

BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS

2023

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	16
Training and Outreach.....	18
Administration and Technology.....	25

This page intentionally left blank for duplication purposes.

2023

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

WORKLOAD AT A GLANCE

Parole Hearings

- ◆ **8,282 scheduled parole hearings**
 - Down 8% from 9,012 in 2022
 - 250 or 3% were for persons housed at an institution for women, unchanged from 2022
 - 8,032 or 97% were for persons housed at an institution for men, unchanged from 2022
 - 4,078 or 49% were initial hearings, down from 58% in 2022
 - 4,204 or 51% were subsequent hearings, up from 42% in 2022
 - 4,063 or 49% were youth offender parole hearings, up from 44% in 2022
 - 2,849 or 70% of those were for persons sentenced to an indeterminate term and eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, unchanged from 2022
 - 1,214 or 30% of those were for persons sentenced to a determinate-term and eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, unchanged from 2022
 - 3,438 or 42% were for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 39% in 2022
 - 3,165 or 92% of those were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 89% in 2022
 - 273 or 8% of those were for determinately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, down from 11% in 2022
 - 896 or 11% were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender¹
- ◆ **1,434 parole grants**
 - Up 14% from 1,259 in 2022
 - 35% of hearings held, up from 28% in 2022
 - 17% of scheduled parole hearings, up from 14% in 2022
 - 56 or 4% were for persons housed at an institution for women, down from 5% in 2022
 - 1,378 or 96% were for persons housed at an institution for men, up from 95% in 2022
 - 419 or 29% were grants issued at a person's initial hearing, down from 38% in 2022

¹ This is the first annual Report of Significant Events to include statistics regarding hearing outcomes for indeterminately sentenced persons who are eligible for a hearing as a nonviolent offender.

- 720 or 50% were to persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, unchanged from 2022
- 627 or 44% were to persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 39% in 2022
- 180 or 20% were to indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **2,638 parole denials**
 - Down 17% from 3,186 in 2022
 - 65% of hearings held, down from 72% in 2022
 - 32% of scheduled hearings, down from 35% in 2022
 - 74 or 3% were for persons housed at an institution for women, unchanged from 2022
 - 2,564 or 97% were to persons housed at an institution for men, unchanged from 2022
 - 1,152 or 44% were to persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, up from 39% in 2022
 - 1,228 or 47% were to persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 44% in 2022
 - 274 or 10% were to indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **572 stipulations**
 - Down 15% from 674 in 2022
 - 7% of scheduled hearings, unchanged from 2022
 - 23 or 4% were to persons housed at an institution for women, up from 2% in 2022
 - 549 or 96% were to persons housed at an institution for men, down from 98% in 2022
 - 304 or 53% were to persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, up from 43% in 2022
 - 215 or 38% were to persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 35% in 2022
 - 46 or 8% were to indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **1,827 voluntary waivers**
 - Down 7% from 1,967 in 2022
 - 22% of scheduled hearings, unchanged from 2022
 - 51 or 3% were from persons housed at an institution for women, up from 2% in 2022
 - 1,776 or 97% were from persons housed at an institution for men, down from 98% in 2022
 - 959 or 52% were from persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, up from 46% in 2022
 - 656 or 36% were from persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 35% in 2022

- 187 or 10% were from indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **1,346 postponements**
 - 9% decrease from 1,486 in 2022
 - 16% of scheduled hearings, unchanged from 2022
 - 33 or 2% were to persons housed at an institution for women, down from 3% in 2022
 - 1,313 or 98% were to persons housed at an institution for men, up from 97% in 2022
 - 671 or 50% were for persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, up from 45% in 2022
 - 528 or 39% were for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 35% in 2022
 - 166 or 12% were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender
- ◆ **465 continued or cancelled hearings**
 - 4% increase from 445 in 2022
 - 62 or 13% were continued
 - 403 or 87% were cancelled
 - 6% of scheduled hearings, up from 5% in 2022
 - 13 or 3% were for persons housed at an institution for women, down from 5% in 2022
 - 452 or 97% were for persons housed at an institution for men, up from 95% in 2022
 - 257 or 55% were for persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing, down from 56% in 2022
 - 181 or 39% were for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing, up from 34% in 2022
 - 40 or 4% were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender

Parole Reconsideration Hearings

- ◆ **188 parole reconsideration hearings scheduled**
 - Up 22% from 154 in 2022
 - 42 or 22% were initial parole reconsideration hearings, down from 29% in 2022
 - 146 or 78% were subsequent annual parole reconsideration hearings, up from 71% in 2022

Administrative Reviews to Consider Advancing Parole Hearing Dates

- ◆ 1,910 cases were screened for possible review, up 17% from 1,632 in 2022
- ◆ 1,546 cases or 81% received a review on the merits, up from 78% in 2022
 - 1,029 or 67% of cases reviewed on the merits were approved for an advanced hearing date, down from 70% in 2022

- 517 or 33% of cases reviewed on the merits were denied an advanced hearing date, up from 30% in 2022
- ◆ 56% of parole hearings held because of an administrative review conducted in 2023 to advance a person's next hearing date resulted in a grant of parole, down from 58% in 2022
- ◆ 44% of parole hearings held because of an administrative review conducted in 2023 to advance a person's next hearing date resulted in a denial of parole, up from 42% in 2022

Comprehensive Risk Assessments (CRA)

- ◆ 4,181 CRAs were completed, down 6% from 4,469 in 2022

Consultations

- ◆ 2,778 consultations conducted, down 4% from 2,894 in 2022

Correspondence

- ◆ 50,693 pieces of correspondence were received and processed, down 9% from 55,787 in 2022
- ◆ 35,079 hearing notices were sent, down 15% from 41,269 in 2022²
- ◆ 12,310 notices of determinately sentenced nonviolent offender parole reviews were sent, down 45% from 22,379 in 2022
- ◆ 1,878 letters were sent from the Legal Division, up 11% from 1,692 in 2022

Determinately sentenced Nonviolent Offender Parole Reviews

- ◆ 2,861 referrals to the Board of Parole Hearings (Board) for nonviolent offender parole review, down 38% from 4,592 in 2022
- ◆ 2,786 reviews on the merits were conducted, down 27% from 3,812³ in 2022
 - 208 or 7% of persons eligible for nonviolent parole consideration were approved for release, down from 8% in 2022
 - 2,578 or 93% of persons eligible for nonviolent parole consideration were denied release, up from 92% in 2022
- ◆ 175 referrals were reviewed and closed for lack of jurisdiction, down 83% from 1,028 in 2022
- ◆ 1,081 reviews of merit decisions were conducted, down 12% from 1,225 conducted in 2022
 - 966 decisions or 89% were upheld after review, up from 86% in 2022
 - 115 decisions or 11% were modified after review, down from 14% in 2022

² Last year, this number was erroneously reported as 57,064. The number of notices sent in 2022 was 41,269.

³ Last year, this number was reported as 4,840. However, this included 1,028 cases that were closed after the Board's jurisdictional review revealed the persons who were referred were not eligible for parole consideration. To more accurately reflect decision outcomes of cases in which the Board exercised discretion, cases closed during the Board's jurisdictional review will no longer be included in this statistic.

Executive Case Summaries

- ◆ 1,416 executive case summaries of parole grant decisions were prepared by the Legal Division, up 14% from 1,241 in 2022

Extradition Cases

- ◆ 746 extradition cases were reviewed, up 51% from 495 in 2022

Petitions to Advance a Parole Hearing Date

- ◆ 589 petitions were received, down 11% from 662 in 2022
- ◆ 589 preliminary reviews of petitions completed, down 11% from 662 in 2022
- ◆ 488 reviews on the merits of petitions received, down 8% from 531 in 2022
 - 274 or 56% of those petitions were approved for an advanced hearing date, down from 63% approved in 2022
 - 213 or 44% of those petitions were denied for an advanced hearing date, up from 37% denied in 2022
- ◆ 49% of parole hearings held as a result of the Board approving a petition to advance a parole hearing date in 2023 resulted in a grant of parole, down from 56% in 2022
- ◆ 36% of parole hearings scheduled as a result of the Board approving a petition to advance a parole hearing date in 2023 resulted in a denial of parole, up from 34% in 2022

International Prisoner Transfer Program

- ◆ 47 cases completed, up 7% from 44 in 2022
- ◆ No persons were transferred to another country, unchanged from 2022

Investigations

- ◆ 1,451 pre-parole investigations were completed, up 15% from 1,266 in 2022
- ◆ Three intimate partner battering investigations were completed, unchanged from 2022
- ◆ 448 Board-initiated investigations were completed, up 39% from 323 in 2022⁴
- ◆ 75 Board-initiated investigative fact findings were completed⁵
- ◆ 36 parolee out-of-state transfer request investigations, up 28 in 2022
- ◆ 7 special condition of parole modification investigations, down from 11 in 2022
- ◆ 39 expanded medical parole reviews were completed, up from 34 in 2022
- ◆ 1,140 pardon investigations were completed, up 5% from 1,084 in 2022
- ◆ 47 commutation investigations were completed, up from 33 in 2022

Medical Parole Hearings

- ◆ 52 medical parole hearings scheduled, up from 14 in 2022

⁴ 279 investigations conducted in 2023 concerned allegations of fraud involving payments from the California Employment Development Department.

⁵ This is the first annual Report of Significant Events to include statistics regarding Board-initiated investigative fact findings.

Offenders with Mental Health Disorders (OMHD) Actions

- ◆ 361 certification hearings were conducted, down 4% from 378 in 2022
- ◆ 378 placement and annual review hearings were conducted, up 2% from 371 in 2022
- ◆ 322 holds to detain persons for OMHD screening were placed, down 49% from 629 in 2022

Parole Discharge Reviews

- ◆ 10,809 cases were reviewed to determine whether a parolee should be discharged from parole, down 20% from 13,454 in 2022

Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) Screening

- ◆ 3,482 SVP screenings, up 14% from 3,058 in 2022
 - 2,361 or 68% of cases were referred for clinical screening, unchanged from 2022
 - 1,121 or 32% of cases were closed as not meeting criteria for clinical screening, unchanged from 2022
 - 2,352 clinical screenings completed by the Forensic Assessment Division (FAD), up 17% from 2,003 clinical screenings completed in 2022
 - 470 or 20% of persons were referred after clinical screening to the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) for a full evaluation, up from 19% in 2022
 - 1,882 or 80% were not referred after clinical screening to DSH for a full evaluation, down from 81% in 2022

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 2023, the Board held **4,071** hearings resulting in the following outcomes:

2023 Outcomes of Hearing Held		
Outcome	Number	Percentage
Grant	1,434	35%
Denial	2,638	65%
Total	4,072	100%

Parole Grant Outcomes as a Percentage of Hearings Held

Grant rates for parole **hearings held** in 2023 are as follows:

- ◆ 35% of all hearings held resulted in a grant, up from 28% in 2022
- ◆ 43% of hearings held for persons housed at an institution for women resulted in a grant, up from 42% in 2022
- ◆ 35% of hearings held for persons housed at an institution for men resulted in a grant, up from 28% in 2022
- ◆ 38% of hearings held for persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a grant, up from 34% in 2022
 - 42% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a grant, up from 37% in 2022
 - 24% of hearings held for determinately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a grant, up from 21% in 2022
- ◆ 34% of hearings held for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant, up from 26% in 2022
 - 35% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant, down from 37% in 2022
 - 23% of hearings held for determinately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a grant, up from 9% in 2022
- ◆ 40% of hearings held for persons eligible for a hearing as an indeterminately sentenced nonviolent offender resulted in a grant
- ◆ 49% of hearings held as a result of a person filing a petition to advance their next hearing date in 2022 resulted in a grant, up from 46% in 2022

- ◆ 56% of hearings held as a result of an administrative review conducted in 2022 resulted in a grant, down from 58% in 2022

Parole Grant Outcomes by Comprehensive Risk Assessment (CRA) Rating⁶

- ◆ 67% of hearings held for a person with a CRA rating of low risk for future violence resulted in a grant of parole
- ◆ 37% of hearings held for a person with a CRA rating of moderate risk for future violence resulted in a grant of parole
- ◆ 3% of hearings held for a person with a CRA rating of high risk for future violence resulted in a grant of parole

Parole Denial Outcomes as a Percentage of Hearings Held

Various denial rates for parole **hearings held** in 2023 are as follows:

- ◆ 65% of hearings held resulted in a denial, down from 72% in 2022
- ◆ 57% of hearings held for persons housed at an institution for women resulted in a denial, down from 58% in 2022
- ◆ 65% of hearings held for persons housed at an institution for men resulted in a denial, down from 72% in 2022
- ◆ 62% of hearings held for persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a denial, down from 66% in 2022
 - 58% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a denial, down from 63% in 2022
 - 76% of hearings held for determinately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing resulted in a denial, down from 79% in 2022
- ◆ 66% of hearings held for persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial, down from 74% in 2022
 - 65% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial, down from 72% in 2022
 - 77% of hearings held for determinately sentenced persons eligible for an elderly parole hearing resulted in a denial, down from 91% in 2022
- ◆ 60% of hearings held for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender resulted in a denial
- ◆ 51% of hearings held as a result of a person filing a petition to advance their next hearing date in 2022 resulted in a denial, down from 54% from 2022
- ◆ 44% of hearings held as a result of an administrative review conducted in 2022 resulted in a denial, up from 42% in 2022

⁶ 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 2023, Black and Latinx incarcerated persons were granted parole at a rate slightly higher than white incarcerated persons. The overall rates varied by a total of six percent, from highest to lowest grant rate.⁷

Grant Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Hearings Held in 2023			
Outcome	Black	Latinx	White
Grant	38%	35%	32%
Deny	62%	65%	68%

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 17 percent for scheduled hearings, therefore, **does not** mean the remaining 83 percent of scheduled hearings resulted in a denial. In 2023, the Board scheduled **8,282** hearings resulting in the following outcomes:

2023 Scheduled Hearing Outcomes		
Outcome	Number	Percentage
Grant	1,434	17%
Denial	2,638	32%
Stipulation	572	7%
Voluntary waiver	1,827	22%
Postponement	1,346	16%
Cancelled/Continued	465	6%
Total	8,282	100%

Using the **scheduled hearing** outcomes above, 1,434 people were granted parole and 2,638 people were denied parole by the Board after a hearing. Another 572 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 3,638 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, or cancelled.

⁷ 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 5,248 people serving a term of life with the possibility of parole were released from state prison between fiscal year 2011-12 and fiscal year 2018-19 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 (2.8% or 137 people) were convicted of a new misdemeanor or felony crime within three years of release and less than one percent (0.5% or 23 people) were convicted of new felony crimes against persons during the same three-year period.

Fiscal Year of Release	No. Released	No. with any new felony or misdemeanor conviction within 3 years of release	% with any new felony or misdemeanor conviction within 3 years of release	No. with new felony conviction for crime against person within 3 years of release	% with new felony conviction for crime against person within 3 years of release
FY 2018-19	1,051	23	2.2%	2	0.2%
FY 2017-18	757	15	2.0%	1	0.1%
FY 2016-17	701	13	1.9%	6	0.9%
FY 2015-16	720	23	3.2%	5	0.7%
FY 2014-15	682	16	2.3%	3	0.4%
FY 2013-14	510	16	3.1%	3	0.6%
FY 2012-13	478	20	4.2%	2	0.4%
FY 2011-12	349	11	3.2%	1	0.3%
Total	5,248	137	2.8%	23	0.5%

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Comprehensive Risk Assessments

Each year the Board's Chief Psychologist presents to the Board an analysis of comprehensive risk assessments (CRA) 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 2022, 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 2022, 17% of examinees were rated low risk, 57% of examinees were rated moderate risk, and 26% 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 2023, the Board scheduled 3,435 hearings for persons eligible for elderly parole, resulting in 627 grants, 1,228 denials, and 215 stipulations to unsuitability. The remaining 1,365 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 2023, the Board scheduled 52 medical parole hearings, resulting in 32 approvals and 8 denials; the remaining 12 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. Beginning in January 2020, the overall rate for panel attorney representation was \$750 per case, with most

panel attorneys being assigned up to 13 clients for one week of hearings each month.

The Budget Act of 2021 included funding for a one-year pilot program requiring panel attorneys to provide an additional hour of counsel to their clients before they were interviewed by one of the Board's forensic psychologists for their comprehensive risk assessment. This resulted in a temporary increase in the overall panel attorney rate from \$750 per case to \$900 per case, for attorney appointments beginning July 1, 2021. In addition, the Budget Act required the Board to submit an analysis of the impact of the additional hour of counsel to the Legislature by January 10, 2023.

The Budget Act of 2022 extended the pilot program through June 30, 2023, and extended the deadline to the end of 2023 for submitting an analysis of the impact of the additional hour of counsel to the Legislature. The report was submitted to the Legislature, and it concluded that the increased rates helped the Board to recruit and retain panel attorneys. The report also found the pilot program served as impetus for the Board changing its procedures to better ensure incarcerated persons have an opportunity to meet with their attorney prior to being interviewed for their CRA by one of the Board's forensic psychologists. Lastly, the report found that due to a variety of risk-relevant factors unrelated to a person's legal representation, it was not possible to ascertain the impact of an additional hour of counsel on CRA risk ratings or parole hearing outcomes.

The Budget Act of 2023 temporarily increased the Board's panel attorney rate from \$900 per case to \$945 per case for attorney appointments beginning July 1, 2023. The increase was based on a survey of rates paid by 10 counties and the federal courts for comparable legal work.

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 of 2023, Parole Justice Works has collected and coded 3,178 surveys from incarcerated persons represented by panel attorneys soliciting feedback on all areas of parole representation. The results show that 70% 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 67% 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 2023, the Board received 2,861 referrals under this program and conducted 2,786 reviews on the merits, resulting in 208 being approved for release and 2,578 denied release. An additional 175 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 2023, the Board scheduled 896 parole hearings for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a parole hearing as a nonviolent offender, resulting in 180 grants, 274 denials, and 46 stipulations to unsuitability. The remaining 396 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 2023, the Board conducted 10,809 parole discharge reviews.

Prosecutor Participation in Parole Hearings

Of the 4,072 parole hearings held in 2023, a prosecutor attended 2,487 (or 61%). Of those 2,487 hearings, 797 (or 32%) resulted in a grant of parole and 1,690 (or 68%) resulted in a denial. As previously noted, the grant rate for all hearings held in 2023 was 35 percent and the denial rate was 65 percent.

Structured Decision-Making Framework (SDMF)

The number of parole hearings scheduled increased 73 percent in five years, from 5,226 hearings scheduled in 2018 to 9,012 hearings scheduled in 2022. The increase was due primarily to changes in the law (statutes and court decisions) that expanded the number of people eligible for a parole hearing.

To meet a projected increase in parole hearings, the Board was expanded from 15 to 17 commissioners in 2019 and again from 17 to 21 commissioners in 2021. In addition, the Board adopted the SDMF in 2019 to streamline the hearing process and make parole hearings more efficient by focusing hearing panels on evidence-based risk factors.

The SDMF is a structured professional judgment 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 parole hearing decisions. The SDMF is intended to produce parole decisions that are structured, consistent, transparent, and focused on a person's current risk. As of 2023, the SDMF is used in 12 states within the U.S. and the National Parole Board of Canada, which developed the tool.

Since the Board implemented the SDMF, the average length of a parole hearing decreased by 23 percent, from more than three hours in 2018 to less than two and a half hours in 2023.

In 2021, California was selected to participate in a project co-sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections and the Association of Paroling Authorities International to form a “community of practice” with other parole boards that use the SDMF. The collaboration focuses on ways for parole boards to increase their capacity to sustain use of the SDMF with fidelity. In 2023, Board staff participated in several community of practice meetings. In addition, Board staff participated in a leadership meeting for the National Institute of Corrections’ Paroling Authority Network, comprised of parole boards currently using the SDMF.

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 15th, 20th, or 25th 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 15th, 20th, or 25th 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 2023, the Board scheduled a total of 4,063 youth offender parole hearings; 2,849 were for indeterminately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing and 1,214 were for determinately sentenced persons eligible for a youth offender parole hearing. The 4,063 scheduled hearings resulted in 720 grants (35% of hearings held), 1,152 denials, and 304 stipulations to unsuitability. The remaining 1,887 scheduled hearings were waived, postponed, continued, or cancelled. In 2023, 49 percent of scheduled parole hearings were youth offender parole hearings.

Victim and Survivor Participation in Parole Hearings

In 2023, 36 percent of parole hearings scheduled had at least one victim or victim’s family member who requested to be notified of the hearing. A victim or victim’s family member attended 18 percent of hearings held (728 of 4,072 hearings). Thirty percent (30%) of hearings held in 2023 with a victim or victim’s family member present resulted in a grant of parole and 510 (or 70%) resulted in a denial. As previously noted, the grant rate for all hearings held in 2023 was 35 percent and the denial rate was 65 percent.

LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

The information below reflects legal developments as of December 31, 2023.

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. Briefing on the motion is complete.

California Supreme Court Cases Pending in 2023

The following cases are proceeding as criminal appeals and the Board is not a party to the litigation.

People v. Williams – California Supreme Court, No. S262229

The question presented: Does Penal Code section 3051(h), 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, No. S277487

A petition for review was granted after the second district court of appeal found the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment was violated by excluding people who were sentenced to life without the possibility of parole from youth offender parole consideration. The court found that the defendant, who committed a special-circumstances felony murder at age 25 and was sentenced to life without the possibility of parole, was similarly situated to persons serving parole-eligible life sentences for crimes committed when they were 25 years of age or younger.

California Court of Appeal Cases Pending in 2023

Criminal Justice Legal Foundation v. CDCR, 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.

Significant Cases Resolved in 2023

***Gay v. Parsons* – 61 F.4th 1088**

The court found that the Board's FAD psychologists were not entitled to absolute judicial immunity because the findings of FAD psychologists are neither binding, nor controlling on the parole hearing panel, nor do FAD psychologists function in a judicial decision-making capacity.

***Peterson v. Board of Parole Hearings (real party Cottle)* – Third District, No. C096833**

The matter was dismissed as moot after Cottle was transferred to the juvenile court, was resentenced, and released. The issue raised was whether the legislation enacting Penal Code section 3051(b)(4), which authorizes parole consideration for juveniles sentenced to life without the possibility of parole, was broader than necessary to remedy constitutional violations in sentencing juveniles to life without the possibility of parole.

Writs of Habeas Corpus

In 2023, the state was required to file a response to 68 habeas petitions filed in state and federal court (down 33% from 102 in 2022). In 2023, 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 2022.

Regulations

On November 17, 2023, the Board filed a notice of proposed rulemaking action with the Office of Administrative Law, seeking to amend notice requirements for victims and their family members who intend to attend a parole consideration hearing. The regulations are expected to take effect in 2024.

TRAINING AND OUTREACH

Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner Training

The Transcript Analysis Program provides commissioners with periodic legal feedback regarding their parole hearing decisions. In 2023, 21 consultations occurred between the Board's Legal Division and commissioners under the Transcript Analysis Program, which is three more than occurred in 2022.

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 training was provided to commissioners and deputy commissioners in 2023:

- ◆ *Ashker v. California* (N.D. Cal., No. C 4:09-cv-05796-CW (RMI)), by Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *CALPIA Rehabilitative Efforts*, by William Davidson, General Manager, and Michele Kane, Assistant General Manager, External Affairs, California Prison Industry Authority
- ◆ *Sex Offender Risk Assessment: Review of Relevant Risk and Protective Factors*, by Dr. Shoba Sreenivasan, Ph.D., Forensic Psychologist (Sexually Violent Predator Evaluator), and Dr. Allen Azizian, Ph.D., Senior Psychologist (Specialist), Clinical Operations, Department of State Hospitals
- ◆ *How Being Trauma-Informed Improves Criminal Justice System Responses*, by Marina Rangel, LCSW and Statewide Mental Health Pre-Release Coordinator, Statewide Mental Health Program, California Correctional Health Care Services, and Carla Fish, Parole Agent II, Division Training Unit, Division of Adult Parole Operations, CDCR
- ◆ *Overview of the Board's Process for Handling Hearing-Related Procedural Matters*, by Tara Doetsch, Chief Deputy of Program Operations, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Access to Medical Records at Parole Hearings*, by Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Compassion, Fatigue, and Recovery*, by Bethany Jones, Senior Television Producer
- ◆ *Training on Accessing Medical Records*, by Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Overview of Pre-Release Process for Long-Term Incarcerated Persons in the Developmental Disabilities Program*, by Marina Rangel, Clinical Social Worker, and Kimber Redmon, Clinical Social Worker, California Correctional Health Care Services
- ◆ *2022 Year in Review with the Forensic Assessment Division*, by Dr. Jasmine Tehrani, Chief Psychologist (Acting), Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Impact of Aging on Physical and Cognitive Health*, by Dr. Michele DiTomas, Chief Medical Executive, California Correctional Health Care Services

- ◆ *Dealing with the Weight: Resources and Strategies for Employee Wellness*, by Dr. Briana Rojas, Chief Psychologist, Associate Director, Office of Wellness, CDCR
- ◆ *Adolescent Brain Development, Life Course Persistent, and Adolescent Limited Offender*, by Dr. Terrie Moffitt, Professor of Psychology, Duke University
- ◆ *The Regilla Project: A Review of BPH Suitability Hearing Transcripts to Assess Frequency and Consideration of Intimate Partner Violence among Women Convicted of Homicide Offenses*, by Debbie Mukamal, Executive Director, and Lauren Courtney, Law Student and Research Assistant, Stanford Criminal Justice Center, Stanford University
- ◆ *Intimate Partner Violence*, by Dr. Nancy Kaser-Boyd, Forensic Psychologist
- ◆ *Interview and Questioning Techniques*, by Dr. Kirk Luther, Professor, Carleton University
- ◆ *Integrated Substance Use Disorder Treatment (ISUDT)*, by Dr. Renee Kanan, Deputy Director of Medical Services and Chief Quality Officer, and Dr. Donna Kalauokalani, Deputy Medical Executive, California Correctional Health Care Services
- ◆ *Behavioral Health Reintegration Program (BHRP)*, by Dr. Alexa Wasserman, Chief Psychologist, and Dr. Elizabeth Kita, Clinical Social Worker, Division of Adult Parole Operations, CDCR
- ◆ *Grant Rates by Comprehensive Risk Assessment (CRA) Risk Level*, by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Articulating a Tie Decision*, by Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Sex Offender Typologies and Implications for Risk*, by Teal Kozel, Psy.D., Commissioner, Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, and Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Qualifications of FAD Psychologists, Comprehensive Risk Assessment Process, and the Structured Decision-Making Framework*, by Emily Wisniewski, Psy.D., ABPP, Chief Psychologist (Acting), Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, and Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Use of Medical Records at Parole Hearings*, by Kerry Kunz, Associate Chief Deputy Commissioner and Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Overview of Scheduling Parole Hearings and Notice Requirements*, by Tara Doetsch, Chief Deputy of Program Operations, and Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Overview of Pre-Release Process for Long-Term Incarcerated Persons in the Developmental Disabilities Program*, by Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, Christopher Hoeft, Senior Attorney, and Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Update from Division of Adult Parole Operations*, by Jason Johnson, Director of Division of Adult Parole Operations, CDCR

- ◆ *Litigation Update*, by Sara Romano, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Correctional Writs and Appeal Section, Office of the Attorney General
- ◆ *Update from the Division of Rehabilitative Programs*, by Brantley Choate, Director, Division of Rehabilitative Programs, CDCR
- ◆ *CDCR Update*, by Jeff Macomber, Secretary, CDCR

In addition, four commissioners appointed or confirmed by the Senate in 2023 attended an intensive eight-day training program entitled, *Administrative Law: Fair Hearing* at the National Judicial College

Commissioners also attended an annual training conference hosted by the Association of Paroling Authorities International in 2023 with the following training sessions:

- ◆ *Parole Under the Microscope: Lessons to Be Learnt from a Parole System Under Scrutiny*, by Martin Jones, Chief Executive, Parole Board for England and Wales
- ◆ *Why Is This Affecting Me? Fostering Resilience through Effective Self-Care Strategies*, by Audrey Cress, Director of Victim Services for the Kansas Department of Corrections
- ◆ *Trauma Informed Accountability with Those Who Engage in Domestic Violence*, by Danielle Thompson, Office of Victim Services, Kansas Department of Corrections
- ◆ *Building an Electronic Pardon Process: "Pardons in the 21st Century" Processes, Consideration, and Impact . . . Redemption!* by Lisa Copeland Deputy Director, Clemency, Crystal Moon, Deputy Division Director, and Kim Patton-Johnson, Deputy Director of Clemency Investigations, Georgia State Board of Pardons and Parole
- ◆ *Balancing Independence, Accountability, and Compliance for Quality Decision-Making*, by Sarah Byron, Manager of Professional Standards (Acting), and Doug Kirkpatrick, Board Member, National Parole Board of Canada
- ◆ *Interstate Compact for the Parole Board Member*, by Tracy Hudrlik, Deputy Compact Administrator, Minnesota Department of Corrections
- ◆ *What We Have Learned About Elderly Parole*, by Jessica Blonien, Chief Counsel, Jennifer Shaffer, Executive Officer, Dr. Jasmine Tehrani, Senior Psychologist, and William Sullivan, Commissioner, California Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Safely Reducing Parole Revocations Through Evidence-Based Decision-Making*, by Valerie Meade and Maja Vlajnic, Crime and Justice Institute
- ◆ *Understanding Systemic Racism: Key to more Effective Supervision of Individuals of African Descent*, Dr. Robert S. Wright

- ◆ *Panel Discussion on Institutional Programming and Parole Decision-Making for Persons Convicted of Sexual Offenses*, by Mark Keating, Board Member, Kansas Prisoner Review Board, Kecia Rongen, Chair, Washington Indeterminate Sentence Review Board, Thando Tsetsewa, National Director for Parole Administration, South African Department of Correctional Services, and Scott Widmer, Board Member, Ohio Parole Board
- ◆ *Healing Through Dialogue; The Kansas VOD Program*, by Emma Barnett, Restorative Justice Specialist, and Kelsey Rose, Restorative Justice Coordinator, Office of Victim Services, Kansas Department of Corrections
- ◆ *Quality Assurance — Next Steps Following Implementation of SDMF*, by Dr. Kirk Luther, Assistant Professor, and Danielle J. Rieger, Ph.D. candidate, Carleton University, and Richard Sparaco, Executive Director, Connecticut Board of Pardons and Paroles
- ◆ *Advancing Fairness and Transparency: National Guidelines for Post-Conviction Risk and Needs Assessment*, by David A. D'Amora, Senior Policy Advisor, and Lahiz P. Tavárez, Senior Policy Advisor, Council of State Governments Justice Center
- ◆ *Evidence Based Substance Use Disorder Treatment —From Incarceration to Parole*, by Sarah Johnson, Director of Addiction Services, Kentucky Department of Corrections
- ◆ *Utilizing Interview and Available Information to Optimize Parole Decision-Making*, by Dr. Kirk Luther, Assistant Professor, Carleton University

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 2023 included the following:

- ◆ *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

- ◆ *Parole Transitions and Resources and Community Risk Management*, by Dr. Alexa Wasserman, Chief Psychologist, and Elizabeth Kita, Clinical Social Worker, Division of Adult Parole Operations and Ryan Youtsey, Senior Investigator, Board of Parole Hearings
- ◆ *Parole Justice Works: The Experiences of Parolees Released by the BPH*, by Heidi Rummell, Clinical Professor of Law and Director, Post-Conviction Justice Project, Gould School of Law, University of Southern California
- ◆ *Advanced Interviewing of Persons with a History of Sexual Offending*, by Dr. Shoba Sreenivasan, Forensic Psychologist, Forensic Services Division, Department of State Hospitals, and Clinical Professor of Psychiatry and Law, Institute of Psychiatry and Law, University of Southern California
- ◆ *Adolescent Brain Development, Life Course Persistent, and Adolescent Limited Offender*, by Dr. Terrie Moffit, Professor of Psychology, Duke University
- ◆ *Intimate Partner Violence*, by Dr. Nancy Kaser-Boyd, Forensic Psychologist
- ◆ *The Regilla Project: Intimate Partner Violence among Women Convicted of Homicide Offenses*, by Debbie Mukamal, Executive Director, Criminal Justice Center, Stanford University
- ◆ *Traumatic Brain Injury: Implications for Violence Risk Assessment*, by Dr. Anna Myers, Psychologist, FAD, Board of Parole Hearings

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
- ◆ participated in SDMF "community of practice" meetings co-hosted by the National Institute of Corrections and the Association of Paroling Authorities.
- ◆ participated in a leadership meeting for the National Institute of Corrections' Paroling Authority Network, comprised of parole boards currently using the SDMF
- ◆ 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 an overview of the Board's parole suitability process, including the Board's SDMF and the role of the FAD at seminars hosted by Life Support Alliance
- ◆ assisted in coordinating the California Agricultural Leadership Foundation's Criminal Justice Seminar and provided an overview of the Board's parole hearing process and the state's clemency process
- ◆ 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
- ◆ provided information on the Board of Parole Hearings and the parole hearing process to the legislature's Public Safety Committee's Policy Academy
- ◆ provided information to incarcerated individuals as part of Mental Health Awareness Week at San Quentin State Prison
- ◆ attended a screening of the documentary film, *26.2 to Life*
- ◆ attended the Annual Training Conference for the Association of Paroling Authorities International and presented information on California's elderly parole hearing process
- ◆ provided an overview of the parole hearing process to the Rotary Club of Woodland
- ◆ provided an overview of violent risk assessment to psychologist interns at Richard J. Donovan State Prison and graduate students at University of California, Irvine
- ◆ presented information about the Board's use and implementation of the SDMF at the National Parole Board of Canada's Annual Training on Risk Assessment
- ◆ provided information about the parole hearing and reentry process to incarcerated persons as part of Prison Palooza 2.0 at California Medical Facility
- ◆ Provided information about the parole hearing process to the Office of the State Public Defender
- ◆ provided information about the Board's SDMF to the Correctional Writs and Appeal Section, Office of the Attorney General
- ◆ provided information about the parole hearing process to various journalists and other media representatives
- ◆ attended an event at San Quentin to support graduates of a program hosted by the Enneagram Prison Project

- ◆ provided information on risk assessment for those who are elderly or medically compromised to the California Medical Facility Hospice Facility
- ◆ provided information about the Board and parole supervision at a reentry event hosted by Impact Justice
- ◆ provided information about the parole and community re-entry processes to sociology students at the University of San Francisco
- ◆ provided information about the Board and parole supervision to incarcerated persons at San Quentin State Prison
- ◆ participated in several meeting with counsel representing incarcerated persons in the *Armstrong*, *Coleman*, and *Plata* class action lawsuits
- ◆ attended an event honoring graduates of various Anti Recidivism Coalition programs at the Central California Women's Facility

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 2023.

- ◆ Further streamlined and significantly expanded the electronic process for drafting, tracking, and issuing release memoranda in BITS; once signed, release memoranda now electronically appear for processing in work queues for CDCR Case Records Services staff
- ◆ Added electronic prompts for CDCR's Case Records Services staff to review a person for youth parole hearing eligibility when CDCR receives a new or amended Abstract of Judgement
- ◆ Expanded functionality for calculating parole eligible dates for persons who receive a commutation of sentence
- ◆ Created several new automated business reports, converted most existing critical business reports to new technology, and significantly enhanced numerous existing automated reports
- ◆ Expanded functionality for Case Records Services staff to identify and calculate parole eligible dates for persons serving terms for nonviolent convictions for crimes they committed while in prison (*Tate* terms).
- ◆ Redesigned the Board's document management system to allow for significantly improved organization and storage of documents throughout BITS
- ◆ Automated email alerts to scheduling staff when CRAs are completed and uploaded into BITS
- ◆ Created and deployed new functionality to assist hearing officers in managing their hearing calendars and expedite review of critical information when preparing for a hearing
- ◆ Expanded work queues for sexually violent predator (SVP) clinical screenings
- ◆ Worked with CDCR to ensure information previously displayed from BITS on CDCR's "Inmate Locator" correctly displays on CDCR's web-based search engine, the California Incarcerated Records and Information Search (CIRIS)
- ◆ Updated text from BITS displayed on CIRIS, including replacing the term "inmate" with "incarcerated person"; made similar changes to several notices and other correspondence generated in BITS
- ◆ Worked with the Governor's Clemency and Parole Team to streamline clemency and parole processes; developed and deployed functionality to allow for a more efficient exchange of relevant data between the Governor's Office and the Board
- ◆ Developed and deployed functionality for drafting, tracking, and issuing "miscellaneous decisions"

California Information Records Information Search (CIRIS)

In 2023, CDCR's Enterprise Information Services Division developed and deployed CIRIS, a new public web-based search engine. CIRIS displays a variety of public information about persons incarcerated in CDCR facilities, including parole eligibility and parole hearings. The CIRIS replaced CDCR's previous search engine known as the "Inmate Locator." A significant amount of information displayed in CIRIS comes from BITS. As such, Board staff worked with CIRIS developers to make relevant information in BITS electronically available for public display in CIRIS.

Commissioner and Executive Team Appointments

In 2023, Governor Newsom appointed Commissioner Infante to the Board and Ryan Youtsey as Chief Deputy of the Board's Offender Investigations and Screening Division (now the Investigation and Reentry Screening Division). In addition, Governor Newsom reappointed the following five commissioners to the Board in 2023: Commissioners Barton, Chappell, O'Meara, Purcell, and Schneider. Also in 2023, the Senate confirmed Governor Newsom's prior appointment of Commissioners Kozel, Muñiz, Ndudim, and Weiss to the Board.

Document Production

The Board continued to produce an unprecedented volume of data and reports for litigation, CDCR's Office of Research, CDCR's Office of Legislative Affairs, the Governor's Office, the Department of Finance, the Legislature, and in response to requests received under California's Public Records Act.