



INSIDE THIS ISSUE

PAROLE BOARD AS PUNISHERS	2
MEMBER SPOTLIGHT	3
INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS	5
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	6
FOCUS ON RELATIONSHIPS	7

TO-DO IN 2018

- ☐ RENEW APAI MEMBERSHIP
- ☐ SERVE ON APAI COMMITTEE
- ☐ URGE FELLOWS TO JOIN APAI
- ☐ MAKE PLANS TO ATTEND THE 2019 ANNUAL TRAINING CONFERENCE IN BALTIMORE MARCH 31 - APRIL 3, 2019

MEMBERSHIP FEES*

INDIVIDUAL	\$65
ORGANIZATIONAL (UP TO 8 MEMBERS)	\$375
(9 TO 13 MEMBERS)	\$475
(14 TO 20 MEMBERS)	\$575
ALUMNI	\$40
ASSOCIATE	\$40
STUDENT	\$15

*Fees are on a per year basis.

From the President

Greetings APAI Members,

The New York Times in an editorial previously published this year praised the changes in our field of parole but challenged states who were behind the curve to examine their own systems and come up with solutions to enhance public safety and at the same be fiscally responsible.

A number of the reforms they cited are in reaction to their city's percentage of technical violators incarcerated accounting for a 15% increase in jail population from 2014-2018 while the overall jail population fell by 21% during this same time period. They gave praise to Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Michigan, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas for dramatic reductions in both categories.

Certain strategies were provided in this article, which I want to share with you as a member of a paroling authority. Bullet points have always been impressed upon me as the best way to list forces of change:

- Adopting a system of graduated sanctions and rewards.
- Capping incarceration periods for minor technical parole violations.
- Requiring a judicial hearing before someone under supervision can be re-incarcerated for a technical violation.

- Shortening terms of supervision for continued compliance after release.
- Using savings from reduced prison populations to expand substance abuse, educational opportunities and housing slots to help parolees become stable contributors to their communities.

While all five of these actions may not be feasible in your jurisdiction, many would assist us in helping to aide public safety, giving our offenders a better chance for success, and reducing the ever increasing costs of housing technical parole violators. It is a win-win solution for all parties involved.

The 2019 Annual Training Conference in Baltimore will expand on the ideas of parole being a force for positive change.

I look forward to seeing all of you there in March.

David Blumberg
APAI President

Parole Boards as Punishers?

A review of a recent study regarding parole board decision-making

by: Dan Fetsco, Professional Lecturer, University of Wyoming & APAI Member

While doing some recent research, I came across E. Rely Vilcić's article *Revisiting Parole Decision-Making: Testing for the Punitive Hypothesis in a Large U.S. Jurisdiction*, which was published earlier this year in the *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.

Dr. Vilcić is a professor of Criminal Justice at Temple University and her article focused on the Pennsylvania Board of Parole. The study explored punitive themes in parole decision-making by examining whether measures reflective of punishment have an impact on decisions beyond other factors related to the purpose of parole, such as successfully transitioning inmates back to the community. To put it bluntly, the article sought to address the criticism that parole decision-makers implicitly engage in re-sentencing when considering inmates for parole.

Dr. Vilcić recounted the recent history of parole in Pennsylvania, which is well-known to long time members of APAI. In the Fall of 2008 and Spring of 2009, the Governor declared a moratorium on all parole releases following several killings of police officers by parolees recently released from prison. In light of the potential reactivity in the aftermath of the moratorium, the study drew data from before the imposition of the moratorium, from January to April of 2008. Three categories of "punishment measures" were tested: 1) the nature of the offense; 2) prior parole denials; and 3) time served.

With regard to the nature of the offense, the study found that more serious offenses generated more punitive responses, with sex offenders having the strongest negative impact upon decision-making. In terms of earlier denials, the study

found that inmates who had been denied parole at least once stood better odds of gaining release than inmates appearing for the first time, with even better chances if the inmate was twice rejected. Interestingly, the amount of time served did not result in any significant punitive or negative impact on decision-making. In discussing the results, Dr. Vilcić stated that "the combined findings converge in fact to offer strong support for a view of parole decision-makers as 'punishers' or 'second-round' judges."

Dr. Vilcić pointed out limitations in the study, one being that the inferences she made from the data did not include interviews with parole board members regarding decision-making and criteria, and that observations of hearings would have benefitted the study. At the very least, the article provided some excellent discussion on the parole decision and its function in the criminal justice process. Dr. Vilcić offers some useful advice when she notes that a tendency to deny release based solely on punitive factors has potential adverse consequences, including disgruntled inmates, lack of meaningful release opportunities for higher risk offenders, and potential increases in overall recidivism rates.

While I would disagree with the idea that parole board members engage in re-sentencing on a widespread or consistent basis, it is simply human nature that some board members will adopt the role of punisher in certain cases. However, I found the article to be thought-provoking and a strong reminder to regularly and critically review the factors we consider in making parole decisions.



Member Spotlight:

Sir Ron Young takes the helm at New Zealand Parole Board

by: Tim Graham, Communications Manager, New Zealand Parole Board

The long-serving judge, Sir Ron Young, has turned his back on retirement for what he describes as the “really worthwhile” job of chairing the New Zealand Parole Board (NZPB).

The former Chief District Court Judge spent three decades in the judiciary. He was appointed President of the Electoral Commission in 2000, joined the High Court bench in 2001 and retired in 2015. The following year, he was knighted for services to the judiciary.

“I felt I’d run my race in terms of being a judge – that was enough for me. When I retired, I decided I would only do things that I really felt were worth doing [and] that meant something to me,” says Sir Ron.

Then the NZPB opportunity arose, and was simply too good to pass up.

“I really want to do this role. It is something different to what I had done, and it is an area where I can learn and develop and contribute something,” he says.

“So I thought ‘I can come out of retirement for that.’”

The past few years have been retirement in name only for Sir Ron, who has been conducting judicial training in the Pacific, and sitting as a judge of both the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu Courts of Appeal. And the Pacific link is set to carry over into his new role, with the Vanuatu Parole Board coming to Wellington later this year for information-sharing and professional development.

Sir Ron arrived at the NZPB in mid-August, taking over from

“I really want to do this role. It is something different to what I had done, and it is an area where I can learn and develop and contribute something,”

Sir Ron Young



Hon Warwick Gendall QC, who spent six years as Chairperson of the Board. Its core function is to conduct risk-assessments on eligible prisoners to decide if they can be safely released, subject to conditions. The Board sits in every prison in the country once a month, either in person or by video conference.

“The amount of work done by each Board per day is extraordinary,” says Sir Ron.

“Board members get a remarkable amount of information to inform their decision-making. Everything on the background of the person, the sentencing notes, information about what’s happened in prison itself, and what rehabilitation and reintegration programmes they’ve done. It’s a huge amount of information to process in each case,” he says.

But the workload is wider than just parole consideration. Monitoring hearings are held, recall applications and com-

continued on page 4

Sir Ron Young — continued from page 3

passionate releases are considered, and Extended Supervision Order conditions are imposed. 7,739 hearings were held in total in the last reporting year.

Sir Ron says it's an "unbelievable number" of hearings.

"There can be 10 to 13 hearings a day, so it's remarkable to me how Board members seem well able to control this material, process it, assess risk, and turn it into a decision."

"You couldn't do it any other way, though."

Sir Ron has thrown himself into his new role. He attended the government's justice summit in Porirua within a week of starting, and has been observing Board hearings to get a feel for the work that lies ahead.

"I'm trying to get around every Board. I'll be chairing a lot myself, starting in late September. I'm trying to see psychologists and others who have valuable information about re-

habilitation programmes. Dozens of people are involved in these programmes and unless you can understand and get a feel for what they're doing, you can't really have confidence in recommending them," he says.

Sir Ron sees parole as "the primary factor that controls reoffending".

"Obviously, all New Zealanders are worried about how many people we have in prison. Parole and risk assessment, the development of programmes to reduce that risk, the need to keep the public safe – all of these things seem to me to be really important," he says.

"The Board's decisions are not simple, but they are vital to a credible justice system. I am under no illusion as to the complexity of the work that lies ahead, but I am also hopeful that this will be some of the most meaningful work of my career," says Sir Ron.

**2019 ANNUAL TRAINING CONFERENCE**

March 31 – April 3, 2019 | Baltimore, Maryland
www.apaintl.org / **registration is open!**

The Power

of Effective Internal Communications

by: Kelly Corder, Director of Communications, Florida Commission on Offender Review | Office of Communications

IN 1962, President John F. Kennedy was preparing to deliver one of the most significant speeches of his presidency in the hopes of rallying public support for the Apollo missions. A hallmark of that public relations campaign was a widely publicized trip to the NASA Space Center. As the story goes, President Kennedy was walking through a hallway when he stopped to speak with a maintenance worker. "Hi, I'm Jack Kennedy. What are you doing?"

"Well, Mr. President," the employee responded, "I'm helping put a man on the moon."

What was likely a fifteen-second interaction revealed that the culture of NASA was breeding mission-driven employees who understood that each of them played a role in the success of their company, or in that case, putting a man on the moon. By cultivating a unified workforce through a quality, two-way communications plan, NASA was changing the way companies viewed their publics.

A common fallacy about public affairs and public relations is that the efforts are relegated to external audiences. This couldn't be further from the truth. The most valued public of any organization should always be the employees. This is especially vital for criminal justice agencies, specifically paroling authorities.

Achieving an agency's mission of ensuring public safety can only be achieved with a unified, informed, and engaged workforce. It's imperative that internal communications efforts receive just as much attention as the external, if not more. While every agency has a spokesperson, it also has an entire team of ambassadors. With a solid communications plan that integrates both internal and external initiatives, an agency can become much

more effective in reaching its goals:

- Make the intranet a tool that not only provides information and updates, but also facilitates feedback from employees
- Encourage both horizontal (peer-to-peer) and vertical (employee-to-manager) communication
- Provide training and learning opportunities for staff
- Release newsletters regularly that are both social and informative
- Regularly reinforce the mission and vision statements of the agency
- Be consistent in messaging
- Utilize metrics to monitor the effectiveness and impact of internal communications
- Celebrate and recognize successes

Andrew Carnegie was a visionary who, like NASA, understood the potential power of an effective team: "Teamwork is the ability to work together toward a common vision. The ability to direct individual accomplishments toward organizational objectives. It is the fuel that allows common people to achieve uncommon results."



Parole agencies shoulder the extraordinary responsibility of ensuring public safety, aiding in the successful reentry of parolees into society, and providing assistance to victims of crime. It's imperative that every employee understand his or her role in achieving that admirable mission, and feel empowered to do so. By creating an atmosphere of transparency, two-way communication, and goal-driven action, criminal justice agencies put themselves on the trajectory for internal and external successes – serving all their publics. At the end of the day, every employee has a different role, but they have the same job: to help the organization succeed.

October

is National Domestic Violence Awareness Month

by: Tina L. Fox, State Director, Victim Services Division & APAI Member, Tennessee

National Domestic Violence Awareness Month is an annual designation observed in October. The U.S. Department of Justice estimates that 1.3 million women and 835,000 men are victims of physical violence by a partner every year.

Every 9 seconds, a woman in the U.S. is beaten or assaulted by a current or ex-significant other. 1 in 7 men will be victims of physical violence from a partner during their lifetime.¹

15% of all violent crimes are due to intimate partner violence. 19% of these incidents involve a weapon, and only 34% of people injured by their partner receive any kind of medical attention for their injuries.¹

Victims of domestic violence are more likely to suffer from depression and express suicidal behaviors. 72% of all murder-suicides involve an intimate partner; 94% of the victims of these murder suicides are women.¹

Domestic violence contributes to higher risks of alcohol, tobacco, and other drug addictions, as well as higher rates of cancer, cardiovascular diseases and hypertension.¹

Victims of domestic violence will lose a total of 8 million days of paid work every year, and the total cost of partner violence exceeds \$8 billion per year.¹

1 in 15 children in the United States are exposed to domestic violence every year.¹

People who are in an abusive relationship will stay with their partner for a number of reasons:

- Their self-esteem is totally destroyed,
- They share a life,
- They are made to feel like everything that goes wrong is their fault.

THE NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOTLINE

1-800-799-7233 (SAFE)

www.ndvh.org

NATIONAL DATING ABUSE HELPLINE

1-866-331-9474

www.loveisrespect.org

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION LIFELINE

1-800-273-8255 (TALK)

www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org

Tina Fox



¹ Source: National Coalition Against Domestic Violence www.ncadv.org/statistics

A Focus on Relationships:

APAI's Networking and Collaboration Across the Globe

by: Matthew Degnan, APAI Northeastern Vice President and Administrator, Rhode Island Parole Board

As APAI Central Vice-President Jonathan Ogletree mentioned in the July 2018 newsletter, "Membership has its privileges." Jonathan outlined many of the benefits of being a part of such a great organization like APAI, but it is important to focus on one of the most critical pieces: Networking and Collaboration with Parole Board Chairs and Members from Across the Globe.

There are not a lot of people who do what we do. It is no secret that the work in our field is a niche area. Having the ability to surround ourselves with people in similar roles enables us to

friends or family. The bond between members such as Dr. Kenneth Walker, Cranston Mitchell, Rissie Owens, and many more is indescribable.

During the 2018 conference, in Lake Tahoe, I had the pleasure of observing the close relationship of Ed Reilly and Jasper Clay. These two were more like brothers than colleagues or acquaintances that only see each other once or twice a year at conferences.

The relationships formed by being involved in this association

not only network and collaborate, but to form friendships that can span across years, states, and political views. Membership allows us to create a network of colleagues who experience many similar challenges and issues. Building these relationships and friendships allows us, as practitioners to continue to improve our processes and support our missions and values. Conferences are not only informative but allow those relationships to build by having time to spend time together in a non-formal manner.

I have had the privilege of being a member of APAI since 2008, and have consistently attended the Annual Training Conference each year. I recall from my first conference noticing interactions of members that appeared to be like great

go far beyond the few days we have in person at the annual conference and truly turn into valuable friendships.

Lastly, the Rhode Island contingency has built personal relationships with many other Parole Boards, APAI staff members, and even our exhibitors and sponsors. These connections are incredibly important to all of us and are an integral part of membership with this association.



Executive Committee

President

David Blumberg

Maryland

Vice President

Danielle LaCost

Wisconsin

Executive Director

Monica Morris

Florida

Past President

Cynthia Mausser

Ohio

Treasurer

Joe Pacholski

Washington DC

Secretary

Jennifer Shaffer

California

Northeastern USA

Matt Degnan

Rhode Island

Western USA

Lonzo Henderson

Alaska

Central USA

Jonathan Ogletree

Kansas

Southern USA

Benita Murphy

West Virginia

International Section

Jennifer Oades

Canada

International Section

Thando Tsetsewa

Africa

International Section

Martin Jones

Europe

Contact APAI

Correctional Management Institute of Texas | George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University | Huntsville, TX 77341-2296

Phone: 877-318-APAI | **Fax:** 936-294-1671 | **E-mail:** info@apaintl.org



fb.me/apaintl



www.apaintl.org



[@APAIParole](https://twitter.com/APAIParole)



CORRECTIONAL
MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE OF TEXAS

