Name of Tool	Brief Assessment for Recidivism Risk (BARR-2002R)
Category	Sexual Offending (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Babchishin, Hanson and Blais
Year	2013

Description

- The Barr-2002R is an actuarial risk scale used to predict violent and general recidivism risk.
- The instrument is composed of a subset of six items from the Static-2002R (measure of general criminality) and age at release.
- The authors recommend that the Barr-2002R is used to predict violent and general recidivism rather than the Static-2002R (Babchishin, Hanson and Blais, 2013).

Age Appropriateness

18+

The Barr-2002R can be used with caution on individuals who committed their most recent offence between the ages of seventeen and eighteen on the condition that their release date falls after their eighteenth birthday. It is not to be used with those whose offence(s) all took place when they were under the age of seventeen.

Assessor Qualifications

Experience in assessing sexual violence risk. Training on the instrument is highly recommended.

Tool Development

- The Barr-2002R was developed within a sample of individuals convicted of sexual offences; thus, cannot be used on those who have committed non-sexual offences (Babchishin, Hanson and Blais, 2013).
- In the development study, the Barr-2002R was found to predict general and violent recidivism as well as other measures like the LS/CMI (Babchishin, Hanson and Blais, 2013).
- Jung, Wielinga and Ennis (2018) administered the Barr-2002R on males who had committed sexual offences (n=324). The instrument showed large effect sizes for predicting general and violent recidivism (AUC .718 and .737 respectively) and a moderate one for sexual recidivism predictions (AUC .661).
- Jung and Wielinga (2019) suggested that the Barr-2002R may be a valuable tool for law enforcement to evaluate violence risk among individuals charged with sexual assault offences. Applying the Barr-2002R to individuals charged with sexual assault (n=293) found that the tool showed a large effect in its ability to predict future general and violent offending; although the severity of future violent offending was not associated with Barr-2002R scores.

General Notes

- The Barr-2002R is not recommended for use in cases of sexual crimes like statutory rape where the sexual activity was consensual between people of similar ages. It is also not recommended for use in individuals who have only been convicted of offences such as child pornography possession and prostitution. It is also not to be used on those who have not committed a violent offence after living in the community for a period of at least eight years (Babchishin, Hanson and Blais, 2013).
- Babchishin, Hanson and Blais (2016) recommended that individuals scoring highly on the Barr-2002R (five or higher) should be subject to a more detailed risk assessment.
- Jung, Wielinga and Ennis (2018) found that there was a significant correlation between the scores of Barr-2002R and the SORAG.

Name of Tool	Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT)
Category	Sexual Offending (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Seto and Eke
Year	2015

Description

- The CPORT is a risk assessment tool designed to predict any sexual recidivism for men convicted of child pornography offences.
- It consists of 7 items: age at time of investigation, any prior criminal history, any contact sexual offending, any failure on conditional release, indicators of sexual interest in child pornography material or prepubescent or pubescent children, more boy than girl content in child pornography and more boy than girl content in other child depictions. If present, each item is worth one point.
- It is recommended that the CASIC scale developed by the authors to assess paedohebephilia (sexual interest in children) is used in conjunction with the CPORT tool.

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

The CPORT guide details the following requirements for those intending to use the tool:
"Individuals accessing this document are expected to be experienced and current in the field of risk assessment and sexual offending, including child pornography offending, in order to make informed decisions regarding how the information herein may be relevant to their professional practice" (Eke, Helmus and Seto, 2018).

Tool Development

- It was developed from a sample of 286 adult men convicted of a least one child pornography offences using information available in Canadian police files, meaning that other criminogenic factors could not be examined. The legal definition for child pornography in Canada was used, where images of nude or partially dressed children are not illegal if there is no sexual activity and/or focus on the genital and anal regions (Eke and Seto, 2016).
- The development study found the CPORT had acceptable predictive accuracy for any sexual recidivism (AUC=.74) and contact sexual recidivism (AUC=.74). The CPORT was found to significantly predict sexual recidivism for internet offenders with other types of offending (bar contact offences) (AUC=.69) and those with histories of contact offending (AUC=.80); although it did not significantly predict sexual recidivism for those with only internet offences (Seto and Eke, 2015).
- The development samples were amalgamated with a new sample of 80 individuals with internet offences to give an overall sample of 346 men with internet offences. Any sexual recidivism for the

entire sample was an acceptable level at .724. This sample was then divided by those who committed only internet offences and those who had also committed contact offences. Predictive accuracy was found to be moderate at .685 for those who had committed internet offences and .767 for individuals with contact and internet offences (Eke, Helmus and Seto, 2018).

•A study looking at the convergent validity of CPORT with the VRS:SO found moderate positive correlations between the CPORT and VRS:SO criminality score. The CASIC scale was also found to have a moderate positive correlation with the VRS:SO sexual deviance score (Maltais and Sribney, 2018).

•A sample of 119 individuals convicted of child pornography offences were scored with the CPORT. CPORT scores are significantly higher for offenders with contact sexual offences and although the likelihood of child pornography reoffending is low, the odds increase with higher scores on the CPORT (Gunnarsdóttir, 2019).

General Notes

•Further updates on the CPORT, including a regularly revised 'Frequently Asked Questions' section, are available at: https://www.researchgate.net/project/Child-Pornography-Offender-Risk-Tool-CPORT

•The CPORT can be used with any man who has committed an internet offence. This includes men who have committed internet offences alongside other types of sexual offences (e.g. contact offence against a child). It can be used alongside other risk assessment tools meant to assess sexual recidivism.

•A limitation of the tool is that the admission or diagnosis of paedophilia or hebephilia is vulnerable to self-reporting bias. To negate this risk, Seto and Eke (2017) developed the CASIC scale to assess 'paedophebephilia' (sexual interest in prepubescent and pubescent children respectively) This scale consists of six items looking at factors like marital status, collection and nature of context, access to children and engaging in online communications with children. Testing the scale on the sample of males from the developmental study resulted in an acceptable AUC of .71. further testing on a small cross-validation sample of 60 individuals with internet offences showed excellent predictive accuracy with an AUC of .81. The authors recommended that the CASIC measure may replace item 5 of the CPORT if a score of 3 or more is generated (Seto and Eke, 2017).

•A modified version of the CPORT (CPORT-M) was developed, consisting of five items: age, prior criminal history, any contact sexual offending, any failure on conditional release and any indication (and/or admission) or paedophilic or hebephiliac interests. The CPORT-M was found to have moderate predictive accuracy of general recidivism amongst individuals with child pornography offences (AUC=.68); although the sexual recidivism rates were too low to correlate with risk (Pilon, 2016).

•As indicated in personal communications in 2017, Seto and Eke gauged there is interest in validating the CPORT in the United States, Australia and criminal justice agencies throughout Canada. In another email update in 2017, Eke shared that there are a few groups currently conducting or planning to conduct validation work with the instrument: for instance, Ontario's probation and parole.

•The authors advise evaluators use caution when reporting CPORT scores, given the unknown stability of the recidivism estimates. It is also recommended that the tool is not used if more than one item is missing (Eke and Seto, 2016).

•The CPORT had not been evaluated with females or juveniles; thus is not recommended for use in these populations (Eke and Seto, 2016).

•At the present time, there has been no empirical assessment of the use of CPORT with individuals who have been charged and are still involved in criminal proceedings. If an assessor decides to use

CPORT prior to conviction for the purposes of sharing information about risk factors, the authors highly recommend that a caveat is added in about there being no empirical support for this. The authors caution against using CPORT in cases where the individual's charge for child pornography offences has already been withdrawn or dismissed – there is currently no empirical evidence for using the CPORT in this population ([Eke, Maaike Helmus and Seto, 2018](#)).

- The CPORT is free and publicly available.

Name of Tool	Kent Internet Risk Assessment Tool-2 (KIRAT-2)
Category	Sexual Offending (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	McManus, Long and Alison
Year	2011

Description

• The KIRAT-2 is a brief screening tool designed to assess the risk of contact sex offending in males who access indecent images of children (IIOC) via the internet. It is the national model in England and Wales to rank those who have committed internet offences for their risk of committing contact offences against children based on their history of contact offending. It aims to identify internet offenders who share the most features with those who have also committed contact sexual offences (Long et al,. 2016).

• The tool can be applied to males involved in possession, distribution and production of IIOC.

• The tool is comprised of two parts. Part one examines two pre-assessment factors: (1) organisational risk and (2) risk of contact sexual abuse. Part two contains fourteen items that assess the individual's previous offence history, their access to children and any other factors that may contribute to their level of risk.

• The tool contains summary risk judgements for the two pre-assessment factors.

• The final risk level of committing contact sexual offences is categorised as either 'low', 'medium' or 'high.' The tool does not predict future risk or reoffending; rather, its intention is to provide a 'robust procedure' to prioritise cases (Long et al., 2016).

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

The KIRAT is intended for use within the police service. Assessors are required to complete an online training course. It is only suitable for use in adult males.

Tool Development

• The factors included in the KIRAT are based on empirical literature relating to internet sex offending. The context for the creation of the KIRAT was related to the limited application of other validated risk assessment tools in assessing sexual violence risk posed by individuals who commit internet sex offences (Long, Alison and McManus, 2012; McManus et al., 2011).

• The KIRAT was generated subsequent to a collaborative project between the University of Liverpool and the Kent Police Force in relation to the investigation of the use of abusive and indecent images of children. The tool was created in order to aid police in prioritising cases of internet sex offending.

• The national roll out of the KIRAT commenced in 2012. The same year the European Commission provided funding under the 'Fighting International Internet Paedophilia' (FIIP) project with partners from the UK, Netherlands, Spain, Ireland and Estonia to develop the tool into its second version (Long et al., 2016).

The development study looked at 273 individuals who had offended (120 with both internet and contact offences and 153 with non-contact offences), with the KIRAT correctly identifying 100% of those at high risk and 70% of those who are low and medium risk of progressing onto a contact offence. The predictive accuracy was found to be good with an AUC of .86. The following factors were identified as significant to dual offending: previous non-sexual convictions, grooming, production of IIOC, living with partner and children who are not biologically their own and access to children (Long, Alison and McManus, 2012).

• Long and colleagues (2016) examined the validity of version 2 of the KIRAT. Data was obtained from 374 police files from 11 forces across the UK. The KIRAT classified 97.6% for high risk and 62.3% for low and medium risk. Fifty cases from the data set were randomly selected to test inter-rater reliability. The majority of variables demonstrated excellent agreement with ICC values higher than .750 and the remainder showed good agreement. Long et al. (2016) concluded that the KIRAT provides an evidence-based approach to prioritising cases for law enforcement.

General Notes

• Tool has not been validated with other specific groups such as females or adolescents.
• The KIRAT is not a conventional risk assessment tool to be used for measuring recidivism. It is also not suitable to be used for sentencing purposes or assessment for court.
• The tool can be completed by hand or electronically.
• The tool is widely used across police forces in England and Wales.
• An executive summary published by the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) described the KIRAT as "... currently the most rigorously tested and widely employed risk assessment tool for IIOC cases..." (CEOP, 2012).
• For further information, e-mail: kirat@kent.pnn.police.uk

Name of Tool	Structured Assessment of Risk and Needs (SARN)
Category	Sexual Offending (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Thornton
Year	2002

Description

• The SARN is a standardised treatment planning tool used within the HM Prison Service (Hogue, 2009). It seeks to identify the long-term psychological risk factors relevant to individuals who have committed sexual offences (Smid et al., 2014).

• The tool contains 16 items that assess risk, treatment needs and progress in those convicted of sexual offences. Each risk factor is scored either 0 (not present), 1 (present but not a central characteristic), 2 (a central characteristic). For instances when information is poor or inconsistent, it is not possible to score factors (Webster et al., 2006).

• The items are subdivided into four domains; (1) sexual interest: sexual preoccupation, sexual preference for children, sexualised violence preference and other offence-related sexual interests; (2) distorted attitudes: adversial sexual entitlement beliefs, rape supportive beliefs, viewing women as deceitful; (3) social and emotional functioning: feelings of personal inadequacy, distorted intimacy balance, grievance thinking towards others, a lack of emotional intimacy with adults; (4) self-management: impulsiveness, poor problem-solving, poor management of emotion.

• The SARN is administered in conjunction with the RM2000. Utilising the RM2000 to assess the static factors, the SARN follows on thereafter to determine the dynamic and treatment factors.

• SARN can be completed by HPC Registered forensic psychologists and experienced probation officers.

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

Assessors should have the relevant training offered by the HM Prison and Probation Service and experience in risk assessment and risk management and SARN can be completed by HCPC Registered forensic psychologists.

Tool Development

• The SARN is based on the Structured Anchored Clinical Judgement-Minimum (SACJ-Min) which itself has been updated and refined into RM2000 (Thornton, 2002).

• The tool is a derivative of the Structured Risk Assessment (Thornton, 2002).

• Webster et al. (2006) obtained a mean inter-rater agreement of 84.3% in a pilot study with a small sample of trained professionals. In the four cases rated by the professionals, the Kappa values ranged from .61 to .84.

- [Webster and colleagues (2006)](#) carried out two studies: one with seven experienced raters; the other with clinicians with differing levels of experience who had been trained in the SARN. The first study demonstrated strong support for the inter-rater reliability of the SARN; although this can perhaps be expected given the raters were highly experienced in rating and dealing with those who have committed sexual offending. The second study gave acceptable to good levels of support for inter-rater reliability.
- [Tully, Browne and Craig (2015)](#) tested another version of the tool commonly used by the National Offender Management Service in England and Wales, focusing on 'treatment needs assessment' based on the risk factors applicable to each individual assessed (SARN-TNA). This tool was applied to 496 adult males over two and four year follow up periods. ROC was found not to be significant at 2 years (AUC .59 in a sample of 304) or 4 years (AUC .57 in a sample of 161). It is, therefore, recommended that the SARN-TNA is not relied upon as a predictor of sexual reoffending.

General Notes

- The instrument itself is only normed on adult males with a previous offence history and is deemed inappropriate for the use with females and juveniles.
- [Webster et al. (2006)](#) circumscribed a number of provisions for use of the SARN: it should be applied by experienced psychologists; its use should be carefully monitored and evaluated; users should have demonstrated reasonable inter-rater reliability before using the tool without supervision.
- [Beech et al. (2003)](#) reported on the use of the SARN in conjunction with the Sex Offender Treatment Programme in English prisons. While facilitators welcomed the tool, they found the outcome reports that were generated were too complex and lengthy for less literate individuals.
- [Hocken and colleagues (2013)](#) carried out thematic analysis on the transcript from a discussion group of sexual offending management experts. It was found that the SARN was not appropriate to be used with individuals with learning disabilities.

Name of Tool	Sexual Offender Treatment Intervention and Progress Scale (SOTIPS)
Category	Sexual Offending (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	McGrath, Cumming and Lasher
Year	2013

Description

- The SOTIPS is a dynamic measure to be used with adult males who have sexually offended. It is designed to augment the findings from static risk tools by allowing for the identification of changeable risk factors that could be targets for treatment and supervision interventions (Lasher and McGrath, 2017; Miner et al., 2018).
- Sixteen risk factors relate to three broad domains:

1) sexual deviance, composed of sexual offence responsibility, sexual behaviour, sexual attitudes, sexual interests and sexual risk management;
Items;

2) criminality factors, containing criminal and rule-breaking behaviour, attitudes, stage of change, cooperation with treatment, cooperation with community supervision, emotion management, problem solving, impulsivity;

3) social stability and supports which consists of employment, residence, social influences (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).

- Scoring is to be undertaken on intake and thereafter every six months. Items are scored on a 4-point scale ranging from minimal, no need for improvement, considerable need for improvement and very considered need for improvement. These are totalled into a range of between 0-48 points, divided into three risk groups: low (scores of 0-10); moderate (scores of 11-20); high (scores of 21-48). The intention of this is to provide an estimation of an individual's overall level of dynamic risk and need for supervision and treatment (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013; Lasher and McGrath, 2017).
- Improvements have been made from the previous version published in 2012. The number of items were reduced from 22 to 16 and a few items were edited to make them clearer. Sample interview questions and several case examples with accompanying scoring explanations are now provided for each item to assist assessors with their scoring. A definition of 'qualifying sexual offence' was also added to the manual. The 'qualifying sex offences' are divided into Category A and Category B offences. Category A offences are illegal sexual behaviours committed against an identifiable child or a non-consenting adult victim. This definition also extends to online solicitation and non-contact offences like exhibitionism and voyeurism. Category B offences are convictions for illegal sexual offences where there is no identifiable victim (possessing child pornography) or both parties were consenting (statutory rape if there is an age difference of less than 3 years, consenting sex with another adult in a public place, soliciting a prostitution) (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).
- Evaluators should consider information from multiple sources when scoring an individual: interviews, information from relevant sources (treatment providers, probation officers, etc.), behavioural observations and psychological tests (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).
- It can be used in combination with other risk assessment tools such as the VASOR-2 or Static-99R (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

The SOTIPS was designed to be used by clinicians, case workers and probation/parole officers. Users of the SOTIPS should have a basic understanding of risk principles and risk factors relating to sexual offending. Users should carefully read the manual and undertake the training, which includes scoring practice cases. Training also includes how to use the SOTIPS with a static risk measure like the Static-99R or VASOR-2 (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).

Tool Development

• The SOTIPS focuses on three factors relating to sexual recidivism: 1) sexual deviancy, including sexual interests, offending, attitudes and motivation to change behaviour; 2) criminality, consisting of general antisociality, impulsiveness and oppositional reactions to rules; 3) social stability and supports looking at dysfunctional coping and the development of social support mechanisms (McGrath, Lasher and Cumming, 2012).

• The SOTIPS development sample (n=759) consisted of adult males who had been convicted of one or more qualifying sexual offences and had committed at least one of these when they were eighteen years of age. SOTIPS scored a good level of inter-rater reliability for single measures (ICC=.77) and average measures (ICC=.87). There was also acceptable inter-rater reliability for each of the three factors: sexual deviance, ICCs of .68 and .81 for single and average respectively; criminality, ICC of .76 for single and .86 for average; social stability and supports of .69 and .82 for single and average measures. Moderate to good predictive accuracy was shown for sexual, violent and any recidivism at 1, 7 and 12 months after participants began treatment (AUCs ranged from .60 to .85). Combining the SOTIPS scores with those from the Static-99R yielded a better degree of predictive accuracy than either instrument alone (AUCs ranged from .67 to .89). (McGrath, Lasher and Cumming, 2012).

• A follow-up study by Lasher and McGrath (2017) using a selection of the original sample (n=563) found that those who did not go on to reoffend demonstrated a greater degree of change during their first year in treatment than those who did commit further sexual or violent offences.

• An evaluation of SOTIPS implementation at sites in Maricopa County and New York City was carried out by Miner and colleagues (2018). The findings from focus groups held with users of the instrument were that the SOTIPS was easy to understand and its focus on sexual offending made it useful and effective for their work.

• Inter-rater reliability was tested for the single and average scores on the SOTIPS. In the site of Maricopa County, ICCs were .653 and .790 for single and average scores respectively. In New York City, this was tracked over time with higher ICCs being generated for scoring done within one month (ICC=.821 for single; ICC=.902 for average) compared to within a time period of two months (ICC=.784 for single; ICC=.879 for average). These findings show that the SOTIPS is sensitive to change over time (Miner et al., 2018).

• The third SOTIPS assessment showed greater ability predict to sexual reoffending than the initial assessment. The AUCs were .71 and .72 for the third assessment of single and average scores respectively; in contrast to the AUC of .63 for the single score and the AUC of .64 for the average score for the initial assessment (Miner et at., 2018).

• Lasher and colleagues (2015) compared therapist and client assessment scores in the middle of a prison-based treatment programme designed for adult males who had committed sexual offences. Although findings showed there were significant differences in SOTIPS scores between therapists and clients, the correlations were substantial for criminality (ICC=.71), moderate for social stability and supports factor (ICC=0.59) and fair for sexual deviance (ICC=0.23). The authors maintained that the SOTIPS provides a useful framework to allow therapists to engage their clients collectively to identify strengths, treatment needs and potential treatment programmes.

General Notes

• Miner and colleagues (2018) found that the SOTIPS items appear to be inclusive of those relating to sexual offending and general criminality. Based on this, they maintained that the SOTIPS is potentially useful for measuring the dynamic risk factors that can predict reoffending, as well as for guiding decision-making relating to interventions, supervision and dispositions.

• Implementation of the SOTIPS into an organisation needs to take into consideration the workload, workflow and decision-making processes of those undertaking assessments and interpreting the results (Miner et al., 2018).

• A study by Miner and colleagues (2018) found that the recency of the SOTIPS assessment was associated with accuracy. This means that it is acceptable for supervision levels to be adjusted based on the most recent risk level.

• Risk categories vary depending on whether the SOTIPS is used alone or in conjunction with another tool. If the SOTIPS is used independently, the categories are low, moderate and high. If it is used in combination with a static risk instrument like the VASOR-2 or Static-99R, the risk categories would be mixed: for instance, if an individual scored as low on the VASOR-2 but as high on the SOTIPS this would give an overall rating of moderate-low (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).

• The manual advises that when the SOTIPS is used in residential settings, a few of the items are scored to reflect the individual's level of functioning for the six months prior to his placement in prison or other secure residential settings (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).

• Since the SOTIPS does not cover all of the factors linked to sexually abusive behaviour, it is recommended by the developers that other relevant tools and professional judgment should be used in the supervision and treatment planning process (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).

• Training workshops use case studies to demonstrate how to score the SOTIPS and also how to use it alongside other tools like the VASOR-2 and Static-99R. A 'Train the Trainer' workshop is available for up to 12 trainees who have already completed SOTIPS training and undertaken at least 10 assessments on individuals who have committed sexual offences. Following this workshop, trainees will be authorised to train staff at their organisation (McGrath, Cumming and Lasher, 2013).

• The manual is available free of charge here: http://www.robertmcgrath.us/index.php/risk-instruments/sotips/

Name of Tool	Vermont Assessment of Sex Offender Risk 2 (VASOR-2)
Category	Sexual Offending (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	McGrath, Hoke and Lasher
Year	2013

Description

- The VASOR-2 is a 14-item static risk tool designed to assess risk amongst adult males who have been convicted of at least one sexual offence.
- It is two-fold in nature: an 11-item reoffence risk scale consisting of static risk factors including alcohol and drug use, residence and employment stability and treatment amenability; a 3 item Severity Items checklist looking at the intrusive nature, the harm caused to the victim and the vulnerability of the victim all for index sexual offence. An individual's score should be updated if they commit a new sexual offence (McGrath, Hoke and Lasher, 2013).
- The qualifying offences for this instrument are 'Category A' ones involving illegal sexual behaviour perpetrated against a child or adult victim. It may be used in cases of 'Category B' offences, which are illegal actions but with no identifiable victims or consenting parties (e.g. statutory rape), but only if the individual already has a conviction for a 'Category A' offence (McGrath, Hoke and Lasher, 2013).
- It is designed to be scored by clinicians, correctional caseworkers and probation/parole officers.

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

This tool is designed to be scored early by clinicians, correctional caseworkers and probation and parole officers. Users should have an understanding of the risk factors relating to sexual offending recidivism and risk assessment.

Users must read the manual and complete training including practice cases to optimise scoring accuracy and reliability.

Tool Development

- The development study found the VASOR-2 predicted sexual recidivism with moderate accuracy (AUC .74) within a group of those who had committed sexual offences (n=1581). It also demonstrated good inter-rater reliability with an ICC of .88 (McGrath, Hoke and Lasher, 2013).
- The VASOR-2 has fewer items and simpler scoring instructions than the original VASOR. The items on the original instrument about force used during index sex offence and amenability to treatment were removed in the revision (McGrath et al., 2014).

- The VASOR-2 was tested for its predictive accuracy on four meta-analytic datasets from Canada and Vermont (n=1581). It was found to predict sexual recidivism amongst different types of sexual offending: child abusers (n=1067, AUC=.74), rapists (n=395, AUC=.77) and non-contact offences (n=87, AUC=.69). Caution is urged, however, when using the scale with those who have committed non-contact sexual offences, due to the low sample size and statistical power (McGrath et al., 2014).
- Good inter-rater reliability was shown for the VASOR-2 when tested using two independent ratings of thirty cases (McGrath et al., 2014).

General Notes

- The VASOR-2 has only limited value for making decisions about allowing an individual who has committed sexual offences to reside with children. The authors recommend that professional judgment and other tools should be used in the decision-making process (McGrath, Hoke and Lasher, 2013).