

BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS

2019

REPORT OF SIGNIFICANT EVENTS



This page intentionally left blank for duplication purposes.

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Workload at a Glance | 1 |
| Grant, Denial, and Recidivism Rates..... | 5 |
| Policy and Procedure Developments..... | 9 |
| Legal Developments | 14 |
| Training and Outreach..... | 16 |
| Administration | 23 |

This page intentionally left blank for duplication purposes.

2019

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

WORKLOAD AT A GLANCE

Parole hearings

- ◆ **6,061 scheduled parole hearings**
 - Up 16% from 5,226 in 2018
 - 267 or 4% were for female inmates
 - 5,974 or 96% were for male inmates
 - 2,618 or 43% were initial hearings, up from 40% in 2018
 - 3,443 or 57% were subsequent hearings, down from 60% in 2018
 - 3,385 or 56% were youth offender hearings, down from 60% in 2018
 - 2,858 or 84% were for indeterminately-sentenced youth offenders, up from 81% in 2018
 - 527 or 16% were for determinately-sentenced youth offenders, down from 19% in 2018
 - 1,362 or 22% were for inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 19% in 2018
 - 1,283 or 94% were for indeterminately-sentenced inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing, down from 95% in 2018
 - 79 or 6% were for determinately-sentenced inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing, unchanged from 5% in 2018
- ◆ **1,184 parole grants**
 - 20% of scheduled parole hearings, down from 22% in 2018
 - 75 or 6% were for female inmates
 - 1,009 or 94% were for male inmates
 - 394 or 33% were grants issued at an inmate's initial hearing
 - 697 or 59% were to youth offenders, down from 61% in 2018
 - 268 or 25% were to inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 21% in 2018
- ◆ **2,257 parole denials**
 - 37% of scheduled hearings, up from 34% in 2018
 - 83 or 4% were for female inmates
 - 2,174 or 96% were to male inmates
 - 1,178 or 52% were to youth offenders, down from 58% in 2018
 - 567 or 25% were to inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 21% in 2018
- ◆ **660 stipulations**
 - 11% of scheduled hearings, up from 9% 2018
 - 21 or 3% were to female inmates
 - 639 or 97% were to male inmates

- 376 or 57% were to youth offenders
- 119 or 18% were to inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing
- ♦ **517 voluntary waivers**
 - 9% of scheduled hearings, up from 8% in 2018
 - 26 or 5% were to female inmates
 - 491 or 95% were to male inmates
 - 314 or 61% were to youth offenders
 - 78 or 15% were to inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing
- ♦ **1,222 postponements**
 - 20% of scheduled hearings, down from 25% in 2018
 - 47 or 4% were to female inmates
 - 1,175 or 96% were to male inmates
 - 706 or 58% were for youth offenders
 - 270 or 22% were for inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing
- ♦ **221 continued or cancelled hearings**
 - 4% of scheduled hearings, up from 3% in 2018
 - 15 or 7% were for female inmates
 - 206 or 93% were for male inmates
 - 114 or 52% were for youth offenders
 - 60 or 27% were for inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing
- ♦ **34 medical parole hearings scheduled**
 - Up 24 scheduled hearings from 10 in 2018
- ♦ **17 Penal Code section 1170(e) cases considered for referral to courts for recall of sentence or resentencing**
 - Up 2 cases from 15 in 2018
- ♦ **134 parole reconsideration hearings scheduled**
 - Up from 108 in 2018
 - 45 or 34% were initial parole reconsideration hearings, down from 44% in 2018
 - 89 or 66% were subsequent annual parole reconsideration hearings, up from 56% in 2018

Consultations

- ♦ 3,877 consultations conducted, up 38% from 2,801 in 2018

Inmate Petitions to Advance Their Next Parole Hearing Date

- ♦ 635 preliminary reviews of inmate petitions to advance their next parole hearing date, down 107 cases or 14% from 742 in 2018
- ♦ 479 reviews on the merits of inmate petitions to advance their next parole hearing date, down 12% from 544 in 2018
 - 323 or 67% of petitions were approved for an advanced hearing date, down from 73% approved in 2018
 - 156 or 33% of petitions were denied for an advanced hearing date, up from 28% denied in 2018
- ♦ 39% of parole hearings scheduled as a result of inmates filing a petition to advance their next hearing date in 2019 resulted in a grant of parole, up from 29% in 2018

Administrative Reviews to Consider Advancing Parole Hearing Dates

- ◆ 1,088 cases were screened for possible review, down 15% from 1,276 in 2018
- ◆ 925 cases or 85% received a review on the merits, down from 92% in 2018
 - 694 or 75% of cases reviewed on the merits were approved for an advanced hearing date, down from 83% in 2018
 - 231 or 25% of cases reviewed on the merits were denied for an advanced hearing date, up from 17% in 2018
- ◆ 37% of parole hearings scheduled as a result of an administrative review conducted in 2019 to advance inmates' next hearing date resulted in a grant of parole, down from 44% in 2018

Comprehensive Risk Assessments

- ◆ 3,358 comprehensive risk assessments completed, up 6% from 3,168 in 2018

Determinately-Sentenced Nonviolent Offender Parole Reviews

- ◆ 7,783 referrals to the Board for parole review, up 51% from 5,162 in 2018
- ◆ 4,337 reviews on the merits were conducted, down 4% from 4,512 in 2018
 - 860 nonviolent offenders or 20% were approved for release, down from 23% in 2018
 - 3,477 nonviolent offenders or 80% were denied release, up from 77% in 2018
- ◆ 916 reviews of decisions were conducted, down 30% from 1,307 conducted in 2018
 - 801 decisions or 87% were upheld after review, up from 83% in 2018
 - 115 decisions or 13% were modified after review, down from 17% in 2018

Correspondence

- ◆ 41,052 pieces of correspondence were received and processed, up 11% from 37,067 in 2018
- ◆ 39,580 hearing notices were sent, up 38% from 28,667 in 2018
- ◆ 17,979 notices of nonviolent offender parole review were sent, up 16% from 15,561 in 2018
- ◆ 1,552 letters were sent from the Legal Division, down 39% from 2,544 in 2018

Executive Case Summaries

- ◆ 1,140 executive case summaries were prepared, down 5% from 1,197 in 2018

Extradition Cases

- ◆ 1,105 extradition cases were reviewed, up 4% from 1,060 in 2018

International Prisoner Transfer Program

- ◆ 192 cases completed, up 32 cases from 160 in 2018
- ◆ No inmates were transferred to another country, down from 1 in 2018

Investigations

- ◆ 1,208 pre-parole investigations were completed, up 5% from 1,154 in 2018
- ◆ 9 intimate partner battering investigations were completed, up from 3 in 2018
- ◆ 66 Board-initiated investigations were completed, up 18% from 56 in 2018
- ◆ 23 Penal Code section 1170(e) investigations were completed, up from 21 in 2018
- ◆ 31 expanded medical parole reviews were completed, up from 11 in 2018
- ◆ 471 pardon investigations were completed
- ◆ 41 commutation investigations were completed

Mentally Disordered Offender (MDO) Actions

- ◆ 598 certification hearings were conducted, down 6% from 633 in 2018
- ◆ 558 placement and annual review hearings, up 9% from 513 in 2018
- ◆ 194 holds to detain offenders for MDO screening, up 40% from 139 in 2018

Parole Discharge Reviews

- ◆ 12,989 cases were reviewed to determine whether parolees should be discharged from parole, down 21% from 16,397 in 2018

Sexually Violent Predator Screening (SVP)

- ◆ 3,474 SVP screenings, down 11% from 3,906 in 2018
 - 2,517, or 72% of cases were referred for clinical screening, up from 69% in 2018
 - 957, or 28% of cases were closed as not meeting criteria for clinical screening, down from 31% in 2018
 - 2,261 clinical screenings completed by the Forensic Assessment Division, down 17% from 2,727 clinical screenings completed in 2018
 - 563, or 25% of offenders were referred after clinical screening to the Department of State Hospitals for a full evaluation, up from 22% in 2018
 - 1,698, or 75% were not referred after clinical screening to the Department of State Hospitals for a full evaluation, down from 78% in 2018

GRANT, DENIAL, AND RECIDIVISM RATES

Parole Hearing Grant and Denial Outcomes as a Percentage of Scheduled Hearings

The Board's official parole hearing grant and denial rates are calculated as the percentage of *scheduled* parole hearings that result in a grant or denial. Scheduled hearings can result in the following outcomes: grant, denial, stipulation, voluntary waiver, postponement, cancellation, or continuance.

In 2019, the Board scheduled 6,061 hearings resulting in the following outcomes:

| 2019 Scheduled Hearing Outcomes | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Outcome | Number | Percentage |
| Grant | 1,184 | 20% |
| Denial | 2,257 | 37% |
| Stipulation | 660 | 11% |
| Voluntary waiver | 517 | 9% |
| Postponement | 1,222 | 20% |
| Cancelled/Continued | 221 | 4% |
| Total | 6,061 | 100% |

Parole Hearing Grant Outcomes as a Percentage of Scheduled Hearings

The grant rates for parole hearings scheduled in 2019 are as follows:

- ◆ 20% of scheduled hearings resulted in a grant
- ◆ 28% of scheduled hearings for female inmates resulted in a grant
- ◆ 19% of scheduled hearings for male inmates resulted in a grant
- ◆ 21% of scheduled hearings for youth offenders resulted in a grant
 - 23% of scheduled hearings for indeterminately-sentenced youth offenders resulted in a grant
 - 8% of scheduled hearings for determinately-sentenced youth offenders resulted in a grant
- ◆ 20% of scheduled hearings for inmates eligible for elderly parole resulted in a grant
 - 20% of scheduled hearings for indeterminately-sentenced inmates eligible for elderly parole resulted in a grant
 - 11% of scheduled hearings for determinately-sentenced inmates eligible for elderly parole resulted in a grant
- ◆ 27% of hearings scheduled as a result of inmates filing petitions to advance their next hearing date in 2019 resulted in a grant
- ◆ 37% of hearings scheduled as a result of an administrative review conducted in 2019 resulted in a grant

Parole Hearing Denial Outcomes as a Percentage of Scheduled Hearings

- ◆ 37% of scheduled hearings resulted in a denial
- ◆ 31% of scheduled hearings for female inmates resulted in a denial
- ◆ 38% of scheduled hearings for male inmates resulted in a denial
- ◆ 35% of scheduled hearings for youth offenders resulted in a denial
 - 36% of scheduled hearings for indeterminately-sentenced youth offenders resulted in a denial
 - 26% of scheduled hearings for determinately-sentenced youth offenders resulted in a denial
- ◆ 42% of scheduled hearings for inmates eligible for elderly parole resulted in a denial
 - 42% of scheduled hearings for indeterminately-sentenced inmates eligible for elderly parole resulted in a denial
 - 30% of scheduled hearings for determinately-sentenced inmates eligible for elderly parole resulted in a denial
- ◆ 46% of hearings scheduled as a result of inmates filing petitions to advance their next hearing date in 2018 resulted in a denial
- ◆ 36% of hearings scheduled as a result of an administrative review conducted in 2018 resulted in a denial

Parole Hearing Grant and Denial Outcomes as a Percentage of Hearings Held

Often the Board's parole grant and denial rates are misunderstood. For example, one might assume that if 20% of scheduled hearings resulted in a grant in 2019, it stands to reason that the remaining 80% resulted in a denial of parole; that is not true.

Using the scheduled hearing outcomes above, 1,184 inmates were granted parole and 2,257 inmates were denied parole by the Board after a hearing. Another 660 inmates were denied parole without a hearing when they entered into a stipulation with the Board stating that they were not suitable for parole. In the remaining 1,960 hearings scheduled, there was no decision rendered concerning the inmate's parole suitability because the inmate voluntarily waived his or her hearing or the hearing was postponed, continued, or cancelled.

The following grant and denial rates represent parole grants and denials as a percentage of hearings *held* that resulted in a decision to either grant or deny parole.

Parole Grant Outcomes as a Percentage of Hearings Held

In 2019, 34% of hearings held resulted in a grant

- ◆ 47% of hearings held for female inmates resulted in a grant
- ◆ 34% of hearings held for male inmates resulted in a grant
- ◆ 37% of hearings held for youth offenders resulted in a grant
 - 39% of hearings held for indeterminately-sentenced youth offenders resulted in a grant
 - 23% of hearings held for determinately-sentenced youth offenders resulted in a grant

- ◆ 32% of hearings held for inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant
 - 32% of hearings held for indeterminately-sentenced inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant
 - 27% of hearings held for determinately-sentenced inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant
- ◆ 37% of hearings held as a result of inmates filing petitions to advance their next hearing date in 2019 resulted in a grant
- ◆ 51% of hearings held as a result of an administrative review conducted in 2019 resulted in a grant

Parole Denial Outcomes as a Percentage of Hearings Held

- ◆ 66% of hearings held resulted in a denial
- ◆ 53% of hearings held for female inmates resulted in a denial
- ◆ 66% of hearings held for male inmates resulted in a denial
- ◆ 63% of hearings held for youth offenders resulted in a denial
 - 61% of hearings held for indeterminately-sentenced youth offenders resulted in a denial
 - 77% of hearings held for determinately-sentenced youth offenders resulted in a denial
- ◆ 68% of hearings held for inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial
 - 68% of hearings held for indeterminately-sentenced inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial
 - 73% of hearings held for determinately-sentenced inmates eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial
- ◆ 63% of hearings held as a result of inmates filing petitions to advance their next hearing date in 2019 resulted in a denial
- ◆ 49% of hearings held as a result of an administrative review conducted in 2019 resulted in a denial

Recidivism Rates after a Grant of Parole from the Board of Parole Hearings

The *Recidivism Report for Offenders Released from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation in Fiscal Year 2014-15* found that of the 682 life-term inmates released in fiscal year 2014-15 as a result of a grant of parole by the Board, 16 offenders or 2.3% were convicted of a new crime during a three-year follow-up period. Less than one percent (0.4%) or three offenders were convicted of felony crimes against persons.

The CDCR's 2018 *Recidivism Report* found that of the 510 life-term inmates released in fiscal year 2013-14 as a result of a grant of parole by the Board, 16 offenders or 3.1% were convicted of a new crime during a three-year follow-up period. Less than one percent (0.6%) or three offenders were convicted of felony crimes against persons.

The CDCR's *2017 Outcome Evaluation Report* found that of the 478 life-term inmates released in fiscal year 2012-13, 20 offenders, or 4.2 % were convicted of a new crime during a three-year follow-up period. Less than one percent (0.4%) or two offenders were convicted of felony crimes against persons.

The CDCR's *2016 Outcome Evaluation Report* found that of the 349 life-term inmates released by the Board in fiscal year 2011-12, 11 offenders or 3.2 percent were convicted of a new crime during a three-year follow-up period. Less than one percent (0.3%) or one offender was convicted of felony crimes against persons.

POLICY AND PROCEDURE DEVELOPMENTS

Elderly Parole Hearings

On February 10, 2014, the Three-Judge Panel in the *Plata/Coleman* class action lawsuit ordered the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to finalize and implement a new parole process whereby “elderly” inmates are referred to the Board to determine suitability for parole. Inmates who are eligible for parole consideration under this program are age 60 or older and have served at least 25 years of continuous incarceration. Both indeterminately- and determinately-sentenced inmates are eligible. Inmates sentenced to life without the possibility of parole or condemned are not eligible for this program.

Inmates eligible for this program receive a comprehensive risk assessment, which specifically addresses how the inmate’s advanced age, long-term confinement, and diminished physical condition, if any, may impact the inmate’s potential risk for future violence. In 2019, the Board scheduled 1,362 hearings for inmates eligible for elderly parole, resulting in 268 grants, 567 denials, and 119 stipulations to unsuitability. The remaining 408 scheduled hearings were waived, postponed, continued, or cancelled.

Expanded Medical Parole Hearings

In 2014, the Three-Judge Panel in the *Plata/Coleman* class action lawsuit ordered the CDCR, in consultation with the Federal Receiver’s Office, to finalize and implement an expanded parole process for medically incapacitated inmates. The new process for expanded medical parole was implemented in July 2014. In 2019, the Board scheduled 34 hearings for expanded medical parole, resulting in 18 approvals, 8 denials, and 8 hearings that were postponed or cancelled.

Parole Consideration for Determinately-Sentenced Nonviolent Offenders

In November 2016, California voters approved the Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act of 2016, also known as Proposition 57. Among other things, Proposition 57 created a parole consideration process for persons convicted of a nonviolent felony offense and sentenced to state prison. The proposition requires the Secretary of CDCR to adopt regulations in furtherance of the proposition’s provisions. In 2018, the Board worked with CDCR to promulgate emergency regulations to implement a parole consideration process for determinately-sentenced nonviolent offenders. The emergency regulations went into effect on April 14, 2018, and CDCR began referring inmates who passed behavior-based public safety screening criteria to the Board for parole consideration on July 1, 2018.

In 2019, the First Appellate Court’s decision in the case of *In re McGhee* became final. The decision invalidated CDCR’s use of behavior-based public safety screening criteria to exclude inmates from parole consideration under Proposition 57. The Board worked with CDCR to amend its regulations and stopped applying the behavior-based public safety screening criteria in July of 2019. In addition,

inmates who previously did not pass the behavior-based public safety screening criteria were referred to the Board for parole consideration.

In 2019, the Board received 7,783 nonviolent offender parole referrals. The Board conducted 4,337 parole reviews and approved 860 nonviolent inmates for release. The Board denied release to 3,477 nonviolent inmates. The remaining referrals were pending review at the end of 2019.

Parole Consideration for Indeterminately-Sentenced Nonviolent Offenders

On September 7, 2018, the Second Appellate District Court of Appeal issued its decision in the case of *In re Edwards*. The court found that the state impermissibly excluded indeterminately-sentenced nonviolent offenders from parole consideration under Proposition 57. In response, the Board worked with CDCR to promulgate regulations to comply with the court's order and implement processes for screening indeterminately-sentenced nonviolent offenders for eligibility, calculating the dates upon which they are eligible for referral to the Board, referring them to the Board, and scheduling them for parole hearings.

In 2019, 2,339 indeterminately-sentenced nonviolent offenders were referred to the Board for a parole hearing. The Board scheduled 249 parole hearings for indeterminately-sentenced nonviolent offenders under Proposition 57, resulting in 3 grants, 72 denials, and 7 stipulations to unsuitability. The remaining 167 scheduled hearings were waived, postponed, continued, or cancelled.

Under the regulations, the Board has until either December 31, 2020 or December 31, 2021 (depending on the length of time the person has been incarcerated and the original sentence imposed by the court) to schedule parole hearings for inmates who were immediately eligible for a parole hearing as a result of the *In re Edwards* decision.

Sexually Violent Predator Clinical Screening

On July 1, 2018, the Board assumed responsibility for clinically screening inmates who are potentially sexually violent predators as defined in Welfare and Institutions Code section 6600. In 2019, the Board's Forensic Assessment Division completed 2,261 clinical screenings. If a clinical screening reveals that the inmate potentially meets the criteria for sexually violent predators, the inmate is referred to the Department of State Hospitals for a full evaluation and possible civil commitment. Of the 2,261 clinical screening conducted by the Board in 2019, 563 were referred to the Department of State Hospitals for a full evaluation.

Structured Decision-Making Framework (SDMF)

The number of scheduled parole hearings increased 16 percent from 5,226 hearings in 2018 to 6,061 hearings in 2019. Current projections indicate the number of scheduled parole hearings will continue to increase annually through at least 2021. This is primarily due to an increase in the number hearings the Board is required to schedule by the end of 2021 for determinately-sentenced youth offenders (under Penal Code sections 3051 and 3051.1) and indeterminately-sentenced nonviolent offenders (under Proposition 57 and CDCR regulations).

In order to meet the increase in parole hearings, the Governor and the Legislature expanded the Board to 17 commissioners in 2019. In addition, the Board worked with the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and Dr. Ralph Serin, Ph.D., C.Psych., Professor, Department of Psychology, and Director, Criminal Justice Decision Making Laboratory at Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada to adopt a SDMF for parole hearings in California.

The SDMF is a structured professional judgement model; it is a systematic compilation of key factors reflecting best practice in risk assessment and parole release decision-making. It combines both research-supported factors and relevant legal considerations, providing a template for hearing panel members to follow that is consistent with the law governing parole decisions in California. The resulting analysis forms the basis for a parole decision. The SDMF is intended to produce parole decisions that are structured, transparent, and focused on an offender's current risk. Additionally, it is intended to increase consistency among hearing panels and to result in more efficient parole hearings and decisions.

The SDMF was initially developed for the National Parole Board of Canada over a period of several years and has since been implemented in seven states in the U.S. The NIC chose California as one of three states to receive technical assistance in evaluating the prospects of successfully implementing the SDMF. The NIC sent teams of experts to California multiple times to evaluate its existing parole processes, including governing law, information technology systems, access to offender information, risk assessment tools, and available support systems for implementing the SDMF. In addition, members of the Board's executive team travelled to Connecticut to observe parole hearings and to gather information about implementing the SDMF.

Each parole board that implements the SDMF modifies the tool as necessary to account for variations in governing law and policy. The Board worked with Dr. Serin, the NIC, and the Attorney General's Office to modify the SDMF to account for inmates who have served long sentences and to reflect relevant legal considerations in California, such as those applicable to youth offender hearings and elderly parole hearings.

In April 2019, experts from NIC, Dr. Serin, representatives from the Attorney General's Office, the Board's Senior Forensic Psychologists, commissioners, deputy commissioners, and attorneys met for three days of SDMF training and practical application of the framework to California cases. The SDMF was subsequently implemented in California's parole hearing process over a period of several months.

Since the Board implemented the SDMF, the average length of a parole hearing has decreased by more than 30 minutes without significantly affecting the overall outcome of hearings.

Youth Offender Parole Hearings

The Board began conducting youth offender parole hearings for indeterminately-sentenced offenders in January of 2014, as required by Senate Bill 260. The Board began conducting youth offender hearings for determinately-sentenced youth offenders in January 2015. Under Senate Bill 260, youth offenders were defined as inmates who were tried as adults but who were under the age of 18 when they committed their offense. Certain exclusions apply.

In 2015, the Legislature expanded the definition of a youth offender to include inmates who committed their crimes when they were under the age of 23, pursuant to Senate Bills 261 and 519 (Chapter 471 and 472, Statutes of 2015), which took effect on January 1, 2016. Combined, these bills required the Board, by December 31, 2018, to schedule hearings for all indeterminately-sentenced youth offenders who were immediately eligible for a hearing when the bills took effect. The bills also require the Board, by December 31, 2021, to schedule hearings for all determinately-sentenced youth offenders who were immediately eligible for a hearing when the bills took effect.

In 2018, the Legislature expanded the definition of a youth offender to include inmates who committed their crimes when they were under the age of 26, pursuant to Assembly Bill 1308 (Chapter 675, Statutes of 2018). This bill requires the Board, by January 1, 2020, to complete all youth offender hearings for indeterminately-sentenced inmates who became eligible for a youth offender hearing on January 1, 2018 (when Assembly Bill 1308 took effect). The bill further requires the Board to complete, by December 31, 2021, all youth offender parole hearings for determinately-sentenced inmates who became eligible for a youth offender hearing on January 1, 2018 (as a result of Assembly Bill 1308).

The Legislature also passed Senate Bill 394 in 2018, requiring the Board, by July 1, 2020, to provide a youth offender parole hearing to inmates sentenced to life without the possibility of parole for crimes they committed when they were under the age of 18, exceptions apply.

For youth offender hearings, the Board is required to give "great weight" to the diminished culpability of youth as compared to adults, the hallmark features of youth, and any subsequent growth and increased maturity of the inmate in determining the youth offender's suitability for parole. In addition, risk assessments produced by the Board for youth offenders must take into account these same factors. The youth offender parole laws also authorized family members, friends, school personnel, faith leaders, and community-based organization representatives who have knowledge about the inmate from before the crime or his or her growth and maturity since the crime to submit statements to the Board for consideration at the inmate's parole hearing.

In 2019, the Board scheduled 3,385 youth offender hearings, resulting in 697 grants and 1,178 denials, and 376 stipulations to unsuitability. The remaining 1,134 scheduled hearings were waived, postponed, continued, or cancelled. In 2019, 56 percent of scheduled parole hearings were youth offender parole hearings.

Youth Offender Regulations

In December 2018, the Board voted to approve proposed permanent regulations governing youth offender parole hearings. The regulations were submitted to the Office of Administrative Law. In August 2019, the Board voted to approve updated proposed permanent regulations governing youth offender parole hearings. The proposed regulations were approved by the Office of Administrative Law and filed with the Secretary of State in November 2019.

Petitions to Advance and Administrative Review Regulations

In September 2018, the Board voted to approve proposed emergency regulations governing the process by which inmates may petition the Board to advance their next parole hearing date and the Board's process for advancing parole hearing dates on its own motion. These processes are referred to as the Petition to Advance process and the Administrative Review process. In March 2019 the Board voted to approve permanent regulations governing these processes. The Office of Administrative approved the regulations and they were filed with the Secretary of State in August 2019.

LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

Armstrong Class Action Litigation (“Armstrong II”)

The subject of the *Armstrong* litigation is the Board's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) throughout its hearing processes. In 2019, the Board's legal staff provided mandatory ADA training for the Board's hearing officers. The Board continues to discuss with plaintiffs various aspects of the Board's continued compliance with the *Armstrong* Remedial Plan II.

Cases Pending Review in the California Supreme Court

In re Palmer II

Penal Code section 4801, subsection (c) requires the Board to give great weight at a parole consideration hearing, to the diminished culpability of youth as compared to adults, the hallmark features of youth, and any subsequent growth and increased maturity of a prisoner who committed their controlling offense when they were age 25 or younger. The Supreme Court is reviewing how the Board applies that standard in parole consideration hearings.

In re Palmer III

Palmer plead guilty to kidnapping for robbery and was sentenced to life with the possibility of parole and became eligible for parole in 1996. The Supreme Court is considering whether Palmer's continued confinement became constitutionally disproportionate under article I, section 17 of the California Constitution and/or the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution after multiple parole denials supported by some evidence. The Supreme Court is also reviewing what the appropriate remedy would be if there was a constitutional violation.

In re Gadlin

In 2016, voters approved Proposition 57, which amended the California Constitution to allow any person convicted of a nonviolent felony offense and sentenced to state prison to be eligible for parole consideration after completing the full term of their primary offense. At issue in *Gadlin* is whether CDCR may exclude from nonviolent parole consideration all inmates who have been previously convicted of a sex offense requiring registration under Penal Code section 290.

Cases Final in 2019

In re McGhee

At issue in *McGhee* was whether the regulations adopted to implement nonviolent parole as authorized by Proposition 57, validly provided for a public safety screening to remove inmates from parole consideration based on institutional behavior within the past five years. The First District Court of Appeal struck down the public safety screening process on the grounds that those regulations prevented some nonviolent offenders from receiving parole consideration. Following this decision, the CDCR and the Board submitted an emergency regulatory action, which was approved by the Office of Administrative Law on September 10, 2019, to comply with the court's decision. This regular rulemaking

makes permanent the emergency regulations that bring the Department and Board into compliance with the McGhee ruling.

People v. Edwards

Penal Codes section 3051.1 mandates youth offender parole hearings for inmates who were under 26 years old when they committed their criminal offense. The Penal Code excludes from youth offender parole hearings inmates sentenced to life without the possibility of parole and inmates who had sentence enhancements applied as a one-strike or three-strike offender. The First District Court of Appeal held that the exclusion of one-strike offenders from youth offender parole hearings violated the Equal protection clause. Based on this decision, CDCR and the Board have removed the exclusion of one-strike offenders from youth offender parole hearings.

Inmate Writs of Habeas Corpus

In 2018 the state was required to file a response to 130 habeas petitions filed in state and federal court (up 12% from 116 in 2017). In 2019, the Board held 11 court-ordered parole suitability hearings as a result of inmate habeas petitions that were granted by the court (down from 21 in 2018).

TRAINING AND OUTREACH

Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner Training

The Transcript Analysis Program provides commissioners with periodic legal feedback regarding their parole hearing decisions. Eighteen consultations occurred between the Board's legal division and commissioners under the Transcript Analysis Program in 2019, which is three less than the 21 that occurred in 2018.

Commissioners, associate chief deputy commissioners, and members of the Board's executive team attended the 2019 Association of Paroling Authorities' Annual Training Conference. Presentations and workshops were provided on the following topics:

- ◆ *Ethics*, presented by Marie Ragghianti, Parole Board Administrator
- ◆ *Essential Principles of Implementation Leadership*, presented by Brandon Mathews, D.M., Colorado State Board of Parole
- ◆ *Interstate Compact*, presented by Ashley Lippert, Executive Director, Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision
- ◆ *High Stakes and Missed Opportunities*, presented by Sandy Jones, Executive Director, Idaho Parole Commission & Julie Micek, Director of Parole Supervision, Nebraska Board of Parole & Sheryl M. Ranatza, Chairman, Louisiana Board of Pardons and Parole & Connie Utada, Associate Manager & Tracy Velazquez, Manager, Public Safety Performance Project, Pew Charitable Trusts
- ◆ *Victims Handbook*, presented by Dr. Najah Burton, Supervisory Victims Coordinator, United States Parole Commission, Department of Justice
- ◆ *The Value of Structured Decision-Making in Parole*, presented by Richard Stoker, Director, National Parole Resource Center
- ◆ *Understanding Criminal Desistance Theory and Offender Change*, presented by Michael Hsu, Chair & Dr. Sid Thompson, former Chair, Oregon Board of Parole
- ◆ *Victims' Rights – How to Accord Victims Their Rights and Stay Ahead of Constitutional and Statutory Changes*, presented by Russell Butler, Executive Director, Maryland Crime Victims' Resource Center & Roberta Roper, Victims' Rights Advocate
- ◆ *Implementing a Gender Responsive Approach to Women in Parole Decision-Making: Conducting a Self-Assessment*, presented by Becki Ney, Principal, Center for Effective Public Policy & Director, National Resource Center on Justice Involved Women, National Parole Resource Center
- ◆ *What the Members Said – Parole Board Decision Making in England and Wales*, presented by Joanne Lackenby, Parole Board Member, England and Wales
- ◆ *Examining Risk Assessment and Clinical Judgement in Parole Release Decision-Making*, presented by Dr. Erin Harbinson & Dr. Julia Laskorunsky, Scholars, Robina Institute of Criminal Law and Criminal Justice

Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner Training (Continued)

- ◆ *Taking Parole to the Next Level: Applying What Works and Ensuring Transparency and Fairness in Montana*, presented by Annette Carter, Chair, Montana Board of Probation and Pardons and Bree Derrick, Deputy Director, Idaho Department of Corrections
- ◆ *Beyond the Headlines*, presented by Daryl Churney, Executive Director General, Parole Board of Canada
- ◆ *ICE Detainers and Deportation*, presented by Joseph Suazo, Detention & Deportation Officer, National Fugitive Operation Program
- ◆ *60,481 to 0: Pennsylvania Stands OnBase*, presented by Leo Dunn, Chair, Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole
- ◆ *A Second Chance: Iowa's Process of Review and Release of Juvenile Lifers*, presented by Jeff Wright and Norman Granger, Vice Chair, New Jersey Board of Parole
- ◆ *Life After Life: Adjustment to LIFE in the Community After Being Released from Serving LIFE Sentences in Prison*, presented by Olinda Moyd, Chief, Parole Division of Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia
- ◆ *Do No Harm*, presented by Bree Derrick, Deputy Director, Idaho Department of Corrections
- ◆ *A Force for Positive Change*, presented by Damon West, Motivational Speaker

Commissioners and deputy commissioners receive training throughout the year during monthly Board meetings, the majority of which are open to the public. In addition to routine training required for all CDCR employees, the following training was provided to commissioners and deputy commissioners in 2019:

- ◆ *Accommodations Available for Hearing-Impaired Inmates at Parole Hearings*, presented by Daniel Moeller, Associate Chief Deputy Commissioner, BPH
- ◆ *Lifer Housing in San Diego*, presented by Ryan Youtsey, Parole Administrator (A), Division of Adult Parole Operations, CDCR
- ◆ *Recommendations Regarding Inmate Housing on Non-Designated Yards*, presented by Connie Gipson, Deputy Director, Facility Operations, Division of Adult Institutions, CDCR & Jenn Neill, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Articulating Decisions Involving Youth Offenders*, presented by Jenn Neill, Chief Counsel & Heather McCray, Assistant Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Legal Analysis of Structured Decision-Making Framework*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jennifer Neill, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Look into My Eyes: The Impact of Bias on the Accuracy of Assessing Accountability and Remorse*, presented by Dr. Brandon Mathews, Colorado Parole Board Member & Alexandra Walker, Vice Chair, Colorado Parole Board
- ◆ *Transgender 101*, presented by Adrien Lawyer, Co-Director/Co-Founder, Transgender Resource Center of New Mexico

Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner Training (Continued)

- ◆ *Legal Implications of Applying the Structured Decision-Making Framework*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jennifer Neill, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *The Anti-Recidivism Coalition's Hope and Redemption Team*, presented by Sam Lewis, Director of Inside Program, Anti-Recidivism Coalition
- ◆ *Articulating a Decision Under the Structured Decision-Making Framework*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jennifer Neill, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Legal Implications of Applying the Structured Decision-Making Framework*, presented by Jennifer Neill, Chief Counsel, BPH & Phillip Lindsay, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Jessica Blonien and Sara Romano, Supervising Deputy Attorneys General, Attorney General's Office
- ◆ *Applying the Structured Decision-Making Framework Using CDCR Inmate Central Files, the Strategic Offender Management System, and the Board's Information Technology System*, presented by Ralph Serin, Ph.D., C.Psych., Professor in Department of Psychology and Director of the Criminal Justice Decision Making Laboratory at Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada & Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, BPH & Robbye Braxton, Correctional Program Specialist, Dr. David Rentler & Richard Sparaco & Jonathan Ogletree, Subject Matter Experts, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections
- ◆ *Legal Standard for Cases Referred En Banc*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jennifer Neill, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Risk Assessment and Parole Considerations of Long-Term Incarcerated Sex Offenders*, presented by Dr. James Rokop, Chief Psychologist, Department of State Hospitals
- ◆ *Hearing Structure and Articulating a Decision Under the Structured Decision-Making Framework*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Tiffany Shultz, Chief Counsel (A), BPH
- ◆ *Nonviolent Parole Processes Under In re McGhee (2019) 34 Cal.App.5th 902*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, BPH
- ◆ *Current Safety and Security Issues in the Institutions*, presented by Ralph Diaz, Secretary & Kathleen Allison, Undersecretary, CDCR & Tiffany Shultz, Assistant Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Hearing Structure and Articulating a Decision Under the Structured Decision-Making Framework*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel & Tiffany Shultz, Assistant Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Youth Consideration Under In re Palmer (2018) 27 Cal.App.5th 120, review granted January 16, 2019, S25214*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Tiffany Shultz, Assistant Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Articulating a Decision Under the Structured Decision-Making Framework*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, BPH

Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner Training (Continued)

- ◆ *Applying the Legal Standards Under California Code of Regulations, Title 15, Section 2253*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Addressing Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders in the Criminal Justice System: Programs, Policies, and Treatment Interventions*, presented by Allison G. Robertson, Ph.D., MPH, Associate Professor in Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University School of Medicine
- ◆ *Overview of the Office of Victim and Survivor Rights and Services*, presented by Katie James, Staff Services Manager II, CDCR
- ◆ *Overview of En Banc Referrals*, presented by Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Waivers, Stipulations, and Postponements*, presented by Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel & Sara Puricelli, Staff Attorney, BPH
- ◆ *You Can't Read the Label from Inside the Jar: Disruptive Truth Bombs about Criminology, Implementation Science, and Real-World Organizational Change*, presented by Alexandra Walker, ABD, Director of Community Relations and Strategy, Alliance for Criminal Justice Innovation
- ◆ *Recall and Resentencing Recommendation Program*, presented by Mike Masters, Correctional Captain, CDCR
- ◆ *Vicarious Trauma*, presented by Brenda Crowding, Deputy Director of the Office of Internal Affairs and the Office of Civil Rights, CDCR
- ◆ *Parole Rescission*, presented by Heather McCray, Assistant Chief Counsel & Chris Hoeft, Staff Attorney, BPH
- ◆ *Expanded Medical Parole*, presented by George Bakerjian, Staff Attorney, BPH
- ◆ *Changes to the Panel Attorney Appointment Program*, presented by Sandra Maciel, Chief Deputy of Program Operations, BPH
- ◆ *Transitional Housing: Past, Present, and Future*, presented by Ryan Souza, Deputy Director, Division of Rehabilitative Programs & Ryan Youtsey, Division of Adult Parole Operations, CDCR & Tiffany Shultz, Assistant Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Analysis of Comprehensive Risk Assessments Administered in 2018*, presented by Dr. Cliff Kusaj, Chief Psychologist, BPH
- ◆ *Institutional Misconduct: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*, presented by Dr. Lisa Tobin, Psychologist, BPH
- ◆ *Overview of the Substance Use Disorder Treatment Program*, presented by Diana Toche, Undersecretary, Health Care Services, CDCR
- ◆ *Structured Decision-Making Framework*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *An Introduction to California Sex Offender Management Board (CASOMB)*, presented by Dr. Lea Chankin, Consulting Psychologist /CASOMB Coordinator
- ◆ *Articulating a Decision Involving Implausible Denials*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, BPH

Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner Training (Continued)

- ◆ *Applying the Legal Standards Under California Code of Regulations, Title 15, Section 2253*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Implementing Penal Code Sections 4802 et. Seq. Regarding Pardons and Commutations*, presented by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer & Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, BPH
- ◆ *Rehabilitative Programming at California Prison Industry Authority*, presented by Randy Fisher, Assistant General Manager over Workforce Development, California Prison Industry Authority

Clinical Psychologist and Senior Psychologist Training

The Board's forensic clinical psychologists receive training during routine staff meetings throughout the year and review a variety of published research through Psych Net, a scholarly research database of the American Psychological Association, which is accessible to all members of the Forensic Assessment Division. Additional training received by the Board's forensic clinical psychologists in 2019 includes the following:

- ◆ *Structured Professional Judgment Approach to Conceptualizing Youth Offending and Subsequent Growth and Maturity* by Cliff Kusaj, Chief Psychologist, BPH
- ◆ *Overview of Community Services Provided to Offenders Released by the Board with Mental Health Treatment Needs* by Robert Storms, Mental Health Program Administrator & Ryan Youtsey, Parole Administrator, Division of Adult Parole Operations
- ◆ *Overview of Mental Health Services Provided to Offenders in Prison* by Rachel Stieferman-Latter, Psychologist, BPH
- ◆ *Board of Parole Hearings Executive Update*, by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, BPH
- ◆ *Conceptualizing Desistance from Offending (Two-Day Training Session)*, by Shadd Maruna, Professor of Criminology, School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work, Queens University, Belfast, Ireland
- ◆ *Panel of Paroled Lifers Represented by The Post-Conviction Justice Project* with Heidi Rummel, Clinical Professor of Law, USC Gould School of Law
- ◆ *Overview of CDCR's Developmental Disabilities Program, Rules Violation Processes, and Implications for Risk Assessment*, by Charles Odipo, Psychologist, BPH & Corey Scheidegger, Senior Psychologist, CDCR Health Care Services & Robert Furster, Correctional Captain, CDCR

Executive Management Training

Executive Officer Jennifer Shaffer, Chief Deputy Rhonda Skipper-Dotta, and Senior Psychologist Jasmine Tehrani attended the Association of Paroling Authorities International (APAI) Annual Training Conference.

Executive Officer Jennifer Shaffer and Chief Counsel Jessica Blonien participated in implicit bias training as part of the *California Leads as an Employer Forum* for government leaders.

Outreach

The Board provided information and conducted outreach to a variety of groups and stakeholders, including the following:

- ◆ Board staff served as guest speakers discussing California's parole process to students from various academic institutions, including the University of California, Davis, the University of California, Irvine, the University of Southern California, and Berkeley High School
- ◆ The Board's executive leadership hosted statewide conference calls with inmate counsel, prosecutors, advocacy groups, and interested members of the public on a variety of Board-related topics
- ◆ Chief Psychologist Cliff Kusaj, Senior Psychologist Amy Parsons, and Psychologist Lisa Kalich provided an overview of the Board's risk assessment methodology to social workers and attorneys at the Alameda County Public Defender's Office
- ◆ Chief Psychologist Cliff Kusaj and Senior Psychologist Jasmine Tehrani provided an overview of risk assessment and parole decision-making with faculty at the University of California, Irvine, Department of Criminology, Law, and Society
- ◆ The Board's executive leadership attended a ceremony promoting the rights of crime victims during National Crime Victims' Rights Week
- ◆ Executive Officer Jennifer Shaffer and Chief Psychologist Cliff Kusaj provided an overview of the Board's consideration of mental health factors in risk assessment and parole decision-making at San Quentin State Prison's Mental Health Wellness Week
- ◆ Board staff met throughout the year with inmate counsel, inmate advocacy groups, district attorney representatives, crime victim advocates, educators, and legislative staff to discuss a variety of topics, including youth offender hearings, elderly parole hearings, nonviolent offender parole reviews, and Proposition 57
- ◆ Board staff participated in quarterly meetings with the Department of State Hospitals and CDCR to improve and streamline the state's processes for screening inmates as potentially mentally disordered offenders and sexually violent predators
- ◆ The Board's associate chief deputy commissioners met with wardens throughout the year in their respective regions to discuss on-going issues affecting parole hearing processes
- ◆ Chief of Investigations Brian Kelley and Executive Officer Jennifer Shaffer provided information concerning the Board to CDCR's Division of Adult Parole Operations executive leadership
- ◆ Assistant Chief Counsel Tiffany Shultz and Executive Officer Jennifer Shaffer attended a graduation ceremony for the Guiding Rage Into Power (GRIP) Program at San Quentin State Prison

- ◆ Associate Chief Deputy Ali Zarrinnam and Executive Officer Jennifer Shaffer attended a Transformative Justice Symposium with victims, inmates, prosecutors, legislative staff, and advocacy groups hosted by Healing Dialog in Action at Lancaster State Prison

In 2019, Executive Officer Jennifer Shaffer served as Chair of the Professional Development Committee and Secretary for the Association of Paroling Authorities International. In addition, she conducted outreach and training to a variety of individuals, organizations, and stakeholders, including the following:

- ◆ Provided information concerning the Board's parole processes to prosecutors and crime victim advocates at the California District Attorneys' Association's summer training conference
- ◆ Provided information concerning the Board at a statewide meeting of CDCR wardens and to newly-appointed wardens as part of CDCR's on-boarding program
- ◆ Participated as a panel member at a session on managing and delegation of a large organization for CDCR's Advanced Learning Institute and Employee Development Program
- ◆ Provided information about the Board's parole processes to inmate family members and advocates on a statewide conference call hosted by Californians Advocating for Reform of Extreme Sentences for Youth (CARES for Youth)
- ◆ Presented information concerning the parole hearing process to a Lifer Family Seminar hosted by Life Support Alliance
- ◆ Provided an overview of California's discretionary parole system to a Professional Fellow from Ukraine, as part of the Professional Fellows Program sponsored by the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs
- ◆ Met with students from USC's Gould School of Law to discuss law and policy governing recall of sentence and resentencing under Penal Code section 1170(e), medical parole, and legal careers with the state
- ◆ Provided information to the National Parole Board of Canada as part of its review of parole hearing practices for incarcerated women
- ◆ Toured and met with executives from Francisco Homes
- ◆ Attended the American Probation and Parole Association's Annual Training Institute
- ◆ Attended a community event with the Sacramento Kings professional basketball organization, community leaders, advocacy groups, and inmates at Folsom State Prison

ADMINISTRATION

2019 CDCR Distinguished Service Medal

Two of the Board's Senior Investigators, Tamara Jones and Minh Nguyen, were honored by CDCR with Distinguished Service Medals for their work in assisting the Board to complete thousands of pardon and commutation of sentence investigations.

Board Information and Tracking System (BITS) Improvements

The Board made several significant modifications to its main computer system, BITS, including the following:

- ◆ Adding new functionality to implement the *In re Edwards* decision, including identifying all nonviolent indeterminately-sentenced inmates, creating a process for CDCR's case records staff to screen them for eligibility for parole consideration under Proposition 57, calculate the date upon which they are eligible for parole consideration, apply behavior-based public safety screening criteria to determine eligibility for referral to the Board for parole consideration, refer them to the Board, conduct a jurisdictional review, schedule them for parole hearings, and notify victims and district attorneys
- ◆ Updating and enhancing the electronic decision templates for the Nonviolent Offender Parole Review process
- ◆ Deploying functionality to display parole eligible dates for indeterminately-sentenced nonviolent offenders on CDCR's "Locate Inmate" web-based search engine
- ◆ Updating logic used by CDCR's case records staff to calculate parole eligible dates for nonviolent offenders to reflect unique sentences imposed by the courts and time served by the inmate
- ◆ Implementing the *In re McGhee* decision by eliminating the behavior-based public safety screening process from the nonviolent parole consideration process under Proposition 57, for both indeterminately-sentenced and determinately-sentenced nonviolent offenders
- ◆ Identifying and referring nonviolent offenders to the Board for parole consideration who were previously determined to be ineligible for referral to the Board based on the behavior-based public safety screening criteria invalidated by the court in the McGhee decision
- ◆ Refining and adding additional functionality to CDCR's process for screening inmates to determine if they meet the criteria for mental health treatment as mentally disordered offenders upon release from CDCR
- ◆ Removing gender-based salutations from the Board's decision and correspondence templates and replacing them with the recipient's first name
- ◆ Adding new functionality to track and electronically generate correspondence associated with the Board's role in screening and investigating requests for pardons and commutations of sentence

California Prison Industry Authority (CALPIA) Employment Evaluation Forms

Met with CALPIA executives for purposes of revising CALPIA inmate employment evaluation forms to provide additional information relevant to the Board's assessment of an inmate's current risk during the parole consideration process.

Commissioner Appointments

The Governor and the Legislature expanded the Board from 15 commissioners to 17 commissioners, effective July 1, 2019. Governor Gavin Newsom appointed the following seven commissioners to the Board in 2019: Commissioners Anderson, Cassidy, Grounds, Gutierrez, Ruff, San Juan, and Thornton.

Document Production

The Board produced volumes of data and reports for litigation, Public Records Act requests, CDCR's Office of Research, CDCR's Office of Legislative Affairs, the Governor's Office, the Department of Finance, and the Legislature.

Executive Board Room Improvements

In 2019, the Board made significant improvements to its public meeting room, including updating and improving the room's technology for training sessions and public speakers as well as an expanded dais to better accommodate the Board's 17 commissioners.

Website Accessibility

Updated the Board's website to be more accessible to persons with disabilities and compliant with California's revised website accessibility compliance standards for state government websites.