2005). *Practice standards and guidelines for the evaluation, treatment, and management of adult male sexual abusers* (drafted by Christopher, M., Murphy, W., Haaven, J., Kokish, R., McGrath, R., & Thomas, J.). Beaverton, OR: Author.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., & Burchard, B. L. (2003). *Current practices and trends in sexual abuser management: The Safer Society 2002 Nationwide Survey*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G., Livingston, J. A., & Hoke, S. E. (2003). Outcome of a treatment program for adult sex offenders: From prison to community. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 3-17.
- McGrath, R. J. (2003). The parole interview. In P. B. Burke (Ed.), *A handbook for new parole board members*. Washington, DC: Association of Paroling Authorities International.
- McGrath, R. J. & Cumming, G.F. (2003). *Sex Offender Treatment Needs and Progress Scale Manual*. Middlebury, VT: Author (available from <http://www.csom.org/pubs/SexOffTreatScale.pdf>).
- McGrath, R. J. & Hoke, S. E. (2002). *Vermont Assessment of Sex-Offender Risk Manual*. Middlebury, VT: Author (available from <http://www.csom.org/pubs/VASOR.pdf>).
- McGrath, R. J., Livingston, J., & Cumming, G. (2002, January). Development of a sex offender treatment needs and progress scale for adult sex offenders. A report to the U. S. Department of Justice (Grant #1000-Wp-VX-0001). Waterbury, VT: Vermont Department of Corrections.
- McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G., Holt, J. (2002). Collaboration among sex offender treatment providers and probation and parole officers: The beliefs and behaviors of treatment providers. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14, 49-65.
- McGrath, R. J. & Hoke, S. E. (1994). *Vermont Assessment of Sex Offender Risk Manual*. Middlebury, VT: Author.
- Bumby, K.M., Goldman, R. A., Heil, P., Hover, G. R., & McGrath, R. J. (2001). *Sex offender treatment skills for corrections professionals: Participant manual*. Longmont, CO: U. S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

- Bumby, K.M., Goldman, R. A., Heil, P., Hover, G. R., & McGrath, R. J. (2001). *Sex offender treatment skills for corrections professionals: Facilitator manual*. Longmont, CO: U. S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.
- McGrath, R. J. (2000). Using behavioral techniques to control sexual arousal. In M. S. Carich & S. E. Mussack (Eds.), *Handbook on sex offender treatment* (pp. 105-116). Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.
- McGrath, R. J. (2000). Recent advances in sex offender risk prediction. *The Correctional Psychologist*, 32(2), 1-4.
- Cumming, G., & McGrath, R. J. (2000). External supervision: How can it increase the effectiveness of relapse prevention. In D. R. Laws, S. M. Hudson and T. Ward (Eds.), *Remaking relapse prevention with sex offenders* (pp. 236-253). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McGrath, R. J. (1999). Offender characteristics and behavior. In M. Loring (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Non-Stranger Sexual Assault Symposium* (pp.100-104). Denver: Denver Sexual Assault Interagency council.
- McGrath, R. J., & Purdy, L. A. (1999). Referring sex offenders for psychosexual evaluation: A review. *Journal of Addictions and Offender Counseling*, 19, 62-75.
- McGrath, R. J., Hoke, S. E., & Vojtisek, J. E. (1998). Cognitive-behavioral treatment of sex offenders: A treatment comparison and long-term follow-up study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 25 (2), 203-225.
- National Community Mental Healthcare Council. (1995). (R. J. McGrath, Chairperson of Guidelines Committee). *Preferred Clinical Practices Guide of the Behavioral Health Network of Vermont: Version 2*. Rockville, MD: Author.
- McGrath, R. J. (Ed.). (1995). *Vermont clinical practices guide for the assessment and treatment of adult sex offenders*. Williston, VT: Vermont Center for Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Abuse.
- McGrath, R. J. (1995). Sex offender treatment: Does it work? *Perspectives*, 19(1), 24-26.
- Behavioral Health Network of Vermont. (1994) (R. J. McGrath, Chairperson of Guidelines Committee). *Preferred Clinical Practices Guide: Version 1*. Montpelier, VT: Author.
- McGrath, R. J. & Hoke, S. E. (1994). *Vermont Assessment of Sex-offender Risk*. Waterbury, VT: Author. Also in G. Cumming & M. Buell, (1997). *Supervision of the sex offender* (pp. 145-147). Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press. Also in M. S. Carich & D. L. Adkerson, (1995). *Adult sex offender assessment* (pp.70-72). Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.
- McGrath, R. J. (1993). Preparing psychosexual evaluations of sex offenders: Strategies for practitioners. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 20(1/2), 139-158.
- Carey, C. H., Candido, J., Cumming, G., McGrath, R. J., Pithers, W. D., Routsong, L., White, P., Purdy, L. (1992). *Recommended guidelines for a system of investigation and treatment of juvenile sex offenders*. Waterbury, VT: Vermont Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Sexual Abuse.
- McGrath, R. J. (1992). Five critical questions: Assessing sex offender risk. *Perspectives*, 16(3), 6-9.
- McGrath, R. J. (1991). Sex-offender risk assessment and disposition planning: A review of empirical and clinical findings. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 35(4), 329-351.

- McGrath, R. J. (1990). Assessment of sexual aggressors: Practical clinical interviewing strategies. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5*(4), 507-519.
- Carey, C. H., & McGrath, R. J. (1989). Coping with urges and craving. In D. R. Laws (Ed.), *Relapse prevention with sex offenders* (pp. 188-196). New York: Guilford Press.
- McGrath, R. J., & Pandiani, J. A. (1987). Amount of financial rebate and collateral participation in a DWI school. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 32*(2), 49-55.
- McGrath, R. J., & Carey, C. H. (1987). Treatment of men who molest children: A program description. *Journal of Offender Counseling, 7*(2), 23-33.
- McGrath, R. J., & Carey, C. H. (1987). Adolescent male sex offenders: Methods and services in Vermont. *The Vermont Psychologist, 11*(2), 29-37.
- Pandiani, J. A., & McGrath, R. J. (1986). Attempts to dissuade drinkers from driving: The effects of driver characteristics. *Journal of Drug Education, 16*(4), 341-348.
- McGrath, R. J. (1986). An education program for collaterals of DWI offenders. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 3*(2), 139-151.

#### **JOURNAL ARTICLES PUBLISHED AS BOOK CHAPTERS**

- McGrath, R. J. (1994). Sex-offender risk assessment and disposition planning: A review of empirical and clinical findings. In D. West (Ed.), *Sex Crimes: International Library of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 221-243). Aldershot, England: Dartmouth Publishing Company.
- McGrath, R. J. (1986). An education program for collaterals of DWI offenders. In S. K. Valle (Ed.), *Drunk driving in America: Strategies and approaches to treatment* (pp. 139-151). New York: Haworth Press.

1111