

Public Comment | October 26, 2026

Gary W. Hardy, PhD

Arizona Sex Offender Management Board | Prepared for oral delivery

Prepared remarks | Target: approximately 2 minutes 45 seconds to 3 minutes

Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Board. My name is Gary W. Hardy.

Thank you for the work you and the subcommittees are doing. I want to offer a constructive request as Arizona develops standards that will affect public safety, treatment, supervision, and families for years to come.

Today's agenda includes a presentation on Colorado's implementation of SORNA. Colorado's experience is worth hearing. But studying another state's practices is not the same as establishing that those practices are the best fit for Arizona.

We have also seen Colorado material used in developing Arizona's evaluation and management proposals. My question is simple: What systematic process is the Board using to compare competing models and evaluate their evidence before recommending statewide standards?

I have submitted two short memoranda to support that question.

The first asks for a public evidence-review matrix: what research supports a proposal, which populations it applies to, what alternatives were examined, what outcomes are expected, and why a particular approach was chosen. This should include meaningful consideration of risk-need-responsivity and individualized approaches, not only containment-oriented systems.

The second concerns assessment standards and professional-interest safeguards. The Adult and Juvenile Subcommittees are considering psychosexual evaluations, specific testing instruments, polygraph practices, and treatment-related decisions. These are consequential choices. An instrument appropriate for one population may not be validated for another. A test that measures sexual interest does not automatically measure future offending risk.

We need to know when testing is necessary, when alternatives are appropriate, and how results will be used. We also need transparent procedures for professional-interest disclosures and independent evidence review when providers help develop standards affecting services they themselves deliver.

That is not an accusation against anyone. Professional expertise is essential. Independent review protects that expertise and strengthens public confidence.

I respectfully ask the Board to direct staff to develop a comparative evidence-review process and matter-specific professional-interest safeguards, and to place both on a future agenda for public discussion.

Arizona has the opportunity to build a system that is not merely borrowed, but justified: individualized, measurable, transparent, and accountable for results.

Thank you.

Supporting submissions

Memorandum 1: Independent Evidence Review and Model Selection. Memorandum 2: Assessment Standards and Professional-Interest Safeguards.

Delivery note: The Board agenda places the call to the public before the Colorado presentation. These remarks refer to it as a scheduled presentation, not a presentation already delivered. Rehearse with a timer; speaking time varies.