WASHINGTON STATE CHAPTER OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE TREATMENT OF SEXUAL ABUSERS
05.15.2015
1 – 3:00 P.M.

Attendees

B. Judd; M. O'Connell; L. Paxton; K. Rongen; L. Trifiletti; J. Landon; M. Pinedo; M. Saylor; P. Spizman; J. Wheeler; H. Coryell; C. Covell; D. Yanisch; S. Getty; A. Schweighofer; V. Gollogly; L. Ramsdell-Gilkey; S. Kehoe-Ehlers; J. Williamson; J. Allison

Introductions: Attendees participated in brief introductions

Business Items

2 Continuing Education credits will be offered for attendance

Updates:
- None at this time.

Program Committee-
Please reserve your room at Mountain View Lodge for the upcoming retreat on June 12-13. Rooms will be release on June 1st and the special WATSA rate will no longer apply.

Additional upcoming training opportunities: None.

Membership committee- None.

Policy / Legislative Committee
- See board meeting minutes.

Budget Committee – None.

New Business
None at this time.

Christmas Covell presented on the Static 99R and Static 2002. The presentation was designed to be an open dialogue about what instruments evaluators are using and why. Currently there are no specific or particularly compelling reasons to use one instrument or another or to use the instruments together. There is one Hanson article (I don't have the reference) that supports the predictive accuracy of using multiple actuarials. The decision of which instrument(s) to use is a matter of clinical judgment and it is useful to consider why you are making the decisions you are making. There are some differences between the two measures:

	1999R	2002
Items	10	14
Domains	None	5
Convictions vs. changes	Both	Convictions only
Persistence of offending	Not really addressed	Specifically addressed
Predictive accuracy	Moderate	Moderate
General criminality		Better because more items
Risk categories	-3 through 1 = Low 2, 3 = Low-Moderate 4, 5 = Moderate-High 6 + = High	0-2 = low risk 3-4 = low-moderate risk 5-6 = moderate risk 7-8 = moderate-high risk 9+ = high risk

Research backing	Much more research in general, more validation studies, across many countries.	
Applicability once person has been in community	10 years (although some concerns about the research sample)	8 years

Other considerations:
1. The Static is not an appropriate tool for prediction of violent recidivism (the VRAG is a better choice)
2. Do evaluators use the Static when their client has been charged but not yet convicted? Some evaluators said they do when there is an agreed upon set of facts (i.e. the client will plead guilty or has admitted to the behavior) and some said they include a caveat in the risk assessment about the applicability of the Static to the case.
3. Is it useful to use the Static with clients who have been incarcerated for long stretches of time/ have not been in the community? Many evaluators place more emphasis on the dynamic factors in these cases. The applicability of the Static is limited here.
4. When you use multiple actuarials and they have different scores/ risk categories it can muddy the water in court.
5. There is support for use of the Risk Matrix 2000 for child porn offenders. The Static normative sample did not include CP offenders, so the Static is not necessarily indicated for this group. Many evaluators use the Static for CP offenders but include a caveat about limitations.
6. The group discussed how to choose the appropriate normative group when using the Static. Most evaluators stated presenting risk ratios seems to raise more questions and confusion than simply presenting the risk category. There are also problems with presenting the risk category alone (i.e. people may assume "high risk" means 90% chance of re-offense!).
7. Is it appropriate to use the Static in Luring/ Internet Sting cases? Not technically appropriate because these individuals were not represented in normative sample. In addition, the research shows many individuals involved in these cases would not have gone through with the behavior. It is helpful to look at the context of the case to decide whether the Static will over-represent risk. Research also says online behavior is not necessarily representative of off-line behavior.
8. Doug Epperson's inherent risk vs. threat model is also helpful.
9. Be mindful of the choices you are making in the risk assessments you choose. Also, be sure to indicate how the Static score applies in your conclusions section.
10. Update Static evaluator's workbook available on Static99.org (under "Norms" tab). http://www.static99.org/pdfdocs/Static-99RandStatic-2002R_EvaluatorsWorkbook-Jan2015.pdf