

Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG) Sex Offender Risk Appraisal Guide (SORAG)

(to be completed within 60 days of admission and updated if additional information is obtained)

Service Recipient's Name: _____

Date of Admission: _____ Legal Status _____

Charges: _____

Date of Assessment: _____ Location: _____

Assessor/s Name/s: _____

Instructions*

Use the attached sheets to document the scores for each item in the VRAG/SORAG assessment for this service recipient. Please refer to the supplementary scoring guidelines for select items (elementary school maladjustment, index offense, separation from parents before age 16, and failure on conditional release). Be sure and include a brief description of the data source for each item in the area marked "Evidence" on the form. Also include a brief description of the adequacy of your data base used to score the VRAG/SORAG. Use the "Summary of Results" section to document the results of the VRAG/SORAG assessment. Do NOT separate these pages.

If the service recipient does not have a sexual offense history, do NOT score the SORAG. If there is a history of sexual offending or if the committing index offense is a sex offense, score BOTH the VRAG and the SORAG or score the VRAG and an alternative actuarial sex offense risk assessment instrument in place of the SORAG– (e.g., the Static-99 is recommended). In either event, the VRAG must be filled out as a measure of risk for general violent recidivism for all cases. Raters will also complete a sex offender risk assessment instrument for sex offenders.

If there are inconsistent data for one or more items, score the instrument using a range. Fill in the HIGHEST score in the Raw Score blank and the LOWEST score in parentheses.

(Check the appropriate response)

1. Does this service recipient have a sexual offense history or index sexual offense? ____ Yes ____ No

2. Did you interview this service recipient to gather data for this assessment? ____ Yes ____ No

Comments about completeness/accuracy of information used to score the VRAG/SORAG:

* NOTE: Please refer to "Violent Offenders. Appraising and Managing Risk" (1998) by Quinsey, Harris, Rice, and Cormier for additional information on the VRAG and SORAG.

Service Recipient's Name: _____ Date: _____

Summary of Results

VRAG Results

SORAG Results

Raw Score
(Lowest) _____

Items Scored as "0"
Due to Lack of Information _____ (fill in item numbers) _____

Items Scored
as a Range _____ (fill in item numbers) _____

*Risk Category
(Low, Medium, High)
based on VRAG/SORAG
scores alone _____

* Do NOT specify a risk category for females. Simply indicate N/A in the space provided. Research on the VRAG with women has not supported its predictive validity in this population [See Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 2002, Law and Human Behavior 26 (4)]

Childhood & Adolescent Taxon Scale

1. Elementary School Maladjustment
 No Problems 0
 Slight (Minor discipline or attendance)
 or Moderate Problems 0
 Severe Problems (Frequent disruptive
 behavior and/or attendance or behavior
 resulting in expulsion or serious suspensions)
 1
 Evidence:

2. Teenage Alcohol Problem:
 No..... 0
 Yes..... 1
 Evidence:

3. Childhood Aggression Rating:
 No Evidence of Aggression 0
 Occasional Moderate Aggression..... 0
 Occasional or Frequent Extreme Aggression. 1
 Evidence:

4. More than 3 DSM Conduct Disorder
 symptoms circled:
 No..... 0
 Yes..... 1

5. Ever suspended or expelled from school:
 No 0
 Yes..... 1
 Evidence:

6. Arrested under the age of 16:
 No 0
 Yes..... 1
 Evidence:

7. Parent alcoholism:
 No 0
 Yes..... 1
 Evidence:

8. Lived with both biological parents to age 16
 (except for death of parents):
 Yes..... 0
 No 1
 Evidence:

**TOTAL CATS SCORE: (Sum of Circled
 Scores 1 - 8) _____**

CONDUCT DISORDER SYMPTOMS (Unless otherwise noted, circle any item that the person did before the age of 18):

1. Often bullied, threatened or intimidated others
2. Often initiated physical fights
3. Used a weapon that could cause serious physical harm to others (e.g., a bat, brick, broken bottle, knife, gun)
4. Was physically cruel to people
5. Was physically cruel to animals
6. Stolen while confronting a victim (e.g., mugging, purse snatching, extortion, robbery)
7. Forced someone into sexual activity
8. Deliberately engaged in fire setting with the intention of causing serious damage

9. Deliberately destroyed others' property (other than by fire setting)
10. Broken into someone else's house, car, or building
11. Often lied to obtain goods or favors or to avoid obligations (i.e., "cons" others)
12. Stolen items of nontrivial value without confronting a victim (like shoplifting, theft, or forgery)
13. **Before 13**, stayed out late at night, despite parental prohibitions
14. Ran away from home overnight (or longer) at least twice while living in parental or parental surrogate home (or once without returning for a lengthy period)
15. **Before 13**, was often truant from school

Violence Risk Appraisal Guide (VRAG) Items:

1. Lived with both biological parents to age 16 (except for death of parent):

- Yes -2
- No +3

Evidence:

2. Elementary School Maladjustment:

- No Problems..... -1
- Slight (Minor discipline or attendance) or Moderate Problems..... +2
- Severe Problems (Frequent disruptive behavior and/or attendance or behavior resulting in expulsion or serious suspensions) +5
(Same as CATS Item)

3. History of alcohol problems (Check if present):

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Parental Alcoholism | Teenage Alcohol Problem |
| Adult Alcohol Problem | Alcohol involved in prior offense |
| Alcohol involved in index offense | |
- No boxes checked -1
 - 1 or 2 boxes checked 0
 - 3 boxes checked +1
 - 4 or 5 boxes checked +2

Evidence:

4. Marital status (at the time of or prior to index offense):

- Ever married (or lived common law in the same home for at least six months) -2
- Never married..... +1

Evidence:

5. Criminal history score for nonviolent offenses prior to the index offense

- Score 0 -2
- Score 1 or 2 0
- Score 3 or above +3
(from the Cormier-Lang system, see below)

6. Failure on prior conditional release (includes

parole or probation violation or revocation, failure to comply, bail violation, and any new arrest while on conditional release):

- No.....0
- Yes +3

Evidence:

7. Age at index offense

Enter Date of Index Offense: ___/___/___

Enter Date of Birth: ___/___/___

Subtract to get Age:

- 39 or over -5
- 34 - 38 -2
- 28 - 33 -1
- 27 0
- 26 or less..... +2

8. Victim Injury (for index offense; the most serious is scored):

- Death..... -2
 - Hospitalized.....0
 - Treated and released..... +1
 - None or slight (includes no victim) +2
- Note: admission for the gathering of forensic evidence only is NOT considered as either treated or hospitalized; ratings should be made based on the degree of injury.

Evidence:

9. Any female victim (for index offense)

- Yes -1
- No (includes no victim)..... +1

Evidence:

10. Meets DSM criteria for any personality disorder (must be made by appropriately licensed or certified professional)

- No..... -2
- Yes +3

Evidence:

11. Meets DSM criteria for schizophrenia (must be made by appropriately licensed or certified professional)

Yes -3
 No +1

Evidence:

12. a. Psychopathy Checklist score (if available, otherwise use item 12.b. CATS score)

4 or under -3
 5 – 9 -3
 10-14 -1
 15-24 0
 25-34 +4
 35 or higher +12

Note: If there are two or more PCL scores, average the scores.

Evidence:

12. b. CATS score (from the CATS worksheet)

0 or 1 -3
 2 or 3 0
 4 +2
 5 or higher +3

12. WEIGHT (Use the highest circled weight from 12 a. or 12 b.)

TOTAL VRAG SCORE (SUM CIRCLED SCORES FOR ITEMS 1 – 11 PLUS THE WEIGHT FOR ITEM 12): _____

CORMIER – LANG CRIMINAL HISTORY SCORES FOR NONVIOLENT OFFENSES¹

Instructions: Include ALL ARRESTS for ALL COUNTS for the following criminal offenses, including juvenile offenses. Write down the number of times the offender has been arrested (or the number of separate counts charged, which ever is highest) for each type of offense. Multiply that number by the weight in the column on the right and write that number in the blank. Total all of the resulting scores to obtain the total Cormier-Lang Criminal History Score.

| <u>Offense</u> | <u>Arrests/Charges</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Score</u> |
|--|------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Robbery (bank, store)..... | | X 7 | = _____ |
| Robbery (purse snatching)..... | | X 3 | = _____ |
| Arson and fire setting (church, house, barn)..... | | X 5 | = _____ |
| Arson and fire setting (garbage can)..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Threatening with a weapon..... | | X 3 | = _____ |
| Threatening (uttering threats)..... | | X 2 | = _____ |
| Theft over * (includes car theft and possession stolen prop)..... | | X 5 | = _____ |
| Mischief to public or private property over *..... | | X 5 | = _____ |
| Break and enter and commit indictable offense (burglary)..... | | X 2 | = _____ |
| Theft under *(includes possession stolen goods under)..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Mischief to public or private property under * (also public)..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Break and enter (includes break and enter with intent)..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Fraud (extortion, embezzlement)..... | | X 5 | = _____ |
| Fraud (forged check, impersonation)..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Possession of a prohibited or restricted weapon..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Procuring a person for, or living on the avails of prostitution..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Trafficking in narcotics..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Dangerous driving, impaired driving (including DWI)..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Obstructing peace officer (including resisting arrest)..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Causing a disturbance..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Wearing a disguise with the intent to commit an offense..... | | X 1 | = _____ |
| Indecent exposure..... | | X2 | = _____ |

TOTAL CORMIER – LANG NONVIOLENT SCORE

* Roughly equivalent to larceny versus grand larceny, based on the value of the stolen property. In 1997, the critical value was \$1000.

¹ Please see attached scoring guide for additional information about the Cormier-Lang System

Sex Offender Risk Appraisal Guide (SORAG)

Items:

1. Lived with both biological parents to age 16
(except for death of parent):
Yes -2
No +3
(Same as VRAG)

2. Elementary School Maladjustment:
No Problems -1
Slight (Minor discipline or attendance)
or Moderate Problems +2
Severe Problems (Frequent disruptive
behavior
and/or attendance or behavior resulting in
expulsion or serious suspensions) +5
(Same as CATS Item)

3. History of alcohol problems (Check if
present):
Parental Alcoholism Teenage Alcohol Problem
Adult Alcohol Problem Alcohol involved in prior offense
Alcohol involved in index offense
No boxes checked -1
1 or 2 boxes checked 0
3 boxes checked +1
4 or 5 boxes checked +2
(Same as VRAG)

4. Marital status (at the time of or prior to
index offense):
Ever married (or lived common law in the
same home for at least six months) -2
Never married +1
(Same as VRAG)

5. Criminal history score for nonviolent
offenses (from Cormier-Lang system)
Score 0 -2
Score 1 or 2 0
Score 3 or above +3
(Same as VRAG)

6. Criminal history score for violent
offenses
Score 0 -2
Score 1 or 2 0
Score 3 or above +6
(From the Cormier-Lang system, below)

7. Number of previous convictions for
sexual offenses (pertains to convictions
known from all available documentation
to be sexual offenses prior to the index
offense) Count any offense known to be
sexual, including, for example, incest
0 -1
1 or 2 +1
3 or more +5
Evidence:

8. History of sex offenses only against girls
under 14 (including index offenses; if
offender was less than 5 years older
than victim, always score +4)
Yes 0
No +4
Evidence:

9. Failure on prior conditional release
(includes parole or probation violation or
revocation, failure to comply, bail
violation, and any new arrest while on
conditional release):
No 0
Yes +3
(Same as VRAG)

10. Age at index
Enter Date of Index Offense: ___/___/___
Enter Date of Birth: ___/___/___
Subtract to get Age:
39 or over -5
34 - 38 -2
28 - 33 -1
27 0
26 or less +2
(Same as VRAG)

11. Meets DSM criteria for any personality
disorder (must be made by appropriately
licensed or certified professional)
No -2
Yes +3
(Same as VRAG)

12. Meets DSM criteria for schizophrenia
(must be made by appropriately
licensed or certified professional)

Yes -3
No +1
(Same as VRAG)

13. Phallometric test results
All indicate nondeviant preferences -1
No Phallometric test results available 0
Any test indicates deviant preferences ... +1
Evidence:

14. a. Psychopathy Checklist score (if
available, otherwise use item 12.b.
CATS score)
4 or under -3

5 – 9 -3
10-14 -1
15-24 0
25-34 +4
35 or higher +12

Note: If there are two or more PCL scores,
average the scores.
(Same as VRAG)

14. b. CATS score (from the CATS worksheet)
0 or 1 -3
2 or 3 0
4 +2
5 or higher +3

14. WEIGHT (Use the highest circled weight
from 12 a. or 12 b.)

**TOTAL SORAG SCORE (SUM CIRCLED
SCORES FOR ITEMS 1 – 13 PLUS THE
WEIGHT FOR ITEM 14):** _____

CORMIER – LANG CRIMINAL HISTORY SCORES FOR VIOLENT OFFENSES²

Instructions: Include ALL ARRESTS for ALL COUNTS for the following violent criminal offenses, including juvenile offenses. Write down the number of times the offender has been arrested (or the number of separate counts charged, which ever is highest) for each type of offense. With the exception of attempted murder, all attempted offenses are scored the same as the offense itself. Multiply that number by the weight in the column on the right and write that number in the blank. Total all of the resulting scores to obtain the total Cormier-Lang Violent Criminal History Score.

| <u>Offense</u> | <u>Arrests/Charges</u> | <u>Weight</u> | <u>Score</u> |
|--|------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Homicide (murder, manslaughter, criminal negligence w/death) | | X 28 | = _____ |
| Attempted murder, causing bodily harm with intent to wound | | X 7 | = _____ |
| Kidnapping, abduction, and forcible confinement | | X 6 | = _____ |
| Aggravated assault, choking, administering a noxious thing | | X 6 | = _____ |
| Assault causing bodily harm..... | | X 5 | = _____ |
| Assault with a weapon..... | | X 3 | = _____ |
| Assault, assaulting a police officer | | X 2 | = _____ |
| Aggravated sexual assault, sexual assault causing bodily harm | | X 15 | = _____ |
| Sexual assault with weapon | | X 12 | = _____ |
| Sexual assault, gross indecency (vaginal, anal or oral penetration)..... | | X 10 | = _____ |
| Sexual assault (attempted rape, indecent assault) | | X 6 | = _____ |
| Gross indecency (offender fellates or performs cunnilingus on victim)..... | | X 6 | = _____ |
| Sexual assault (sexual interference, invitation to sexual touching)..... | | X 2 | = _____ |
| Armed robbery (bank, store) | | X 8 | = _____ |
| Robbery with violence | | X 5 | = _____ |
| Armed robbery (not a bank or store) | | X 4 | = _____ |
| TOTAL CORMIER – LANG VIOLENT SCORE..... | | | _____ |

² Please see attached scoring guide for additional information about the Cormier-Lang System

DETERMINING THE PROBABILITY OF VIOLENT AND SEXUAL RECIDIVISM

I. Violent Offender Recidivism

1. Use the VRAG total score from Page 4.
 2. Using the VRAG table, go down the left column until you see the number of the VRAG score you wrote down in 1.
 3. The VRAG Category of Risk tells you the risk category for this offender. The VRAG categories range from Low to High. If someone's score approximates a higher risk category, indicate such by citing a range (e.g., if someone's VRAG score is a -8, -9, or -10, categorize their risk as Low to Medium, rather than just Low). This indicates that the patient/defendant is at the high range of the Low scale.
-

II. Sexual Offender Recidivism

1. Use the SORAG total score from Page 6.
2. Using the SORAG table, go down the left column until you see the number of the SORAG score you wrote down in 1.
3. The SORAG Category of Risk tells you the SORAG category for this offender. The SORAG categories range from Low to High. If someone's score approximates a higher risk category, indicate such by citing a range (e.g., if someone's SORAG score is a 17, 18, or 19, categorize their risk as Medium to High, rather than just Medium). This indicates that they are at the high range of the Medium scale.

VRAG

| VRAG Score | Category of Risk |
|------------|------------------|
| -24 | Low |
| -23 | Low |
| -22 | Low |
| -20 | Low |
| -19 | Low |
| -18 | Low |
| -17 | Low |
| -16 | Low |
| -15 | Low |
| -14 | Low |
| -13 | Low |
| -12 | Low |
| -11 | Low |
| -10 | Low |
| -9 | Low |
| -8 | Low |
| -7 | Medium |
| -6 | Medium |
| -5 | Medium |
| -4 | Medium |
| -3 | Medium |
| -2 | Medium |
| -1 | Medium |
| 0 | Medium |
| 1 | Medium |
| 2 | Medium |
| 3 | Medium |
| 4 | Medium |
| 5 | Medium |
| 6 | Medium |
| 7 | Medium |
| 8 | Medium |
| 9 | Medium |
| 10 | Medium |
| 11 | Medium |
| 12 | Medium |
| 13 | Medium |
| 14 | High |
| 15 | High |
| 16 | High |
| 17 | High |
| 18 | High |
| 19 | High |
| 20 | High |
| 21 | High |
| 22 | High |
| 23 | High |
| 24 | High |
| 25 | High |
| 26 | High |
| 28 | High |
| 32 | High |

SORAG

| SORAG Score | Category of Risk |
|-------------|------------------|
| -17 | Low |
| -16 | Low |
| -15 | Low |
| -14 | Low |
| -13 | Low |
| -12 | Low |
| -11 | Low |
| -10 | Low |
| -9 | Low |
| -8 | Low |
| -7 | Low |
| -6 | Low |
| -5 | Low |
| -4 | Low |
| -3 | Low |
| -2 | Low |
| -1 | Low |
| 0 | Low |
| 1 | Low |
| 2 | Low |
| 3 | Medium |
| 4 | Medium |
| 5 | Medium |
| 6 | Medium |
| 7 | Medium |
| 8 | Medium |
| 9 | Medium |
| 10 | Medium |
| 11 | Medium |
| 12 | Medium |
| 13 | Medium |
| 14 | Medium |
| 15 | Medium |
| 16 | Medium |
| 17 | Medium |
| 18 | Medium |
| 19 | Medium |
| 20 | High |
| 21 | High |
| 22 | High |
| 23 | High |
| 24 | High |
| 25 | High |
| 26 | High |
| 27 | High |
| 28 | High |
| 29 | High |
| 30 | High |
| 31 | High |
| 32 | High |
| 33 | High |
| 34 | High |

Supplementary Scoring Guidelines

(from <http://www.mhcva.on.ca/Research/bookerr.htm>)

Elementary School Maladjustment

First, it's important to note that this refers to the eight grades (formal years) of schooling after kindergarten. Here are some criteria and examples for scoring this item:

Minor or Moderate Problems: (minor or moderate discipline or attendance problem; reports of nonassaultive, disruptive behavior or incidents of truancy on at least two occasions or one or two suspensions for nonassaultive or minor assaultive behavior) Some examples are: suspended for smoking on school property; told to report to the principal's office on at least two occasions for refusing to co-operate with assignments, or for interfering with other students' class participation, or for "talking back" to a teacher; parents notified because of incidents of pushing students down in the schoolyard; suspended twice for truancy; and told to report to the principal's office for threatening a teacher.

Severe problems (frequent disruptive behavior and/or attendance problems, or serious assaultive behavior, or any behavior resulting in expulsion) Some examples are: punching a teacher; expelled for selling drugs at school; suspended for beating up a student; several incidents of truancy either occurring all in one grade or over several grades.

Index Offense

In our research, the index offense was the criminal or antisocial activity that resulted in the offender becoming a subject in our research. In most cases, this was a criminal charge or conviction that directly resulted in his admission to Oak Ridge. Especially among sex offenders, however, the index offense sometimes involves judgment. For example, for a man sent to Oak Ridge for sexual assaulting his daughter many times over a decade, we defined the index offense date as the date on which the first assault occurred. As another example, for a man sent to Oak Ridge for rape who later was convicted for making obscene phone calls while incarcerated, the rape was the index offense. As yet another example, for a man sent to Oak Ridge for a sexual murder who revealed in therapy that he also committed rapes before being apprehended, the sexual murder was the index offense.

Separation from Parents before age 16

Any period greater than or equal to a month during which the offender lived completely apart from either biological parent counts. Separations could be due to divorce or marital separation, or institutionalization of parent or child but separation due entirely to death of a parent did not count. Also, voluntary (i.e., instigated by the family and not by the youth justice system) separations for vacation, summer camp, or boarding school did not count.

Did failure on Conditional Release count failures when under clinical supervision as an insanity acquittee or other psychiatric release?

No, only failures involving criminal justice services (bail, probation, parole, etc.) counted.

Cormier-Lang System for Quantifying Criminal History

GROUP 1

| | |
|---|----|
| Homicide (murder, manslaughter, criminal negligence causing death) | 28 |
| Attempted murder, causing bodily harm with intent to wound | 7 |
| Kidnapping, abduction, and forcible confinement | 6 |
| Aggravated assault, choking, administering a noxious thing | 6 |
| Assault causing bodily harm | 5 |
| Assault with a weapon | 3 |
| Assault, assaulting a peace officer | 2 |
| Aggravated sexual assault, sexual assault causing bodily harm | 15 |
| Sexual assault with weapon | 12 |
| Sexual assault, gross indecency (vaginal or anal penetration; victim Forced to fellate offender) | 10 |
| Sexual assault (attempted rape, indecent assault) | 6 |
| Gross indecency (offender fellates or performs cunnilingus on victim) | 6 |
| Sexual assault (sexual interference, invitation to sexual touching) | 2 |
| Armed robbery (bank, store) | 8 |
| Robbery with violence | 5 |
| Armed robbery (not a bank or store) | 4 |

GROUP 2

| | |
|--|---|
| Robbery (bank, store) | 7 |
| Robbery (purse snatching) | 3 |
| Arson and fire setting (church, house, barn) | 5 |
| Arson and fire setting (garbage can) | 1 |
| Threatening with a weapon | 3 |
| Threatening (uttering threats) | 2 |
| Theft over* (includes car theft and possession of stolen property over) | 5 |
| Mischief to public or private property over* | 5 |
| Break and enter and commit an indictable offense (burglary) | 2 |
| Theft under* (includes possession of stolen goods under) | 1 |
| Mischief to public or private property under* (includes public mischief) | 1 |
| Break and enter (includes breaking and entering with intent to commit an offense) | 1 |
| Fraud (extortion, embezzlement) | 5 |
| Fraud (forged check, impersonation) | 1 |
| Possession of a prohibited or restricted weapon | 1 |
| Procuring a person for, or living on the avails or prostitution | 1 |
| Trafficking in narcotics | 1 |
| Dangerous driving, impaired driving (driving while intoxicated) | 1 |
| Obstructing peace officer (including resisting arrest) | 1 |
| Causing a disturbance | 1 |
| Wearing a disguise with the intent to commit an offense | 1 |
| Indecent exposure | 2 |

NOTES AND INSTRUCTIONS*

This system is an adaptation of an adaptation of an earlier one by Akman and Normandeau (1967). It can be used to quantify an offender's history of criminal offenses, a current or index offense, or a particular subgroup of offenses (such as violent offenses or property offenses). For scoring the VRAG and SORAG, all arrests (including juvenile crimes) prior to the index offense are scored separately for violent and nonviolent criminal history. Add up each "count" of an offence to determine the seriousness within that type. For example, if there are two counts of breaking and entering ($2 \times 1 = 2$) and three counts of theft under ($3 \times 1 = 3$), then the resulting score would be 5. Scores can be cumulative or separated into desired categories (i.e., total of all offense types or separated into violent and nonviolent or sexual and nonsexual). Charges of "attempted" offense such as attempted armed robbery are scored the same as if the offense had been completed with the exception of attempted murder, which has a separate assigned value.

This system can be used when only official police "rap sheet" information is available (e.g., records from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Fingerprint Service), but when possible, police reports from investigating officers and witnesses should also be used to clarify details. In cases where the exact type is unknown, use an "at least" method to score. For example, if an offense is known to be assault but there are no details as to whether it was assault causing bodily harm or aggravated assault, score the offense in the lowest category, as 2.

Many Criminal Codes and other systems to categorize criminal conduct distinguish between violent and nonviolent offenses. In Canada there is a distinction between offenses against the person and offenses against property. However, such official distinctions usually do not appropriately capture what is, at best, a somewhat arbitrary distinction. In Canada, for example, bigamy is listed as an offense against the person, whereas robbery is an offense against property. In scoring the VRAG and the SORAG, offenses listed in Group 1 are generally considered to be violent, and offenses listed in Group 2 are nonviolent, but exceptions are possible. Documents with details of offenses can (and should whenever possible) be used for scoring. In general, for example, armed robbery and robbery with violence are scored as violent offenses, but robbery is considered to be nonviolent. However, if investigating officers' reports indicated that a robbery arrest was associated with violent conduct (e.g., a victim was injured), the offense would be recorded as violent. As another example, an arrest for pointing a firearm or possession of a restricted weapon would be recorded as nonviolent without additional information. However, if police reports from witnesses indicated that the charges were associated with violent conduct (e.g., attempting to fire a weapon at someone), the offense would be recorded as violent. Similarly, a conviction for setting offense may be recorded as mischief (with a score of 1), but if details of the offense clearly indicated that the offense was actually setting fire to a home and causing substantial damage, then the score would be 5 for the most serious of the arson offenses.

Many criminal offenses do not appear here. There are a variety of reasons for this. First, some offenses (e.g., sedition, bestiality, bribery, counterfeiting, hijacking, pretending to discover stolen property by occult science) are so rare that we did not derive a score for them. In the case of such

* From Appendix E of "Violent Offenders. Appraising and Managing Risk" (1998) by Quinsey, Harris, Rice, and Cormier

rare offenses, the listed offense closest to the rare one should be used: kidnapping for hijacking; and fraud for counterfeiting, for example.

Second, some offenses – prostitution, possession of narcotics, bookmaking and other so-called “victimless” crimes – were too minor to include. Third, some offenses – parole; mandatory supervision violations; breach of probation, recognizance or bail; failure to appear; and escapes and unlawfully at large – were addressed separately in other areas of the original research and are therefore not included here unless these crimes resulted in additional offenses (e.g., a murder by a prison escapee), which then would be scored.

This system (and the earlier one by Akman & Normandeau, 1967) is based on the Criminal Code of Canada, which itself is based on British Common Law, as are the criminal statutes throughout the English-speaking world. Thus, the Canadian Criminal Code is very similar to the statutes in individual states in the United States. To the extent that a particular state code is different, some amount of judgment is required to approximate as closely as possible the names of offenses in other jurisdictions. For example, an offense commonly listed in U.S. states is battery, which usually involves some physical injury. It would therefore be comparable to the assault causing bodily harm listed in this scoring method. Similarly, larceny does not appear in the Canadian Code but is usually equivalent to theft.

In addition, the Canadian Criminal Code entails two classes for some offenses (e.g., theft, mischief, possession of stolen property) against property-offenses resulting in a loss over a particular monetary value versus those involving a loss less than that value. This is similar to the grand larceny versus larceny distinction in some other jurisdictions. The scoring system presented here reflects that distinction assigning larger values to offenses exceeding that criterion (Over*) compared to those that do not (Under*). Because of inflation, the critical value has changed from time to time (from \$50 to \$200 to \$1,000). Scoring is done according to whether the offense exceeded the cutoff value at the time.

Problems with interjurisdictional comparability are more troublesome for research application of this system than application to individual cases. In an individual case, once it is clear an offender's score is zero or exceeds 2 (e.g., more than one violent offense and more than two nonviolent offenses automatically exceed a score of 2), scoring is straightforward. Only in cases where a distinction is possible among scores of 0, 1, or 2 is any judgment required to determine how a particular arrest corresponds to the system here. Sometimes the sentence prescribed by the Criminal Code can be a guide to relative seriousness.