

# Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction



Ohio Institute on Correctional Best Practices

## **Best Practices Tool-Kit: Sex Offender Registration and Notification**



Ted Strickland  
Governor

Terry J. Collins  
Director

October 2007

*The Best Practices Tool-Kit is published at least 4 times a year by the Institute for Excellence in Justice, a collaborative partnership between the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Institute on Correctional Best Practices and the Ohio State University's Criminal Justice Research Center. Please direct all questions to Coretta Pettway at [Coretta.Pettway@odrc.state.oh.us](mailto:Coretta.Pettway@odrc.state.oh.us)*



# BEST PRACTICES TOOL KIT

Prepared by: Millie Harris and Coretta Pettway



## Sex Offender Registration and Notification

This Best Practices Tool-Kit aims to identify laws, state statutes and some empirical research regarding sex offender registration and notification. The objective of this tool kit is to provide information that will better inform policymakers, practitioners and researchers on sex offender registration and notification. For definitional purposes, best practices fall on a continuum ranging from those practices that are well established and have clearly demonstrated their effectiveness to those that show promise or may be exemplary, but have yet to be fully evaluated and their results documented (Wilkinson 2003).<sup>1</sup>

### Background: Ohio Statutes

The federal government implemented three acts primarily responsible for the creation and operation of sex offender registration and notification:

1. Jacob Wetterling Act (1994) required states to:
  - ❑ Create a system of sex offender registration;
  - ❑ Distinguish sex offenders from sexually violent predators (SVP), with the latter defined as someone who commits a sexually violent offense and has a mental abnormality which disposes that person to commit future sexually violent offenses;
  - ❑ Establish a board of experts to serve the courts by providing information by which the court determines whether or not the offender has such a mental abnormality and is sexually dangerous; and,
  - ❑ Along with local law enforcement, develop sex offender registration and address verification systems;
  - ❑ Ensure that registered sex offenders moving from state to state are reciprocally registered.
2. Megan's Law (1996) required states to:
  - ❑ Develop and enforce procedures regarding the dissemination of relevant information about registered sex offenders living in, working in, or visiting their community (notification); and,
  - ❑ Allow the disclosure any information collected on a state sex offender registry to be released for any purpose allowed under state law for law enforcement purposes.
3. Pam Lyncher Act (1996):
  - ❑ Instructs the Federal Bureau of Investigation to establish a national sex offender database; and,
  - ❑ Requires lifetime registration for recidivists and offenders who commit certain aggravated offenses.

In July 2006, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act, a bill designed to "close potential gaps and loopholes under the old law [Wetterling Act of 1994] and generally strengthen the nationwide network of sex offender registration and notification programs", was passed (Federal Registry 2007:2).<sup>2</sup> This Act significantly modifies the Acts signed in the 1990s and includes the following:

- ❑ Redefine the levels of sex offender registration, based on the offense(s) of conviction;

<sup>1</sup> Wilkinson, R. 2003. "Best Practices: What Does It Mean In Times of Perpetual Transition?" International Corrections and Prison Association 2003 Meetings. Viewed July 25, 2006 at <http://www.drc.state.oh.us/web/articles/articles/article91.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> Federal Registry. 2007. *The National Guidelines for Sex Offender Registration and Notification*. Department of Justice, Part IV. Vol. 72, No. 103. Viewed October 11, 2007 at <http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20071800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2007/pdf/E7-10210.pdf>

- ❑ Require sex offenders to register and keep the registration current in the jurisdictions in which they reside, work, or go to school;
- ❑ Require more extensive registration information;
- ❑ Require periodic in-person appearances by registrants to verify and update the registration information; and,
- ❑ Broaden the availability of information concerning registered sex offenders to the public.

### **Sex Offender Registration in Ohio**

Currently, three classes of offenders are required to register upon release from prison:<sup>3</sup>

#### Sexually Oriented Offender

An offender convicted of a sexually oriented offense is;

- Required to register for 10 years;
- Required to verify their address with the local sheriff annually; and,
- Not subject to community notification provisions.

#### Habitual Sex Offender

An offender with a current and one or more previous convictions for a sexually oriented offense:

- Receives this classification by the sentencing judge;
- Is required to register for 20 years;
- Is required to verify their address with the local sheriff yearly; and,
- The sentencing judge determine whether community notification is required.

#### Sex Predator

An offender convicted of a sexually oriented offense who is found by the court to be likely to commit another sex offense in the future:

- Receives this classification by the sentencing judge;
- Is required to register for life;
- Is required to verify his/her address with the local sheriff quarterly; and,
- Has community notification as a requirement.

Based upon these registration requirements, the Ohio Attorney General reports that there are 16,193 registered sex offenders in Ohio as of October 11, 2007.<sup>4</sup> Nieto and Jung (2006) report that at least one in five sex offenders in the U.S. fail to comply with registration requirements and their location is unknown.<sup>5</sup>

Effective January 1, 2008, Senate Bill 10 (S.B. 10), Ohio's response to the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act, repealed the above classification system, as well as abolished any hearings involving judicial discretion for registration and notification requirements for adult sex offenders. S.B. 10 includes stricter registration requirements. Sex offenders will now automatically be classified according to the

<sup>3</sup> Bickle, L. 1999. *Policy Brief: Ohio Sex Offender Registration*. Ohio Legislative Budget Office. Vol. 1, no. 3. Viewed October 3, 2007 at [http://www.wvu.edu/~lawfac/mmcdiarmid/sexoffend%20ohio%20data01\\_20\\_99.pdf](http://www.wvu.edu/~lawfac/mmcdiarmid/sexoffend%20ohio%20data01_20_99.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> Ohio Attorney General website: <http://www.esorn.ag.state.oh.us/Secured/p1.aspx>. Viewed October 11, 2007.

<sup>5</sup> Nieto, M. and D. Jung. 2006. *The Impact of Residency Restrictions on Sex Offenders and Correctional Management Practices: A Literature Review*. California Research Bureau: California State Library. Viewed October 15, 2007 at <http://www.library.ca.gov/crb/06/08/06-008.pdf>.

offense of conviction into a 3-tiered system and the likelihood of committing a future sex offense is no longer considered:<sup>6</sup>

	Registration Requirements		In-Person Verification Requirement
	Adult	Juvenile*	
Tier I	15 years	10 years	Annually
Tier II	25 years	20 years	Every 180 days
Tier III	Lifetime	Lifetime	Every 90 day

\*Applicable to juvenile sex offenders age 14 or older and may be removed by the judge in some instances.

Offenders under the current classification as of July 1, 2007 will be reclassified into the 3-tier system based on the most severe offense of conviction. Persons can challenge the reclassification by requesting a hearing within 60 days of being informed of the change in their classification status.

For adult sex offenders, the change in law is also retroactive, which means that offenders currently required to register will be required to register according to the new system beginning January 1. For example, a sexually oriented offender is now required to register for 10 years following release from prison. Beginning January 1, the registration requirements for these offenders, if reclassified as a Tier I offender, will extend another 5 years, regardless of what year the offender was in at the beginning of 2008. For example, all sexually oriented offenders who would have completed their 10<sup>th</sup> and final year of registration, will have to register for an additional 5 years. Offenders can petition the court to reduce the 15 year requirement after they have registered for 10 years and meet a number of provisions set forth in S.B.10.

With the enactment of the Amended Substitute Senate Bill 5 (SORN-Sex Offender Registration and Notification) in 2003, all persons required to register must do so within 5 days of entering any county, and within 5 days of changing address. Under the new registration requirements, offenders must provide their name and any aliases, social security number, date of birth, fingerprints, photographs, DNA specimen, vehicle registration information, residence, employment, school if attending, any professional or occupational license or permit or registration, email addresses and telephone numbers.<sup>7</sup> In Ohio, the penalty for failure to register is determined by the sex offense committed. Once registered, no matter where it took place, each offender is added to local, regional, and national databases.

Ohio registers sexual offenders using E-SORN, Electronic Sex Offender Registration and Notification database. E-SORN is controlled by the Attorney General's office and is a one-stop location the public can use to search for a sex offender living in their community within 88 counties. Sheriff's offices around the state are responsible for updating the database for their jurisdiction.

### **Notification: Background**

The federal Megan's Law required states to make certain information about registered sex offenders available to the public, but allowed states the discretion of how and what information is disclosed. Under S.B. 10, community notification is required for Tier III adult sex offenders, public-registry qualified juvenile sex offenders<sup>8</sup> and some Tier III juvenile sex offenders. There are basically three types of community notification:<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> A complete listing of which Ohio offenses fall into Tier I, II or III were viewed at the Ohio Judges website on October 11, 2007 at <http://www.ohiojudges.org/index.cfm?PageID=E3F36AE6-8013-4D04-89A0A6A56AF135A1&PageObjectID=712>.

<sup>7</sup> Sokolov, H. 2007. *Senate Bill 10 – A New Sexual Offender Law*. Communication received October 12, 2007.

<sup>8</sup> Public registry-qualified juvenile sex offenders are age 14-17, has been designated as a serious youthful offender, and has been adjudicated for aggravated murder or murder with a sexual motivation or rape, sexual battery, or gross sexual imposition with force, deception or controlled substance use on the victim.

<sup>9</sup> Presser, L. and E. Gunnison. 1999. "Strange Bedfellows: Is Sex Offender Notification a Form of Community Justice?" *Crime and Delinquency*. 45(3): 299-315.

1. Active Notification – Information is delivered without it being requested;
2. Limited Disclosure – Information is provided to specific organizations, such as schools, daycares, etc;
3. Passive Notification – Information is obtained by the inquisition through searching a sex offender registration database for example.

### **Effectiveness of Sex Offender Registration and Notification**

The goals of the Jacob Wetterling Act were to increase public safety, deter sex offenders from committing future crimes, and provide law enforcement with additional investigative powers (Nieto and Jung 2006). For the few studies examining the effectiveness of sex offender registration and notification, mixed results were found. In some instances no significant difference was found in the recidivism rates of sex offender registrants versus pre-registration sex offenders (Adkins, Huff, and Stageberg 2000).<sup>10</sup> Other research found as much as a 70% reduction in felony sex offender recidivism for sex offenders bound by registration and notification requirements versus those not bound by those requirements (Barnoski 2005).<sup>11</sup>

### **Sex Offender Restrictions**

Another aspect of sex offender registration and notification concerns the restrictions placed on sex offenders, which have been a major focus of research in this area. The restrictions are usually contained within laws to strengthen registration and notification. State sex offender restrictions generally fall into one of two categories: Child Safety Zone or Distance Marker. Child Safety Zones involve restricting sex offenders from loitering in identified areas where children tend to congregate, such as schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, school bus stops, etc. Distance Marker laws restrict sex offenders from residing within a certain distance of designated places where children congregate. As of August 2007, 29 states have enacted one of these forms of restrictions on sex offenders, the majority of which restrict where sex offender may reside (Council of State Governments 2007).<sup>12</sup> Typical residency restrictions prohibit persons convicted of a sex offense from living within 1,000 feet of specific locations which children congregate, including schools, child-care facilities, parks, etc., but nationwide, this ranges between 500-2000 feet. Residency restrictions affect a small geographic area, but many municipalities have ordinances prohibiting convicted sex offenders from living in their communities within specified distances of schools, daycare centers and other places where children congregate. As a result, "the cumulative and aggregate effect of the many exclusion zones adopted at the state, local, and neighborhood levels, prevents sex offenders from living in many cities, towns, and communities. Further, as one jurisdiction has attempted to restrict the residency of its sex offenders by creating exclusion zones, neighboring communities have followed suite to avoid becoming a haven to local sex offenders" (Yung 2007:3).<sup>13</sup>

Currently, several central Ohio communities have enacted local ordinances restricting how close sex offenders can live to schools and other places children congregate, including Canal Winchester, Grove City, Hilliard, Johnstown, Newark, Pickerington, Reynoldsburg, Sunbury, and Upper Arlington (Lane, 2007).<sup>14</sup> Ohio also includes an expanded definition of residency to include "premises in a nursing home, adult care facility, residential group home, homeless shelter, hotel, motel, boarding house, or facility operated by an

<sup>10</sup> Adkins, G.; Huff, D.; Stageberg, P. 2000. *The Iowa Sex Offender Registry and Recidivism*. Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Statistical Analysis Center. Viewed October 16, 2007 at [http://www.state.ia.us/government/dhr/cjip/images/pdf/01\\_pub/SexOffenderReport.pdf](http://www.state.ia.us/government/dhr/cjip/images/pdf/01_pub/SexOffenderReport.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> Barnoski, R. 2005. "Sex Offender Sentencing in Washington State: Has Community Notification Reduced Recidivism?" Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 1-4. Viewed August 31, 2007 at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/05-12-1202.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> Council of State Governments. 2007. "Out of Bounds: States Reconsider Sex Offender Management Through Residency Restrictions." *State Government News* 50 (7): 33-36. Viewed September 17, 2007 at <http://www.csg.org/pubs/Documents/SN0708.pdf>.

<sup>13</sup> Yung, C. 2007. "Banishment By A Thousand Laws: Residency Restrictions on Sex Offenders." *Washington University Law Review*. Vol. 85.

<sup>14</sup> Lane, M. 2007. "Sex Offender Ghettos: Get-tough laws force predators to move but do little to make kids safer." *The Columbus Dispatch*. Sunday, October 7, 2007.

independent housing agency that is located within 1,000 feet of any school premises” (Ohio Attorney General Opinion 2005:1).<sup>15</sup>

Advocates of residency restrictions believe that they decrease the likelihood that sex offenders will come in contact with and victimize children. However, no empirical research was found indicating that residency restrictions actually reduce recidivism. The majority of research in this area reports the unintended consequences on sex offenders, including limiting opportunities for employment, treatment services, pro-social support systems, and housing (see Suggested Reading section below). Yet, research has indicated that stable relationships, employment and access to social services can be contributing factors to the success of offenders returning to the community following release from prison and may well reduce the risk of recidivism.

### Suggested Readings

The articles identified below are not an exhaustive list of the literature regarding sex offender registration and notification. They provide a starting point for the identification of research or statistics regarding the establishment, effectiveness and collateral consequences of sex offender registration and notification laws and ordinances. The list is sorted by subject heading and includes statistical reports regarding sex offenders, notification studies, registration (including residency restriction studies) and studies focusing on sex offender reentry.

### Statistical Reports

Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2003. “5 Percent of Sex Offenders Rearrested for Another Sex Crime Within 3 Years of Prison Release.” U.S. Department of Justice, 1-2.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1999. “Fact Sheet: Update 1999. Summary of State Sex Offender Registry Dissemination Procedures.” U.S. Department of Justice, 1-8.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1997. “Sex Offenses and Offenders,” U.S. Department of Justice, 1.

Office of Criminal Justice Services. 2006. “Report to the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission: January 2006, Sex Offenders.” State of Ohio, 1-23.

### Notification

Barnoski, R. 2005. “Sex Offender Sentencing in Washington State: Has Community Notification Reduced Recidivism?” Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 1-4. Viewed August 31, 2007 at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/05-12-1202.pdf>.

**Description:** Explores connection between sex offender registration and community notification legislation in Washington State and recidivism during three time periods; before the 1990 Community Protection Act, between 1990 and 1997, and after the 1997 amendments. Data suggested that there was a decrease in recidivism for violent and sexual felonies after the 1997 amendments; however, a causal link between the decrease in recidivism and notification requirements was not found.

Caputo, A.A. & Brodsky, S.L. 2004. “Citizen Coping with Community Notification of Released Sex Offenders,” *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 22: 239-252.

**Description:** Investigates if citizens, when notified about sex offenders in their community, alter their behavior to protect their families. Results show marginal support for the contention that community notification is associated with protective actions against sex offense and that few crime specific strategies were used by the 250 citizens sampled.

---

<sup>15</sup> Petro, J. 2005. *Ohio Attorney General Opinion 2005-0001*. Opinions Section, State of Ohio Office of the Attorney General. Viewed October 17, 2007 at <http://www.ag.state.oh.us/legal/opinions/2005/2005-001.pdf>.

Elbogen, E.B., Patry, M., & Scalora, M.J. 2003. "The Impact of Community Notification Laws on Sex Offender Treatment Attitudes." *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 26, 207-219.

**Description:** Determines the level of understanding sex offenders have about Megan's Law in Nebraska and how this law impacts sex offenders' views about treatment. Results indicate that offenders had little knowledge about the notification laws and the laws motivated some offenders to not recidivate. Policy implications for clinical work are given.

Levenson, J. S., & Cotter, L. P. 2005. "The Effect of Megan's Law on Sex Offender Reintegration." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 21 (1): 49-66.

**Description:** Provides information about the effects of community notification on sex offenders' reentry and rehabilitation in Florida by examining offenders' opinions about notification, if they are aware of their own risk, and if different notification methods have different effects. Offenders note some negative effects of community notification, but are not able to accurately determine their risk. No particular notification method has more harmful consequences when compared to others.

Levi, R. 2000. "The Mutuality of Risk and Community: The Adjudication of Community Notification Statutes." *Economy and Society*. 29 (4): 578-601.

**Description:** Examines the connection between notification requirements and views of how communities perceive risk related to sex offender recidivism, which is based on common sense. The author explores how "risk" and "common sense" have become the basis of authority for legal resolutions regarding preventing sex offender recidivism.

Presser, L. & Gunnison, E. 1999. "Strange Bedfellows: Is Sex Offender Notification a Form of Community Justice?" *Crime & Delinquency*. 45 (3): 299-315.

**Description:** Describes the differences and similarities between offender notification and community justice. The development of both movements are identified. The authors state that the offender notification movement is not consistent with the community justice movement.

Zevitz, R.G. & Farkas, M.A. 2000. "Sex Offender Community Notification: Assessing the Impact in Wisconsin." U.S Department of Justice.

**Description:** Examines the effect community notification has had on sex offenders, community residents, law enforcement agencies, and probation and parole officers in Wisconsin through surveys. Data shows that notification increased fears about sexual offenses, hampered sex offenders' reentry, and strained agencies' resources. Policy implications are given.

Zevitz, R.G., Crim, D., & Farkas, M.A. 2000. "Sex Offender Community Notification: Examining the Importance of neighborhood meetings." *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*. 18: 393-408.

**Description:** Relates Wisconsin community residents' impressions and thoughts about attending community notification meetings and how that experience influences a collective community response to sex offenders' presence. Data show that these meetings can be effective in managing sex offenders, but can increase a community's anxiety and fear, depending on how the meeting is conducted. Recommendations for effective community notification meetings are presented.

Zevitz, R. G., & Farkas, M. A. 2000a. "Sex Offender Community Notification: Managing High Risk Criminals or Exacting Further Vengeance?" *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*. 18: 375-391.

**Description:** Explores the social and psychological impact community notification has on sex offenders reentering communities in Wisconsin that have been notified about their presence. Data show that community notification can negatively impact offenders' ability to effectively reintegrate into communities. The authors suggest that helping offenders find housing and employment would help offset the negative effects of community notification.

Zevitz, R.G. & Farkas, M.A. 2000b. "The Impact of Sex-Offender Community Notification on Probation/Parole in Wisconsin." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 44 (1): 8-21.



**Description:** Aims to empirically examine the effect of notification laws, especially on correctional agencies. The study surveyed probation and parole officers and supervisors in Wisconsin. Data show that notification can achieve goals within corrections, but it requires officers and supervisors to expend more resources.

Registration, Including Articles on Residency Restrictions

Barnoski, R. 2006. *Sex Offender Sentencing in Washington State: Failure to Register as a Sex Offender-Revisited*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 1-4. Viewed August 31, 2007 at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/06-01-1203A.pdf>.

**Description:** Examines the relationship between failure to register as a sex offender and subsequent recidivism. Results show that almost one-fifth of sex offenders required to register are convicted of a failure to register within the 5 year follow up period. Sex offenders with a conviction for failure to register have recidivism rates 50% higher than the rates of those without such a conviction.

Beauregard, E., Proulx, J., & Rossmo, D.K. 2005. "Spatial Patterns of Sex Offenders: Theoretical, Empirical, & Practical Issues." *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 10: 579-603.

**Description:** Examines theoretical, empirical, and practical aspects of spatial patterns and behavior of sex offenders. Data reveal that most sexual offenses occur close to the offenders' residence. Critiques theories related to travel patterns of sex offenders.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1998. "National Sex Offender Registry Assistance Program: Fiscal Year 1998 Program Announcement." U.S. Department of Justice.

**Description:** Announces the establishment of the National Sex Offender Registry Assistance Program.

Center for Sex Offender Management. 1999. "Sex Offender Registration: Policy Overview and Comprehensive Practices." U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 16 pages. Viewed July 31, 2007 at <http://www.csom.org/pubs/sexreg.html>.

**Description:** Examines state registration laws and highlights promising practices.

Council of State Governments. 2007. "Out of Bounds: States Reconsider Sex Offender Management Through Residency Restrictions." *State Government News*. CSG Staff . 50 (7) 33-36. Viewed September 12, 2007 at <http://www.csg.org/pubs/Documents/SN0708.pdf>.

**Description:** Provides an overview of residency restriction laws (citations), and distance/location for 29 states within the U.S.

Grubestic, T.H., Mack, E., & Murray, A.T. 2007. "Geographic Exclusion: Spatial Analysis for Evaluating the Implications of Megan's Law." *Social Science Computer Review*. 25 (20), 143-162.

**Description:** Proposes a method for analyzing residential restrictions zones for sex offenders. The article uses data from Hamilton County, Ohio to determine where offenders are geographically living, where and what the restriction zones are, and how to investigate arguments about housing inequality for sex offenders. Results show that geographic methodological analysis is effective in examining restricted zones.

Levenson, J. S. 2005. "Sex Offender Residence Restrictions: A Report to the Florida Legislature," October 2005, 1-14.

**Description:** Suggests that current residence restrictions for convicted sex offenders are not evidence-based and therefore are not as effective as they appear. The author provides background information about residency restrictions and examines several myths that these restrictions are based on. Recommendations for evidence-based policies are presented.

Levenson, J. S. & Cotter, L. P. 2005a. "The Impact of Sex Offender Residence Restrictions: 1,000 feet from Danger or One Step From Absurd?" *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 49 (2): 168-178.

**Description:** Analyzes the effect of residence laws on the reentry of sex offenders' in Florida from the perspective of the sex offender. Results from a survey show that ex-offenders view restrictions as negatively impacting them by increasing isolation and financial difficulty, which could exacerbate stressors leading ex-offenders to recidivate. Results also indicate that if offenders want to recidivate, the restrictions will not stop them and the authors suggest that restrictions be based on patterns of prior offenses and present risk factors.

Matson, S. & Leib, R. 1996. "Sex Offender Registration: A review of State Laws." Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 1-39.

**Description:** Discusses arguments about whether registration laws heighten communities' protection from sex offenders and details features of states' laws about sex offender registration. Includes a summary chart of state registration characteristics and requirements as enforced in 1996.

Patkin, D. "Megan's Law and the Misconception of Sex Offender Recidivism." University of California, Los Angeles School of Law. Unpublished Paper. Viewed August 8, 2007 at [http://works.bepress.com/debra\\_patkin/1](http://works.bepress.com/debra_patkin/1).

**Description:** Examines the use of recidivism studies as rationalization for enacting Megan's Laws by detailing the history of Megan's Law, showing that it does not consider that recidivism statistics are not the same across studies, and states that notification laws overgeneralize.

Tewksbury, R. & Lees, M. 2006. "Perceptions of Sex Offender Registration: Collateral Consequences and Community Experiences." *Sociological Spectrum*, 26: 309-334.

**Description:** Presents information about registered sex offenders in Kentucky and how they view the emotional, social, and other consequences of the label. Results indicate that there are four main consequences: employment problems, trouble with relationships, harassment, and stigmatization.

Welchans, S. 2005. "Megan's Law: Evaluations of Sexual Offender Registries." *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. 16 (2): 123-140.

**Description:** Examines empirical evaluations of Megan's Law by focusing on the effectiveness of sex offender registration and community notification and the aspects of Megan's Law that should be investigated in the future.

"Where are they? A Spatial Inquiry of Sex Offenders in Brazos County." 2006. Urban Regional Information Systems Association. Viewed August 15, 2007 at [http://urisa.org/pm\\_anonymous](http://urisa.org/pm_anonymous).

**Description:** Proposes that Geographical Information System (GIS) can help locate residences of sex offenders in Brazos County, Texas. GIS shows that a number of sex offenders live within the restricted Child Safety Zone. The article suggests that the web-based GIS methodology used in the study can be useful in managing risk.

### Reintegration/ Reentry

Carter, M., Bumby, K., & Talbot, T. 2004. "Promoting Offender Accountability and Community Safety through the Comprehensive Approach to Sex Offender Management." *Seton Hall Law Review*, 34: 1273-1297.

**Description:** Examines the Comprehensive Approach to Sex Offender management by describing the features of it and how it can be incorporated into legal processes, treatment, assessment, reentry, community supervision, and registration and notification.

Center for Sex Offender Management. 2000. "Community Supervision of the Sex Offender: An Overview of Current and Promising Practices. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 1-22. viewed July 31, 2007 at <http://www.csom.org/pubs/supervision2.html>.

**Description:** Gives an overview of promising practices and lessons communities have learned about managing sex offenders reentering society.

Center for Sex Offender Management. 2007. "Managing the Challenges of Sex Offender Reentry." U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 1-20. Viewed July 31, 2007 at [http://www.csom.org/pubs/reentry\\_brief.pdf](http://www.csom.org/pubs/reentry_brief.pdf).

**Description:** Provides policy guidelines for the successful reentry of sex offenders into the community based on a rehabilitation-oriented viewpoint. The article also includes some statistical information on sex offenders.

Center for Sex Offender Management. 2001. "Recidivism of Sex Offenders." U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 1-20. Viewed August 14, 2007 at <http://www.csom.org/pubs/recidsexof.html>.

**Description:** Discusses factors involved in characterizing recidivism and summarizes and analyzes current research about recidivism rates for sex offenders. The report (concentrating on adult male sex offenders) identifies issues related to a decrease in sexual offenses and how this may impact sex offender management.

Center for Sex Offender Management. 2002. "Time to Work: Managing the Employment of Sex Offenders Under Community Supervision." U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 1-12. Viewed August 8, 2007 at <http://www.csom.org/pubs/timetowork.pdf>.

**Description:** Examines supervision of sex offenders' employment upon release, which includes the following aspects: finding potential employment, creating relationships with employers, and monitoring offenders' work. This report discusses the role employment plays in offenders' post release success.

Edwards, W. & Hensley, C. 2001. "Contextualizing Sex Offender Management Legislation and Policy: Evaluating the Problem of Latent Consequences in Community Notification Laws," *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 45 (1): 83-101.

**Description:** Addresses the effectiveness of community notification as it relates to sex offender management laws. In addition, individuals' perceptions of and reactions to laws about sex crimes, the social-systems model for managing sex offenders, consequences of community notification requirements, and recommendations based on therapeutic jurisprudence are explored.

La Fond, J.Q. & Winick, B.J. 2004. "Sex Offender Reentry Courts: A Proposal for Managing the Risk of Returning Sex Offenders to the Community." *Seton Hall Law Review*, 34: 1173-1212.

**Description:** Investigates why it is hard to determine if sex offenders will commit other sex crimes upon release from prison. The authors critique current ways the law addresses sex offenders and suggest using sex offender reentry courts (based on risk management and therapeutic jurisprudence philosophies) to manage sex offenders in society.

La Vigne, N.G., Thomson, G.L., Visher, C., Kachnowski, V., & Travis, J. 2003. "A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Ohio." Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, 3-84.

**Description:** Examines prisoner reentry in Ohio by looking at policy, the demographics of offenders, how offenders are prepared for release, which communities offenders are going to, and the economic and social characteristics of communities with high rates of ex-offenders.

New York State Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives. 2007. "Sex Offender Management Survey Report Results and Recommendations." March 23, 2007, 1-54.

**Description:** Details how sex offenders are supervised, including information about the evidence based practice approach called The Comprehensive Approach to Sex Offender Management, conditions for probation, treatment, risk assessment, and training of probation officers. Included are strengths and weaknesses of these supervision efforts. Recommendations are given.

Phillips, D.M. 1998. "Community Notification as Viewed by Washington's Citizens." Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 1-4. Viewed August 8, 2007 at <http://wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/CnSurvey.pdf>.

**Description:** Discusses purpose of community notification and the results of a survey completed by residents of Washington State about their awareness, view of, and response to notification laws, knowledge of the laws' purpose, and opinion about its necessity.

Tewksbury, R. 2005. "Collateral Consequences of Sex Offender Registration." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 21(1): 67-81.

**Description:** Using a sample of 121 sex offenders registered in Kentucky, the author examines the collateral consequences of registration from the perspective of the offender. Overall, the research shows these offenders experience a combination of social stigmatization, loss of relationships, employment, housing, and are subjected to verbal and physical assault.

Tewksbury, R. & Mustaine, E. E. 2006. "Where to Find Sex Offenders: An Examination of Residential Locations and Neighborhood Conditions," *Criminal Justice Studies*. 19 (1): 61-75.

**Description:** Examines where a sample of registered sex offenders in Florida reside to determine if they live close to places where children and potential victims are expected to be to investigate the types of communities and neighborhoods where the offenders live, and assess if these communities impact reintegration efforts. Results indicate that some offenders reside close to areas where potential victims might be, most of offenders' communities are disorganized, and some have links to criminal activity.

Wodahl, E. J. 2006. "The Challenges of Prisoner Reentry from a Rural Perspective." *Western Criminology Review*. 7(2): 32-47.

**Description:** States that prisoner reentry is primarily discussed as it relates to urban areas; however, rural areas are also impacted by prisoner reentry. The author discusses problems facing offenders when returning to rural communities and suggests that policies taking these issues into consideration are needed.