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Combatting Sexual Offending and Victimization

- Practitioners and policymakers have a common goal: to protect the public from sex offenders and prevent sexual violence
- A variety of policies and programs exist
- Little known about “what works”
- Programs are more likely to be effective when based on scientific evidence
U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Role in Combatting Sexual Offending and Victimization

- Established in 2006 by AWA
- First federal office devoted solely to sex offender management-related activities
- Responsible for assisting with implementation of SORNA, and for informing about a broader scope of sex offender management activities needed to ensure public safety
- SOMAPI: identify evidence based practices, current gaps/needs of the field, and provide guidance to states and locals
SMART Office Sex Offender Management Assessment and Planning Initiative

- Goal is to identify research-supported programs for replication across the U.S.
  - Inform OJP funding decisions concerning sex offender programming and research
- Assess the state of research and practice of sex offender management
  - Work conducted by subject-matter experts through NCJA
  - Review of the literature on sexual offending and sex offender management
- 2012 Discussion Forum involving national experts
**SMART Office Sex Offender Management Assessment and Planning Initiative**

Literature reviews on 8 adult and 5 juvenile topics

*Important to distinguish between adults and juveniles*

**Adult Topics**
- Incidence and prevalence
- Etiology
- Typologies
- Risk assessment
- Recidivism
- Internet offending
- Treatment effectiveness
- Management strategies

**Juvenile Topics**
- Etiology/typologies
- Risk assessment
- Recidivism
- Treatment effectiveness
- Registration and notification
SMART Office Sex Offender Management Assessment and Planning Initiative

- Key products:
  - Summaries of the research available online at: http://www.smart.gov/SOMAPI/index.html
  - Findings, policy implications, future research needs
  - Research briefs
  - Targeted conference presentations
  - Webinars
  - National Symposium
Literature Review Methods

- Source materials identified using abstract databases, internet searches, outreach to relevant organizations and subject matter experts
- Primarily studies conducted within the past 15 years
- Emphasis on individual studies that employed scientifically rigorous methods, as well as on synthesis studies – such as systematic reviews and meta-analyses
Sex Offender Management Strategies

Summary of Research Findings
Intensive Supervision Research - General

- No support for ISP with criminal offenders\(^1\)
- Support for treatment oriented ISP\(^2\)
Containment Approach

- Developed based on research of best practices at the time
- Collaboration between officers, treatment providers, & polygraphers\(^3\)
- Research supports effectiveness\(^4\)
- But is not conclusive\(^5\)
Circles of Support & Accountability (COSA)

- Community volunteers (e.g., faith based)
- Provide resources
- Typically post-supervision
- Developed in Canada, and now in U.K., Europe, and U.S.
COSA Research

- Two Canadian studies showed COSA effective in reducing sexual recidivism\(^6\)
- MN DOC study showed reduction in any rearrest\(^7\)
- U.K. study (n=60) showed favorable outcomes (e.g., 1 sexual recidivist, 5 reincarcerations)\(^8\)
Polygraph Research

- Impact on disclosures (# of victims, offenses, offense categories, high risk behaviors, age of onset, duration, frequency)\(^9\)
- Research mixed: containment approach may be effective; polygraph by itself questionable\(^{10}\)
Polygraph Surveys

- Treatment providers and supervision officers believe the polygraph is helpful\textsuperscript{11}

- Sex offenders (n=95) also believe polygraph is beneficial - 72\%\textsuperscript{12}
Electronic Monitoring (GPS)

- Passive (radio transmitter device; GPS) and active (GPS – real-time location tracking)
- Exclusion zone and victim residence notification
- 47 states use GPS (6 – lifetime)\textsuperscript{13}
Electronic Monitoring (GPS) General and Specific Research

- General offender research results mixed with some showing no benefits\textsuperscript{14} while others do show benefits\textsuperscript{15}
- Sex offender research also mixed with some showing benefits\textsuperscript{16} while others don’t\textsuperscript{17}
- Laws have no impact on rate of rape\textsuperscript{18}
Sexual Offender Civil Commitment (SOCC)

- 20 states and the U.S. government have civil commitment programs
- Detain high risk sex offenders with a “mental abnormality” as Sexually Violent Predators (SVPs) post-supervision
SOCC Research

- Very few released – less than 10 per program (n=16 programs)$^{19}$
- No outcome studies of SVPs
- Study of almost-SVPs (referred but not committed) – 23% sexual recidivism in 6-year follow-up$^{20}$
SORN Research

- Research to date mixed on SORN effectiveness
- Some studies demonstrate no reduction in sex crime rate based on SORN$^{21}$
- Others show reductions$^{22}$
SORN Research

- Most studies demonstrate no reduction in sex reoffense based on SORN\(^23\)
- A few show reductions\(^24\)
- Failure to register doesn’t impact reoffense\(^25\)
SORN Surveys

- Public believes SORN beneficial\(^{26}\)
- Impact on sex offenders (physical assault or injury, property damage, threatened or harassed, job loss, loss of housing, a family member or roommate being harassed or assaulted, negative psychological consequences)\(^{27}\)
Residence Restriction Research

- No reduction in sexual reoffense\textsuperscript{328}
- No reduction in sex crime rate\textsuperscript{29}
- No deterrence for sexual reoffenses\textsuperscript{30}
- Most offenders meet victims (not strangers) in private residence\textsuperscript{31}
Residence Restriction Surveys

- Offenders report having to move, limited housing options, increased homelessness, loss of family support, & family hardship\textsuperscript{32}
Sex Offender Management Strategies

Research Limitations and Future Needs
Research Limitations

- Small # of studies on a given strategy
- Short follow-up periods
- Small sample sizes
- Different outcome measures
- Inability to isolate ind. variable
- Lack of generalizability
- Lack of scientific rigor in some studies
Survey Limitations

- Small response rates and sample sizes
- Self-selection bias
- Lack of corroboration of offender self-report
Research Needs

- Research using rigorous scientific methods be encouraged & supported
- Comparison studies with longer follow up periods
- Identify program components leading to positive results
Sex Offender Management Strategies

Conclusions and Policy Implications
Conclusions

- Treatment oriented specialized supervision appears to be effective
- COSA is a promising practice but more research needed
- Polygraph research is mixed; should only be used as part of comprehensive treatment/supervision approach
Conclusions

- More research is needed on SORN
  - Has broad community support
- Residence restrictions don’t appear to be effective; should not be used
- Positive impact of strategies reliant upon RNR approach (not 1 size fits all)
- Policies should be evidence-based; allow for innovation and study
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Registration and Notification of Juveniles who Commit Sexual Offenses

Introduction
Juvenile SORN

- Wetterling Act allowed but did not mandate juvenile SORN
- 41 states register juveniles
- 30 states notify on juveniles
- Adam Walsh Act – 1st Federal juvenile SORN law

¹
Juvenile SORN Assumptions

- High rate of juvenile sexual offending
- Juveniles similar to adults
- Juveniles are a heterogeneous, difficult to intervene with, and have high recidivism²
Juvenile SORN

- Iatrogenic effect on juveniles, families, and community
- Implemented in the absence of research
Registration and Notification of Juveniles who Commit Sexual Offenses

Summary of Research Findings
Juvenile SORN Research

- UCR Data from 47 states (1994-2009)
- Sex crime rates pre- and post-SORN
- No statistically significant decrease in juvenile sex crime arrests post-SORN\(^3\)
Juvenile SORN Research

- N = 1275 juveniles between 1990-2004 in South Carolina
- SORN implemented in 1995
- 9 year follow-up
- No different in sexual recidivism pre- and post-SORN
- Non-sexual, non-assault recidivism rate higher for SORN juveniles
Juvenile SORN Research

- N = 319 juveniles in Washington from 1995-2002
- 5 year follow-up period
- Level I or II – 9% sexual recidivism
- Level III (SORN) – 12% sexual recidivism
Juvenile Disposition Research

- N = 18,068 juveniles who committed sexual offenses or robbery in South Carolina between 1990-2004
- Change in prosecutor decision-making post-SORN (1995), particularly if younger and fewer priors
- No change in decision-making for robbery

6
Juvenile Disposition Research

- N = 299 juveniles in Michigan in 2006
- Cases pled to non-SORN case
- Ineligible for county-funded specialized treatment

\(^7\)
Juvenile vs. Adult Recidivism Rates

- Juvenile sexual recidivism rates between 7-13% over 5 year follow-up\(^8\)
- Adult sexual recidivism rates 14% over 5 year follow-up, 20% over 10 years, and 24% over 15 years\(^9\)
- Do juveniles and adults present the same risk?
Sexual Recidivism for Juveniles who Commit Sex vs. Non-Sex Offenses

- N = 2,029 juveniles released from secure custody
- 5 year follow-up
- Sexual recidivism = 6.8% for juveniles who commit sexual offenses
- Sexual recidivism = 5.7% for juveniles who commit non-sex offenses\(^\text{10}\)
Research Needs

- More, more, more
- Research using rigorous scientific methods be encouraged & supported
- Larger sample sizes to overcome low base rate issue
- Impacts of SORN on juveniles and families
Registration and Notification of Juveniles who Commit Sexual Offenses

Conclusions and Policy Implications
Conclusions

- SORN questionable for juveniles
- Need more research before any further expansion
- Ensure support community safety and effective rehabilitation of the juveniles
Notes

1 Holmes (Didwania) (2009; revised 2012)
2 Chaffin (2008); Letourneau & Miner (2005)
3 Holmes (Didwania) (2009; revised 2012)
4 Letourneau, Bandyopadhyay, Sinha, & Armstrong (2009a)
5 Barnoski (2008)
6 Letourneau, Bandyopadhyay, Sinha, & Armstrong (2009b)
7 Calley (2008)
8 Alexander (1999); Caldwell (2010); Reitzel & Carbonell (2006)
10 Caldwell (2007)
References

References

Q & A

To submit questions for the presenters please use the chat feature on the right hand side of your screen. Please select Host and Presenter.
Thank You for Joining Us!

Please join us for the final webinar in this series on October 19. The topic will be Adult Sex Offender Treatment.

To register for this webinar, please visit http://ncja.org/webinars-events/sex-offender-mgt-webinars

The webcast and slides from today’s webinar will be posted at the same link.

This webinar series is supported by Grant No. 2010-DB-BX-K086 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the SMART Office, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions are those of the speakers.