

BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS

2024

---

REPORT OF SIGNIFICANT EVENTS



This page intentionally left blank for duplication purposes.

## Contents

Workload at a Glance .....	1
Grant and Denial Rates .....	7
Recidivism Rates .....	10
Additional Information .....	11
Legal Developments .....	15
Training and Outreach .....	18
Administration and Technology .....	24

This page intentionally left blank for duplication purposes.

# 2024

## SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

---

### WORKLOAD AT A GLANCE

---

#### Parole Hearings

- ◆ **7,999 scheduled parole hearings**
  - Down 3.42% from 8,282 in 2023
  - 270 or 3% were for persons housed at an institution for women, unchanged from 2023
  - 7,731 or 97% were for persons housed at an institution for men, unchanged from 2023
  - 3,631 or 45% were initial hearings, down from 49% in 2023
  - 4,368 or 55% were subsequent hearings, up from 51% in 2023
  - 3,862 or 48% were youth offender parole hearings, down from 49% in 2023
    - 2,777 or 72% of those were for persons sentenced to an indeterminate term and eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, up from 70% in 2023
    - 1085 or 28% of those were for persons sentenced to a determinate term and eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, down from 30% in 2023
  - 3,581 or 45% were for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 42% in 2023
    - 3,337 or 93% of those were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 92% in 2023
    - 244 or 7% of those were for determinately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, down from 8% in 2023
  - 762 or 9.5% were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **1,150 parole grants**
  - Down 20% from 1,433 in 2023
  - 31% of hearings held, down from 35% in 2023
  - 14% of scheduled parole hearings, down from 17% in 2023
  - 56 or 5% were for persons housed at an institution for women, up from 4% in 2023
  - 1,094 or 95% were for persons housed at an institution for men, down from 96% in 2023
  - 319 or 28% were grants issued at a person's initial hearing, down from 29% in 2023
  - 550 or 48% were to persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, down from 50% in 2023

- 606 or 53% were to persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 44% in 2023
- 107 or 9% were to indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **2,614 parole denials**
  - Down 1% from 2,638 in 2023
  - 69% of hearings held, up from 65% in 2023
  - 32% of scheduled hearings, unchanged from 32% in 2023
  - 73 or 3% were for persons housed at an institution for women, unchanged from 2023
  - 2,541 or 96% were to persons housed at an institution for men, down from 97% in 2023
  - 1,176 or 45% were to persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, up from 44% in 2023
  - 1,272 or 49% were to persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 47% in 2023
  - 235 or 9% were to indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **547 stipulations**
  - Down 4% from 572 in 2023
  - 7% of scheduled hearings, unchanged from 2023
  - 18 or 3% were to persons housed at an institution for women, down from 4% in 2023
  - 529 or 97% were to persons housed at an institution for men, up from 96% in 2023
  - 278 or 51% were to persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, down from 53% in 2023
  - 206 or 38% were to persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, unchanged from 38% in 2023
  - 58 or 11% were to indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **1,956 voluntary waivers**
  - Up 7% from 1,827 in 2023
  - 24% of scheduled hearings, up from 22% in 2023
  - 59 or 3% were from persons housed at an institution for women, unchanged from 3% in 2023
  - 1,899 or 97% were from persons housed at an institution for men, unchanged from 97% in 2023
  - 1039 or 53% were from persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, up from 52% in 2023
  - 762 or 39% were from persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 36% in 2023
  - 183 or 9% were from indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender

◆ **1,271 postponements**

- Down 6% from 1,348 in 2023
- 16% of scheduled hearings, unchanged from 2023
- 42 or 3% were to persons housed at an institution for women, up from 2% in 2023
- 1,229 or 97% were to persons housed at an institution for men, down from 98% in 2023
- 634 or 50% were for persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, unchanged from 50% in 2023
- 541 or 43% were for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 39% in 2023
- 136 or 11% were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender

◆ **457 continued or cancelled hearings**

- 2% decrease from 467 in 2023
  - 68 or 15% were continued
  - 389 or 85% were cancelled
- 6% of scheduled hearings, unchanged from 6% in 2023
- 22 or 5% were for persons housed at an institution for women, up from 3% in 2023
- 435 or 95% were for persons housed at an institution for men, down from 97% in 2023
- 228 or 50% were for persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, down from 55% in 2023
- 193 or 42% were for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 39% in 2023
- 43 or 9% were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender

**Parole Reconsideration Hearings**

◆ **252 parole reconsideration hearings scheduled**

- Up 34% from 188 in 2023
- 84 or 33% were initial parole reconsideration hearings, up from 22% in 2023
- 168 or 67% were subsequent annual parole reconsideration hearings, down from 78% in 2023

**Administrative Reviews to Consider Advancing Parole Hearing Dates**

- ◆ 1,785 cases were screened for possible review, down 6% from 1,903 in 2023
- ◆ 1,437 cases or 81% received a review on the merits, up from 79% in 2023
  - 946 or 53% of cases reviewed on the merits were approved for an advanced hearing date, down from 67% in 2023
  - 491 or 28% of cases reviewed on the merits were denied an advanced hearing date, down from 33% in 2023
- ◆ 30% of parole hearings held in 2024 because of an administrative review to advance a person's next hearing date resulted in a grant of parole, down from 41% in 2023

- ◆ 37% of parole hearings held in 2024 because of an administrative review to advance a person's next hearing date resulted in a denial of parole, up from 31% in 2023

### **Comprehensive Risk Assessments (CRA)**

- ◆ 3,726 CRAs were completed, down 11% from 4,181 in 2023

### **Consultations**

- ◆ 2,194 consultations conducted, down 21% from 2,778 in 2023

### **Correspondence**

- ◆ 117,104 pieces of correspondence processed, down .3% from 117,496 in 2023<sup>1</sup>
  - 47,215 pieces of correspondence processed by Correspondence Unit
  - 23,000 pieces of correspondence processed by the Scheduling Unit
  - 1,828 letters were sent from the Legal Division, down 3% from 1,878 in 2023
  - 33,154 hearing notices were sent, down 5% from 35,079 in 2023
  - 11,907 notices of determinately sentenced nonviolent offender parole reviews, petition to advance reviews, and administrative reviews were sent, down 3% from 12,310 in 2023

### **Determinately sentenced Nonviolent Offender Parole Reviews**

- ◆ 2,587 referrals to the Board of Parole Hearings (Board) for nonviolent offender parole review, down 10% from 2,861 in 2023
- ◆ 2,684 reviews on the merits were conducted, down 9% from 2,786 in 2023
  - 183 or 7% of persons eligible for nonviolent parole consideration were approved for release, unchanged from 7% in 2023
  - 2,371 or 88% of persons eligible for nonviolent parole consideration were denied release, up from 87% in 2023
- ◆ 130 referrals were reviewed and closed for lack of jurisdiction, down 26% from 175 in 2023
- ◆ 914 reviews of merit decisions were conducted, down 15% from 1,081 conducted in 2023
  - 826 decisions or 90% were upheld after review, up from 89% in 2023
  - 88 decisions or 10% were modified after review, down from 11% in 2023

### **Executive Case Summaries**

- ◆ 1,205 executive case summaries of parole grant decisions were prepared by the Legal Division in 2024, down 15% from 1,416 in 2023

---

<sup>1</sup> This number accounts for a change in methodology tracking all correspondence received and processed in each division at the Board, including PTA correspondence as well as email correspondence received by the Scheduling Unit's triage email team.

### **Extradition Cases**

- ◆ 450 extradition cases were reviewed, down 39% from 735 in 2023

### **Petitions to Advance a Parole Hearing Date**

- ◆ 518 petitions were received, down 12% from 586 in 2023
- ◆ 518 preliminary reviews of petitions completed, down 12% from 586 in 2023
- ◆ 439 reviews on the merits of petitions received, down 12% from 500 in 2023
  - 219 or 50% of those petitions were approved for an advanced hearing date, down from 51% approved in 2023
  - 191 or 44% of those petitions were denied for an advanced hearing date, unchanged from 44% denied in 2023
- ◆ 39% of parole hearings held in 2024 as a result of the Board approving a petition to advance a parole hearing date resulted in a grant of parole, down from 49% in 2023
- ◆ 34% of parole hearings scheduled in 2024 as a result of the Board approving a petition to advance a parole hearing date resulted in a denial of parole, down from 36% in 2023

### **International Prisoner Transfer Program**

- ◆ 43 cases completed, down 4% from 45 in 2023
- ◆ No persons were transferred to another country, unchanged from 2023

### **Investigations**

- ◆ 1,203 pre-parole investigations were completed, down 17% from 1,451 in 2023
- ◆ 2 intimate partner battering investigations were completed, down 33% from 3 in 2023
- ◆ 195 Board-initiated investigations were completed, up 7% from 169 in 2023
- ◆ 71 Board-initiated investigative fact findings were completed, down 5% from 75 in 2023
- ◆ 36 parolee out-of-state transfer request investigations, unchanged from 36 in 2023
- ◆ 12 special condition of parole modification investigations, up from 7 in 2023
- ◆ 33 expanded medical parole reviews were completed, down from 39 in 2023
- ◆ 1,014 pardon investigations were completed, down 11% from 1,140 in 2023
- ◆ 112 commutation investigations were completed, up 138% from 47 in 2023
- ◆ 259 EDD investigations were completed, down 7% from 279 in 2023

### **Medical Parole Hearings**

- ◆ 46 medical parole hearings scheduled, down from 52 in 2023

### **Offenders with Mental Health Disorders (OMHD) Actions**

- ◆ 423 certification hearings were conducted, up 17% from 361 in 2023
- ◆ 377 placement and annual review hearings were conducted, down .3% from 378 in 2023
- ◆ 269 holds to detain persons for OMHD screening were placed, down 16% from 322 in 2023

### **Parole Discharge Reviews**

- ◆ 10,436 cases were reviewed to determine whether a supervised person should be discharged from parole, down 3% from 10,809 in 2023

### **Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) Screening**

- ◆ 3,166 SVP screenings, down 9% from 3,482 in 2023
  - 2,030 cases were referred for clinical screening, down 14% from 2,361 in 2023
  - 1,136 cases were closed as not meeting criteria for clinical screening, up 1% from 1,121 in 2023
  - 2,115 clinical screenings completed, down 10% from 2,352 in 2023
  - 511 persons were referred after clinical screening to the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) for a full evaluation, up 9% from 470 in 2023
  - 1,604 were not referred after clinical screening to DSH for a full evaluation, down 15% from 1,882 in 2023

---

## GRANT AND DENIAL RATES

---

The Board's parole hearing grant and denial rates are calculated both as a percentage of **hearings held** that result in a grant or denial and as a percentage of **hearings scheduled**. A scheduled hearing can result in one of several outcomes: grant, denial, stipulation, voluntary waiver, postponement, cancellation, or continuance. A variety of factors unrelated to a person's suitability for parole can affect the outcome of a scheduled hearing (such as the need to postpone a hearing when a person is ill). For this reason, the percentage of **hearings held** that result in a grant or denial more accurately reflects the Board's parole suitability decision-making.

### Parole Hearing Outcomes as a Percentage of Hearings Held

In 2024, the Board held **3,764** hearings resulting in the following outcomes:

2024 Outcomes of Hearing Held		
Outcome	Number	Percentage
Grant	1,150	31%
Denial	2,614	69%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,764</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Parole Grant Outcomes as a Percentage of Hearings Held

Grant rates for parole **hearings held** in 2024 are as follows:

- ◆ 31% of all hearings held resulted in a grant, down from 35% in 2023
- ◆ 43% of hearings held for persons housed at an institution for women resulted in a grant, unchanged from 2023
- ◆ 30% of hearings held for persons housed at an institution for men resulted in a grant, down from 35% in 2023
- ◆ 30% of hearings held for persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a grant, down from 38% in 2023
  - 32% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a grant, down from 42% in 2023
  - 20% of hearings held for determinately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a grant, down from 24% in 2023
- ◆ 32% of hearings held for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant, unchanged from 32% in 2023
  - 33% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant, down from 35% in 2023
  - 18% of hearings held for determinately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant, down from 23% in 2023
- ◆ 31% of hearings held for persons eligible for a hearing as an indeterminately sentenced nonviolent offender resulted in a grant, down from 40% in 2023
- ◆ 36% of hearings held in 2024 as a result of a person filing a petition to advance their next hearing date resulted in a grant, down from 49% in 2023

- ◆ 51% of hearings held in 2024 as a result of an administrative review conducted resulted in a grant, down from 56% in 2023

### **Parole Grant Outcomes by Comprehensive Risk Assessment (CRA) Rating<sup>2</sup>**

- ◆ 62% of hearings held for a person with a CRA rating of low risk for future violence resulted in a grant of parole, down from 67% in 2023
- ◆ 30% of hearings held for a person with a CRA rating of moderate risk for future violence resulted in a grant of parole, down from 37% in 2023
- ◆ 6% of hearings held for a person with a CRA rating of high risk for future violence resulted in a grant of parole, up from 3% in 2023

### **Parole Denial Outcomes as a Percentage of Hearings Held**

Various denial rates for parole **hearings held** in 2024 are as follows:

- ◆ 69% of hearings held resulted in a denial, up from 65% in 2023
- ◆ 57% of hearings held for persons housed at an institution for women resulted in a denial, unchanged from 2023
- ◆ 70% of hearings held for persons housed at an institution for men resulted in a denial, up from 65% in 2023
- ◆ 70% of hearings held for persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a denial, up from 62% in 2023
  - 68% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a denial, up from 58% in 2023
  - 80% of hearings held for determinately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a denial, up from 76% in 2023
- ◆ 68% of hearings held for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial, up from 66% in 2023
  - 67% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial, up from 65% in 2023
  - 82% of hearings held for determinately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial, up from 77% in 2023
- ◆ 69% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender resulted in a denial, up from 60% in 2023
- ◆ 64% of hearings held in 2024 as a result of a person filing a petition to advance their next hearing date resulted in a denial, up from 51% from 2023
- ◆ 49% of hearings held in 2024 as a result of an administrative review conducted resulted in a denial, up from 44% in 2023

---

<sup>2</sup> A CRA may be up to three years old at the time of the person's hearing.

### Grant Rates by Race and Ethnicity

For hearings held in 2024, Black and Hispanic incarcerated persons were again granted parole at a rate slightly higher than white incarcerated persons. The overall rates varied by a total of two percent, from highest to lowest grant rate.<sup>3</sup>

Outcome	Black	Hispanic	White
Grant	31%	30%	29%
Deny	69%	70%	71%

A more extensive independent study is being conducted by the University of California at Berkeley concerning hearing outcomes, evidence-based risk factors, and various demographics, including race and ethnicity.

### Parole Hearing Outcomes as a Percentage of Scheduled Hearings

As mentioned above, a scheduled parole hearing can result in a grant, denial, stipulation, voluntary waiver, postponement, cancellation, or continuance. As shown below, a grant rate of 14 percent for scheduled hearings, therefore, **does not** mean the remaining 86 percent of scheduled hearings resulted in a denial. In 2024, the Board scheduled **7,999** hearings resulting in the following outcomes:

Outcome	Number	Percentage
Grant	1,150	14%
Denial	2,614	33%
Stipulation	547	7%
Voluntary waiver	1,956	24%
Postponement	1,271	16%
Cancelled/Continued	457	6%
Tie Votes (Pending Final Action)	4	.05%
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,999</b>	<b>100%</b>

Using the **scheduled hearing** outcomes above, 1,150 people were granted parole and 2,614 people were denied parole by the Board after a hearing. Another 547 people were denied parole without a hearing when they entered a stipulation with the Board stating that they were not suitable for parole. In the remaining 3,688 hearings scheduled, there was no decision rendered concerning the person's suitability for parole because the person voluntarily waived their hearing or the hearing was postponed, continued, cancelled or resulted in a tie vote.

<sup>3</sup> There were too few hearings held for persons from other races and ethnicities to provide meaningful comparison.

---

**RECIDIVISM RATES**

---

**Recidivism Rates for Persons Released After Serving a Sentence of Life with the Possibility of Parole**

A total of 6,220 people serving a term of life with the possibility of parole were released from state prison between fiscal year 2011-12 and fiscal year 2019-20 after receiving a grant of parole from the Board. More than 97 percent of persons who were released after a grant of parole successfully transitioned to the community without being convicted of another crime within three years of release. Less than three percent (2.5% or 156 people) were convicted of a new misdemeanor or felony crime within three years of release and less than one percent (0.5% or 30 people) were convicted of new felony crimes against persons during the same three-year period.

---

<b>Fiscal Year of Release</b>	<b>No. Released</b>	<b>No. with any new felony or misdemeanor conviction within 3 years of release</b>	<b>% with any new felony or misdemeanor conviction within 3 years of release</b>	<b>No. with new felony conviction for crime against person within 3 years of release</b>	<b>% with new felony conviction for crime against person within 3 years of release</b>
<b>FY 2019-20</b>	972	29	2.9%	7	0.7%
<b>FY 2018-19</b>	1,051	23	2.2%	2	0.2%
<b>FY 2017-18</b>	757	15	2.0%	1	0.1%
<b>FY 2016-17</b>	701	13	1.9%	6	0.9%
<b>FY 2015-16</b>	720	23	3.2%	5	0.7%
<b>FY 2014-15</b>	682	16	2.3%	3	0.4%
<b>FY 2013-14</b>	510	16	3.1%	3	0.6%
<b>FY 2012-13</b>	478	20	4.2%	2	0.4%
<b>FY 2011-12</b>	349	11	3.2%	1	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,220</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0.5%</b>

---

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

---

### **Comprehensive Risk Assessments**

Each year the Board's Chief Psychologist presents to the Board an analysis of CRAs administered by the Board's Forensic Assessment Division (FAD) during the preceding year. The information is presented at an executive board meeting open to the public.

A CRA is a structured professional judgment model of risk assessment that assesses a person's potential risk for future violence as low, moderate, or high. In 2024, the FAD relied on the Historical Clinical Risk Management-20 (HCR-20) Version 3 and the STATIC-99-Revised (when applicable) for its CRAs. Based on CRAs administered in 2024, 10% of examinees were rated low risk; 59% of examinees were rated moderate risk; and 31% were rated high risk.

### **Elderly Parole Hearings**

There are two groups of persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing: (1) persons not sentenced under the Three Strikes Law nor convicted of first-degree murder of a peace officer are eligible once they are age 50 or older and have served 20 years of continuous incarceration, and (2) persons who are sentenced under the Three Strikes Law or who were convicted of first-degree murder of a peace officer are eligible for a parole hearing after reaching age 60 and after having served 25 years of continuous incarceration.

In 2024, the Board scheduled 3,580 hearings for persons eligible for elderly parole. Of that number, 1,878 hearings were held, resulting in 606 grants (32% of elderly hearings conducted), 1,272 denials, 204 stipulations to unsuitability and 3 tie-grant votes. The remaining 1,495 scheduled hearings were waived, postponed, continued, or cancelled.

### **Medical Parole Hearings**

Persons are eligible for referral to the Board under the Medical Parole Program if they (1) suffer from a significant and permanent condition, disease, or syndrome, resulting in them being physically or cognitively debilitated or incapacitated or (2) qualify for placement in a licensed health care facility, as determined by the Resource Utilization Guide IV Assessment Tool. The Board conducts a medical parole hearing to determine if the person will pose an unreasonable risk to public safety if placed in a licensed health care facility in the community.

In 2024, the state completed the phasing out of a contract with Golden Legacy to provide care to individuals who were granted medical parole. Of the individuals being served under this contract, 22 returned to prison, 23 were granted compassionate release and 1 paroled.

In 2024, the Board scheduled 46 medical parole hearings, resulting in 22 approvals and 5 denials; the remaining 19 hearings were postponed or cancelled.

### **Panel Attorney Program**

The Board appoints attorneys (referred to as “panel attorneys”) to represent incarcerated persons in the parole hearing process. For cases assigned and accepted by panel attorneys before June 30, 2024, the rate for representation is \$945 per case. After July 1, 2024, the rate for panel attorney representation increased to \$1,005 per case. In addition, for cases assigned after July 1, 2024, panel attorneys who represent incarcerated persons with certain vision or hearing disabilities receive \$2,010 per case.

In addition to increased panel attorney rates, since 2020, the Board has partnered with a nonprofit entity, Parole Justice Works, to provide training, mentoring, and resources to panel attorneys and to assist the Board in monitoring the quality of attorney representation.

Parole Justice Works provides training for panel attorneys, maintains an attorney resource bank, a website, a Listserv, and an attorney-mentoring program. It also conducts roundtable meetings for panel attorneys on topics relevant to providing effective legal representation to clients in the parole hearing process and conducts client surveys soliciting feedback on all areas of parole representation.

As of December 2024, Parole Justice Works has collected and coded 4,744 surveys from incarcerated persons represented by panel attorneys soliciting feedback on all areas of parole representation. The results show that 69% of incarcerated persons represented by panel attorneys reported that they were either satisfied or more than satisfied with their attorney's representation at their parole hearing, and that 68% described the attorney's pre-hearing preparation of them as either making a big difference in the hearing, or important or helpful in the hearing.

### **Parole Consideration for Determinately sentenced Nonviolent Offenders**

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) refers certain determinately sentenced persons eligible for parole consideration as a nonviolent offender to the Board for review and possible release once the person has served the full term of their primary offense. Persons are reviewed for release based on their criminal history, a review of their institutional records, and after consideration of input received from the incarcerated person, victims, victims' families, and the district attorney's office that prosecuted the person. A written decision is rendered after an administrative review of relevant and reliable records; no hearing is conducted.

The number of persons approved for release under the nonviolent offender parole review program has steadily declined over the past several years, as more persons with recent negative behavior and persons convicted of sex crimes (who were ineligible for parole consideration under the program prior to 2021) are referred to the Board. At the same time, persons who were previously most likely to be approved for release under the program are no longer referred to the Board. This is because nonviolent offenders who participate in rehabilitative programs and who refrain from negative behavior are now eligible for increased credit earning.

As a result, many are no longer referred to the Board because they are instead released once they have served the full term of their sentence, less applicable credits.

In 2024, the Board received 2,587 referrals under this program and conducted 2,684 reviews on the merits, resulting in 183 being approved for release and 2,371 denied release. An additional 130 were reviewed and the Board determined it did not have jurisdiction to render a release decision because the person was ineligible for parole consideration.

### **Parole Consideration for Indeterminately Sentenced Nonviolent Offenders**

The Board conducts parole hearings for incarcerated persons sentenced to an indeterminate term (life with the possibility of parole) under an alternative sentencing scheme (such as California's Three Strikes Law) for a nonviolent offense. Under this parole hearing process, CDCR refers eligible persons to the Board for a parole hearing and possible release once they have served the full term of their primary offense.

In 2024, the Board scheduled 762 parole hearings for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender, resulting in 107 grants, 235 denials, and 58 stipulations to unsuitability. The remaining 362 scheduled hearings were waived, postponed, continued, or cancelled.

### **Parole Terms and Reviews for Discharge from Parole**

On August 6, 2020, Governor Newsom signed Senate Bill (SB) 118, which shortened parole periods for most persons released from state prison on or after July 1, 2020. The bill also standardized the timing for reviewing persons for possible discharge from parole. The parole term for most determinately sentenced persons is now two years and for indeterminately sentenced persons, it is three years. One exception is that parole terms for persons required to register as a sexual offender under Penal Code section 290 et seq. remain unchanged. In addition, persons subject to the new parole terms must be reviewed for possible discharge from parole no later than 12 months after release from confinement, and annually thereafter. The Board is responsible for reviewing all indeterminately sentenced persons and certain determinately sentenced persons for discharge from parole.

In 2024, the Board conducted 10,436 parole discharge reviews.

### **Prosecutor Participation in Parole Hearings**

Of the 3,764 parole hearings held in 2024, a prosecutor attended 2,189 (or 58%). Of those 2,189 hearings, 609 (or 28%) resulted in a grant of parole and 1,578 (or 72%) resulted in a denial. As previously noted, the grant rate for all hearings held in 2024 was 31 percent and the denial rate was 69 percent.

### **Youth Offender Parole Hearings**

The Board began conducting youth offender parole hearings in 2014, as required by SB 260 (Chapter 312, Statutes of 2013). Under SB 260, youth offenders were defined as persons who were tried as adults but who were under the age of 18 when they committed their controlling offense. Under SB 260, youth offenders are eligible for a parole hearing during their 15<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, or 25<sup>th</sup> year of incarceration, depending on the length of the original sentence imposed by the court. Exclusions apply.

The Legislature has since expanded the definition of a youth offender multiple times. Today, persons who committed their controlling offense when they were under the age of 26 are eligible for a youth offender parole hearing during their 15<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, or 25<sup>th</sup> year of incarceration, depending on the sentence imposed by the court. Exclusions apply. This now also includes persons sentenced to life without the possibility of parole for crimes they committed when they were under the age of 18. Exclusions apply.

Overall, in 2024, the Board scheduled a total of 3,862 youth offender parole hearings; 2,777 were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing and 1,085 were for determinately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing. Of the scheduled hearings, 1,681 hearings were held, resulting in 505 grants (30% of youth offender hearings held), 1,176 denials, and 278 stipulations to unsuitability. The remaining scheduled hearings were waived, postponed, continued, or cancelled. In 2023, 48 percent of scheduled parole hearings were youth offender parole hearings.

### **Victim and Survivor Participation in Parole Hearings**

In 2024, 38 percent of parole hearings scheduled had at least one victim or victim's family member who requested to be notified of the hearing (3,023 hearings out of 7,999 hearings scheduled). A victim or victim's family member attended 957 hearings held. Nineteen percent (19%) of hearings held in 2024 with a victim or victim's family member present resulted in a grant of parole and 772 (or 81%) resulted in a denial. As previously noted, the grant rate for all hearings held in 2024 was 31 percent and the denial rate was 69 percent.

---

## LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

---

The information below reflects legal developments as of December 31, 2024.

### **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 2023, Plaintiffs' counsel filed a motion to enforce the revised permanent injunction as applied to class members who are deaf/hard of hearing, or blind/low vision. In 2024, the court ordered that some additional accommodations were needed for some class members. The court-ordered requirements include translating documents into sign language for some class members, video recording sign language interpretation provided during parole hearings for some class members, providing additional meetings with panel attorneys for some class members, and providing documents to certain class members in a manner consistent with their primary method of communication, without waiting for a request. The Board continues to work toward full compliance with the *Armstrong* Remedial Plan II.

### **California Court of Appeal Cases Pending:**

#### ***Criminal Justice Legal Foundation v. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, et. al.*; Third District Court of Appeal, No. C100274**

The Sacramento County Superior Court partially denied and partially granted a petition for writ of mandate challenging CDCR credit regulations. In granting the petition the court found that CDCR could not use regulations to issue credits that advance an indeterminately sentenced person's Minimum Eligible Parole Date. The case is fully briefed, and argument is set for May 20, 2025.

#### ***Jessica M. et. al, v. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, et. al.*; Second District Court of Appeal, No. B343930**

The Los Angeles County Superior Court denied a petition for writ of mandate where petitioners sought to prevent youth parole hearings for people convicted of sex offenses and sentenced to “full, separate, and consecutive” terms under Penal Code section 667.6 based on how the legislation was passed. The superior court held that Jessica's Law resulted in a technical re-enactment of section 667.6, subdivision (c); thus, the Legislature could amend that subdivision by a simple majority vote, or alternately section 3051 did not amend section 667.6, subdivision (c) because the statutes do not conflict. Petitioners have appealed.

### **Significant Cases Resolved in 2024**

#### ***People v. Williams\** – California Supreme Court, 17 Cal.5th 99**

The California Supreme Court held that Penal Code section 3051, subdivision (h) does not violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment by excluding

young adults convicted and sentenced for serious sex crimes under the One Strike law (Pen. Code, § 667.61) from youth offender parole consideration, while young adults convicted of first-degree murder are entitled to such consideration.

***People v. Hardin\** – California Supreme Court, 15 Cal.5th 834**

The California Supreme Court held that the legislature's expansion of the youth offender parole statute to generally offer opportunities for early release to persons incarcerated for crimes committed between ages 18 and 25, but not those serving sentences of life in prison without possibility of parole based on convictions for first-degree murder with special circumstance, had a rational basis of maintaining appropriate punishment for most culpable crimes, and thus, did not violate equal protection. The Court reasoned that the legislature rationally excluded offenders convicted of special circumstance murder, because the "special circumstance" statute was intended to mark murders committed under those enumerated circumstances as particularly egregious and deserving of the harshest punishment.

***People v. Briscoe\** – First District Court of Appeal, 105 Cal.App.5th 479**

The court held that people who were sentenced under Penal Code section 190.2, subdivision (d) for special circumstance murder, and were under 26 at the time of the commitment offense are entitled to youth parole consideration. Penal Code section 190.2, subdivision (d) applies to people who were a major participant in a felony that included a murder, and acted with reckless indifference to human life, but were not the actual killer.

\*These cases were criminal appeals and the Board was not a party to the litigation.

***In re Reed* – First District Court of Appeal, 103 Cal.App.5th 43**

The court summarized that people who were convicted of murder and released after July 1, 2020, were subject to a three-year parole term under Penal Code section 3000.01, subdivision (b)(2). The court concluded that with this statutory change, those individuals cannot be remanded to the custody of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation if a trial court finds them in violation of parole.

***In re Brown*, 104 Cal.App.5th 969**

The court held that the Three Strikes exclusion under Penal Code, section 3055, subdivision (g), applies to incarcerated persons, like petitioner, who were convicted and sentenced under the Three Strikes law even if they had already commenced serving a prison sentence. When petitioner went before the parole board in 2022, his "current sentence" for purpose of elderly parole included both his indeterminate term and his fully consecutive determinate term.

## **Writs of Habeas Corpus**

In 2024, the state was required to file a response to 25 habeas petitions filed in state and federal court (down 37% from 68 in 2023). In 2024, the Board held two court-ordered parole suitability hearings as a result of habeas petitions filed by incarcerated persons who were granted by the court, unchanged from 2023.

---

## TRAINING AND OUTREACH

---

### **Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner Training**

The Transcript Analysis Program provides commissioners with periodic legal feedback regarding their parole hearing decisions. In 2024, 24 consultations occurred between the Board's Legal Division and commissioners under the Transcript Analysis Program, which is three more than occurred in 2023.

Commissioners and deputy commissioners receive training during monthly executive board meetings, the majority of which are open to the public. In addition to training required for all CDCR employees, the following trainings were provided to commissioners and deputy commissioners in 2024:

- ◆ *Tablets for Incarcerated Population*, by Kyle Clark, Communication Technology Solutions IT Supervisor, CDCR, and Jon Jenkins, Representative, ViaPath
- ◆ *Overview of Posse Solutions*, by Nick Woodall, President and Chief Executive Officer
- ◆ *Overview of A New Way of Live*, by Susan Burton, Founder, Pamela Marshall, Co-Director, and Jorja Leap, Program Evaluator
- ◆ *Overview of Enneagram Prison Project (EPP)*, by Susan Olesek, Founder, Dustin Baldwin, Ambassador, EPP Canada & EPP France Board Member, Troy Philipps, Ambassador, Chuck Stubblefield, Ambassador, and Alex Senegal, Ambassador and EPP Board Member
- ◆ *Overview of Anti-Recidivism Coalition*, by Sam Lewis, Executive Director, Norma Cumpian, Assistant Deputy Director, Joseph Osorio, Associate Director, Sacramento, Jacob Brevard, Inside Programs Director, David Amaya, HART Program Manager, Southern Region, and Wajuba McDuffy, Hope Team Life Coach
- ◆ *Criteria for Determining Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) Evaluation*, by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, Jasmine Tehrani, Chief Psychologist, Forensic Assessment Division (FAD), and Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) Criteria and Evaluations*, by Dr. Shoba Sreenivasan, Forensic Psychologist, Department of State Hospitals
- ◆ *Five Keys/Home Free*, by Sunny Schwartz, Founder, Five Keys Charter School and the San Francisco Sheriff's Department's Resolve to Stop the Violence Project
- ◆ *Restorative Justice*, by Rebecca Weiker, Co-Director, Mend Collaborative
- ◆ *Issues and Resources for Crime Victims*, by Heidi Rummel, President and Founder, Parole Justice Works
- ◆ *Updates on the Board's Information and Technology System and Scheduling*, by Travis Stratton, Chief of Application Development, Tara Doetsch, Chief Deputy of Program Operations, and Steve Mehler, Chief of Scheduling Unit, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Structured Professional Judgment and Sexual Dynamic Risk Considerations*,

- by Dr. Jasmine Tehrani, Chief Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Disability Awareness and Etiquette*, by Melissa Langley, Representative, Disability Access Services, Department of Rehabilitation
- ◆ *Intimate Partner Violence and Brain Injuries*, by Dr. Michelle Patch, Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing
- ◆ *California Reentry Institute*, by Collette Carroll, Director and Founder
- ◆ *Institutional Misconduct: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*, by Dr. Lisa Tobin, Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Overview of the Office of Victim and Survivor Rights and Services' (OVSRS) Contact with Victims Throughout the Parole Hearing Process*, by Silvia Aceves, Victim Services Manager, OVSRS, CDCR
- ◆ *Inside Circle*, by Eldra Jackson III, Executive Director
- ◆ *Comprehensive Risk Assessments and Dynamic Risk Considerations for Sex Offenders and Year End Review*, by Dr. Jasmine Tehrani, Chief Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Programming for Sex Offenders*, by Dr. Adrianna Shoji, Chief of Mental Health, Valley State Prison
- ◆ *Supervision of and Assistance to Penal Code Section 290 Registrants*, by Daniel Stout, Parole Agent III, and Bryan Nakayama, Parole Agent III, Division of Adult Parole Operations (DAPO), CDCR
- ◆ *Occupational Mentor Certification Program*, by Anthony Maiden, Staff Services Manager, Harvinder Baraich, Staff Services Manager, and Yolanda Vasquez, Staff Services Manager, Division of Rehabilitative Programs, CDCR
- ◆ *Medicated Assisted Treatment*, by Dr. Donna Kalauokalani, Deputy Medical Executive, Medical Services Division, California Correctional Health Care Services
- ◆ *Litigation Update*, by Sara Romano, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Correctional Writs and Appeal Section, Office of the Attorney General
- ◆ *Security Threat Groups*, by Edgar Ramos, Special Agent-In-Charge, and Bianca Ramos, Special Agent, Office of Correctional Safety, CDCR
- ◆ *Update from Division of Adult Parole Operations*, by Jason Johnson, Director, DAPO, CDCR
- ◆ *Update from Division of Adult Institutions*, by Ron Broomfield, Director of Division of Adult Institutions (DAI), CDCR
- ◆ *CDCR Update*, by Jeff Macomber, Secretary, CDCR

Commissioners also attended an annual training conference hosted by the Association of Paroling Authorities International in 2024 with the following training sessions:

- ◆ *From the Big House to the White House: Unlocking Potential*, by Christopher Poulos
- ◆ *Bridge to Heal Us*, by Erin Jones
- ◆ *The Science of Addiction and Recovery*, by Donna Kalauokalani, MD, MPH,

- and Renee Kanan, MD, MPH
- ◆ *Typologies & Implications for Risk Management for Persons Convicted of Sexual Offenses*, by Teal Kozel, Psy.D.
  - ◆ *Rethinking Parole Conditions*, by Dr. Brian Lovins
  - ◆ *Practical Recommendations for Understanding and Incorporating EDI Considerations in Release Decisions*, by Danielle J. Reiger
  - ◆ *Improving Supervision Through Collaborative Partnerships*, by Mac Pevey and Joselyn Lopez
  - ◆ *Centering Victims in Parole Decision-Making and Parole Supervision*, by Kelsey Hansen, Jennifer Kisela, Mark Langan, and Julie Micek
  - ◆ *Strengthening Cross-Agency Collaboration; Nevada's Adult Justice System Agencies Unite to Implement System Change*, by Valerie Meade and Abigail Strait
  - ◆ *Understanding Domestic Violence Perpetration: Implications for Parolees*, by Chris Huffine, Psy.D.
  - ◆ *Questioning the Vulnerable in the Parole Process*, by Faith Geary and His Honor Peter Rook QC
  - ◆ *Embracing and Working in Collaboration with Oversight Bodies*, by Chris Cirrito
  - ◆ *Data-Driven Parole Decision-Making in Pennsylvania*, by C. James Fox and Brett Miller
  - ◆ *Assessing the Reliability and Impact of Montana Board of Pardons and Parole's Decision-Making Tool*, by Caitlin Flood and Maja Vlajnic
  - ◆ *Outreach: Demystifying Parole Decision-Making*, by Sylvie Blanchet and Lisa Saether
  - ◆ *Looking to the Future – Improving Approaches to Risk Assessment Through Better Use of Data*, by Andrew Barbee
  - ◆ *Elements of a Self-Assessment Supervision Toolkit for Releasing Authorities*, by Richard Stroker
  - ◆ *The Importance of Risk Assessment and Stakeholder Partnerships in Making Release Decisions for Individuals Convicted of Sexual Offenses*, by Corey McNally, Jeff Patnode, and Brent Borg
  - ◆ *Reentry United – Inside and Out*, by Crissa Blankenburg, Nate Johnson, Brian Shipman, and Angela Sprank
  - ◆ *Enhancing Clemency Decision-Making Through Effective Community Partnerships*, by Steve Hayes, Felecia Holloway, Crystal Moon, and Rita Rucker
  - ◆ *Women and LGBTI Populations: Ensuring Equity in the Parole Process*, by Erica King

## **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 FAD. Additional training received by the Board's forensic clinical psychologists in 2024 included the following:

- ◆ *Interviewing Individuals with a History of Sexual Offenses*, by Dr. Craig Tiofilo, Department of State Hospitals, SVP
- ◆ *MAI Notes Discussion*, by Commissioner Catherine Purcell, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Diagnostic Complexities in Evaluating Persons with a History of Sexual Offending*, by Dr. Christy Trombley, Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Impulsivity and Borderline Personality: Implications for Violence Risk*, by Dr. Wendy Chan, Senior Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Essentials of Forensic Report Writing (Part I)*, by Randy Otto, Ph.D., ABPP, Associate Professor of Psychology, Nova Southeastern University
- ◆ *Essentials of Forensic Report Writing (Part II)*, by Randy Otto, Ph.D., ABPP, Associate Professor of Psychology, Nova Southeastern University
- ◆ *Essentials of Forensic Report Writing (Part III)*, by Randy Otto, Ph.D., ABPP, Associate Professor of Psychology, Nova Southeastern University
- ◆ *Essentials of Forensic Report Writing (Part IV)*, by Randy Otto, Ph.D., ABPP, Associate Professor of Psychology, Nova Southeastern University
- ◆ *Sexual Offender Dynamic Risk Considerations (Part I)*, by Shoba Sreenivasan, Ph.D., SVP Evaluator, Clinical Professor, University of Southern California, and Jasmine A. Tehrani, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Sexual Offender Dynamic Risk Considerations (Part II)*, by Shoba Sreenivasan, Ph.D., SVP Evaluator, Clinical Professor, University of Southern California, and Jasmine A. Tehrani, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Structured Professional Judgment and Sexual Dynamic Risk Considerations*, by Shoba Sreenivasan, Ph.D., SVP Evaluator, Clinical Professor, University of Southern California, and Jasmine A. Tehrani, Ph.D., Chief Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Animal Maltreatment and Risk Assessment*, by Lacey Levitt, Ph.D., Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Intimate Partner Violence*, by Dr. Rachel Latter, Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Race, Ethnicity and Risk Assessment*, by Dr. Joel Dvoskin, Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, University of Arizona College of Medicine
- ◆ *Sexual Offending Typologies and Implications for Risk Management*, by Teal Kozel, Psy.D., Commissioner, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Socioemotional Pathways to Violence and to Desistance through Transformative Self-Awareness*, by Susan Olesek, Founder, the Human Potentialists and Enneagram Prison Project

- ◆ *Trauma Informed Conceptualization of Addiction and Recovery*, by Dr. Donna Kalauokalani, Deputy Medical Executive, and Dr. Renee Kanan, Deputy Director of Medical Services and Chief Quality Officer, California Correctional Health Care Services

## **Outreach**

Board staff met throughout the year with counsel for incarcerated persons, advocacy groups, district attorney representatives, crime victim advocates, educators, legislative staff, and other stakeholders to discuss a variety of topics concerning the Board. For example, Board staff:

- ◆ participated in quarterly meetings with DSH and CDCR to improve and streamline the state's processes for identifying persons who meet the criteria for additional treatment with DSH as a person with a mental health disorder or as a sexually violent predator
- ◆ participated in several meetings with a variety of state departments and programs responsible for community treatment and support of persons with developmental disabilities, cognitive deficiencies, or significant physical limitations to discuss and coordinate reentry options for incarcerated persons in the parole hearing process
- ◆ received feedback concerning the parole hearing process via several discussions with victims and victim's family members who participated in the parole hearing process
- ◆ discussed the parole hearing process with numerous formerly incarcerated persons, their families, and advocacy groups representing them
- ◆ provided information about the Board's parole processes to a variety of legislators, their staff, and representatives from the Legislative Analyst's Office
- ◆ participated in monthly meetings with representatives from Parole Justice Works to discuss the Board's panel attorney program
- ◆ participated in round table discussions with the Board's panel attorneys hosted by Parole Justice Works
- ◆ provided updates concerning the parole hearing process and the Board to the California District Attorneys Association's Lifer and Parole Committee and Victims' Rights Committee
- ◆ attended the Annual Training Conference for the Association of Paroling Authorities International and presented information on California's elderly parole hearing process
- ◆ participated in several meetings with counsel representing incarcerated persons in the *Armstrong*, *Coleman*, and *Plata* class action lawsuits
- ◆ attended the RISE program at California Men's Colony at the invitation of Life Support Alliance (LSA)
- ◆ attended the California State Leadership Forum, titled California for All: Advancing Adversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility
- ◆ assisted the Chief Psychologist of the Minnesota Department of Corrections

with consultation and guidance on their efforts to develop a program closely aligned with the Board's Forensic Assessment Division

- ◆ completed the Board's Parole Hearing Process Handbook, available on our website
- ◆ attended an event at the Home Free transitional housing program
- ◆ participated in events with the Division of Adult Parole Operations, with law students at the University of San Francisco, and with the Filipino American Law Enforcement Officers Association
- ◆ visited the New Way of Life reentry program in South Los Angeles
- ◆ visited the California Correctional Healthcare Facility and received positive comments about the Parole Hearing Process Handbook
- ◆ did outreach with the New York Board of Parole
- ◆ participated in outreach, touring men's and women's FACT facilities in Northern California and San Diego
- ◆ participated in a statewide training for The Impact Justice Homecoming Project and shared information regarding the parole process
- ◆ visited San Quentin Rehabilitation Center in collaboration with the Trust Organization, speaking to 40 incarcerated long-term offenders regarding parole supervision
- ◆ provided an overview of the FAD and violence risk assessment to psychology interns at the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility
- ◆ attended a resource fair at the California Health Care Facility and provided information and fact sheets, including information on the *CJLF* decision
- ◆ gave a presentation to the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office, Alternate Public Defender's Office, and the Independent Defense Counsel's Office and provided information on the evolution of risk assessments, on risk categories, and how to prepare for the FAD interview
- ◆ gave a presentation at the California Institute for Women on how to prepare for FAD interviews and suitability hearings
- ◆ attended the California State University, Fresno and Agricultural Leadership Foundation's Criminal Justice Seminar
- ◆ gave a presentation at Berkeley High School
- ◆ attended an event at Stanford Law School
- ◆ served on a panel at the University of San Francisco Law School's Second Chance Summit on Resentencing, Rehabilitation and Reentry
- ◆ attended the LSA former lifers celebration picnic in Orange County
- ◆ attended a Connect California Reentry Summit, the 2024 Palooza at the California Medical Facility
- ◆ gave a presentation at San Quentin Rehabilitation Center's Mental Health Awareness week
- ◆ met virtually with members of the Kansas Parole Board to discuss board processes

---

## ADMINISTRATION AND TECHNOLOGY

---

### **Board's Information and Tracking System (BITS) Improvements**

Each year the Board makes several significant modifications to its main computer system, BITS, allowing the Board to implement changes in the law and further streamline its processes. Below is a summary of modifications made to BITS in 2024.

- ◆ Completed the first phase of Forensics Assessment Division module redesign
- ◆ Expanded Board's Document Management (BDMS) basic search feature
- ◆ Per request from Secretary's Office changed the 1170.3 Secretary Review workflow and modified Secretary Letter to support separate letter(s) for persons with multiple counties of commitment
- ◆ Created the Schedule Hearing Officer module to streamline the process for assigning hearing officers to hearings in BITS
- ◆ Created and deployed Structured Decision-Making Framework functionality in the hearing officers' preparation dashboards
- ◆ Removed BITS dependency upon external software saving the Board an annual cost of \$68,250
- ◆ Created the BITS Utility for Support Teams – Electronic Remediation (BUSTER) to provide support features for other BITS modules, reducing the overall maintenance costs by allowing designated staff to move module workflows between work steps
- ◆ Updated Counselor Management work queues to include Notice of DPV/DNV Rights for BPH Hearings, Notice of Deaf-Signer Rights for BPH Hearings, and BPH Questionnaire
- ◆ Added a new BITS Component Library that provides developers with ready-to-use components to build new BITS screens with increasing development efficiency and improving consistency and quality
- ◆ Added functionality when documents are created in the Board's Correspondence Management Module and tied to a Clemency case are now available for access/viewing in the Clemency Detail screen under the documents tab
- ◆ Added two new document types to Sexually Violent Predator module, Juvenile Petition and Department of Justice Assessment
- ◆ Created the Board's research engine B-SEARCH which gives the Board the ability to research past/current/future Consultations, Suitability Hearings, Reconsideration Hearings, Rescission Hearings, and Expanded Medical Parole Hearings based on a wide a variety of filtering criteria reducing the Board's reliance on BITS programmers to query some of our less complex data requests
- ◆ Updated Time Served values throughout BITS, now all modules use the same calculated values from CDCR's Office of Research
- ◆ Added functionality that allows certain BITS users to review an incarcerated person's central file from BITS

- ◆ Streamlined the process for Associate Chief Deputy Commissioners to assign Deputy Commissioners to review Petition to Advance requests from incarcerated persons in the hearing cycle
- ◆ Added a system alert that notifies scheduling staff when an incarcerated person who is scheduled for a hearing has transferred out to court
- ◆ Updated the Board's Correspondence Management Module letter templates by replacing the word inmate with incarcerated person
- ◆ Began Proof of Concept research for new Entra authentication to support adding Power BI, a data visualization and business intelligence reporting tool

### **Commissioner and Executive Team Appointments**

In 2024, Executive Officer Jennifer Shaffer retired after 13 years with the Board. Governor Newsom appointed Scott Wyckoff as her successor. Governor Newsom also reappointed 7 commissioners: Commissioners Dobbs, Garland, Long, Minor, Ndudim, Sharrieff, and Taira. Also in 2024, the Senate confirmed Governor Newsom's prior appointments of Commissioners Barton, Chappell, Infante, O'Meara, Purcell, and Schneider to the Board.