
Computer Errors Allow Violent California Prisoners to be Released Unsupervised

Rhea Mae Edwards

Instructions

1. For each slide, synthesize your research and write in complete sentences in essay format using 14pt type.
 - a. Write about each area/question on each slide.
 - b. Add additional slides if you need more room.
 - c. Use the green instructions in the notes below each slide to focus your research.
 - d. Research similar cases to expand your knowledge.
 - e. If an area/person doesn't seem to fit your topic, then broaden your research as needed.
 - i. When in doubt, write the instructor for clarification using the Canvas Inbox.
 - f. Cite sources using hyperlinks, like this: Title of the Article or Law in the sentence. See the example on the [Writing Requirements](#) page.
 - i. Cite Laws, Acts, Agencies, Cases, Articles, Studies, etc.
 - g. Get help with research by consulting the [Research Tools](#) page.
 - h. Locate Laws and Acts in the Canvas Modules area.
2. Add all sources to the Bibliography page.
 - a. Include author, title, publisher, date, and URL.

Timeline

According to the article "[Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised](#)", the program to place prisoners under non-revocable parole, along the implementation of the new software being used, began due to overpopulation in California's prisons.

An initial study was conducted, reviewing 200 case files out of 10,134 former inmates that were placed under non-revocable parole. It was estimated that based on their 15% error rate being resulted from the sample, that more than 450 violent inmates during the first seven months of the program were granted, being ineligible to be in it.

The error rate has dropped from 15% to 8% according to the investigators studies stated by the article "[Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised](#)", after some of the computer problems have been corrected during this time.

January
2010

January - July
2010

July
2010

May
2011

May 2011
to Present

Spoken by inspector general spokeswoman, Renee Hansen, reported by the Los Angeles Times, article titled "[Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised](#)", that there has not been any attempt "to return of the offenders [back] to state lockups or place them [back] on supervised parole".

The article "[Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised](#)" was posted by the Los Angeles Times, in regards to the issue of this program granting California prisoners non-revocable parole with the use of prison officials and a software program, where assumptions based on the title of the article, mainly blames the software program for granting ineligible privilege to violent inmates.

Executive Team

Responsibilities.	What they did right.	What they did wrong.
<p>The executive team in this case study would be in charge of implementation of the program of placing prisoners on non-revocable parole, “where participants are not required to report to parole officers and can be sent back to prison only if caught committing a crime”, that started in January 2010, in order to help to problem of overcrowding in California prisons, explained by the article titled “Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised”.</p>	<p>The executive team was able to implement the program within the prisons, which also to reduce the populations of inmates within them. Inmates were given participation in the program of non-revocable parole, and the prison officials also using the implemented software program were able to do their job within the program. Also the program continues to be implemented as a whole till ever since it has to reported and described by the Los Angeles Times article.</p>	<p>The program granted participation to called violent inmates. With seven months into the program, it was predicted that more than 450 inmates were ineligible for non-revocable parole. The program they implemented was not entire perfect. There were and are some bugs with how the program is completing its job at hand of reducing the population in the California prisons. It is just their use of power was both decreasing the safety of the society as a whole due issues within the program.</p>

Attorneys and/or Governing Organizations

Responsibilities.	What they did right.	What they did wrong.
The responsibilities of the attorneys and/or governing organizations of this situation of the implementation of the non-revocable parole program, is to either help result any disputes that may occur or help control the overall progress of what is being done within and beyond the California prisons.	The attorneys and/or governing organizations for the California prisons implementing the non-revocable parole program, are able to conduct their general jobs of what they do for the prisons. Being able to follow any of laws that become revalent to any situation or problem they are faced with or what they have to focus their attention to and work on. Overall, they are doing their job for these California prisons.	Regarding the fact that “no attempt [has] been made to return any of the offenders to state lockups or place them on supervised parole, said [by] inspector general spokeswoman Renee Hansen” in the “ Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised ” article, the attorneys and governing organization are lack on what they can do after the fact of wrongly classify inmates to the non-revocable parole program with these California prisons. They could be doing more after the fact.

Outside Testers (Investigators)

Responsibilities.	What they did right.	What they did wrong.
Outside Testers/Investigators were responsible for analyzing the performance of the non-revocable parole program, basing their results off the information of the software being used by the prison officials and additional information of the inmates being sent through this process of the California prisons, which was explained by the Los Angeles Times article " Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised ".	They were able to conduct their studies. Their initial study being done in one sample of July 2010 with reviewing 200 case files out of 10,134 former inmates who were on non-revocable parole of that month. They were able to come to their result of 31 of those inmates being ineligible for the program, and nine of those being likely to commit violent crimes again, resulting in a 15% error rate overall, concluding that within the first seven months of the program being implemented by the prisons, that over 450 violent inmates were on non-revocable parole.	These outside testers/investigators in a sense took advantage of their use of power by only basing the information off the results of the software being used and the case files of the inmates on the non-revocable parole, and not considering the limitations of the software being used which the prison officials do not have. Prison officials should also be considered with the error rate being at what it is at any given time the study is being conducted.

In-House Programmers

Responsibilities.	What they did right.	What they did wrong.
In-house programmers have the responsibility to create the software that the prison officials would use on their computer systems to help determine the qualification an inmate has for the non-revocable parole program based on the information it is given by the users and the prisons in this case.	The in-house programmers were able to create a software program that determined the qualification of an inmate's eligibility for the non-revocable parole program based off the required input from the user and any information of an inmate that was put into its database that it has access to and ability to use to make its decision. The program was given a limitation regarding the privacy of an inmate, that which this "computer program that the prison officials used to make [the] assessment does not [have] access [to] an inmate's disciplinary history.	The software program that the in-house programmers created, inhabited a handful of bugs that caused the program to wrongly resulted the qualification status of an inmate. There was an initial error rate of 15% percent analyzed of the software program, which reported by the " Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised ", was reduced to and 8% error rate after some changes and fixes to the software program in regards to this error rate issue.

Users (California Prison Officials)

Responsibilities.	What they did right.	What they did wrong.
<p>The responsibilities of a California prison official, is to determine the qualification of an inmate for the non-revocable parole program. They are responsible to make their decision based off their use of the software program being used for the program, and any additional information of the inmate in question.</p>	<p>A California prison official was able to make a decision of the qualification of an inmate for the non-revocable parole program. They have the use of their power in order to do so by make that ultimate decision for an inmate. They are granted the access to an inmate's files, any additional information, and the use of the software program that is a part of the implementation of the non-revocable parole program in the California prisons in order to aid the overall issue of overcrowding in the prisons.</p>	<p>The law that was created for the non-revocable parole program, "Non-Revocable Parole", states that an inmate is excluded for the non-revocable parole program "if they are gang members, have committed sec crimes or violent felonies or have been determined to pose a high risk to reoffend based on an assessment of their records behind bars". The software program does not have access to such information of an inmate, so it is up to a prison official to take that information in high account to, which may not have been done properly in the process.</p>

Culprits (Prisoners/Inmates)

Responsibilities.	What they did right.	What they did wrong.
<p>The prisoners/inmates being the culprits in this case study, has the responsible to be who they are. The things and the potential crimes they have committed, does not have much relevance in this situation overall. The purpose of this case study is the analysis of the of how the non-revocable parole program is implemented and how it is being done within the California prisons.</p>	<p>The prisoners/inmates are mostly accepting their final call on if they are qualified for the non-revocable program or not. The ones who end up being in the program, most of them are true to what the program offers in regards to their extended limitation of their freedom within the society. There are given a higher quality of life compared to what they had before hopefully.</p>	<p>Some of the prisoners/inmates that are in the non-revocable parole program, do not follow the rules that the non-revocable parole program limits them to. Being who they truly are not being mainly relevant in this case study, as a prisoner/inmate, what they can do wrong is somewhat limited based off the rules and limitations stated within this non-revocable parole program within these California prisons.</p>

And the blame goes to...

Executive Team

27 %

Because...

They were the implementers of the non-revocable parole program for the California prisons. Without the executive team, no program would exist. Based off the workable theory rule utilitarianism, the purpose of the program was to aid the overpopulation problem in the prisons, which it did, but the program did have its issues with being implemented.

In House
Programmers

28 %

Because...

In reality, no program, even being just a little bit more than a couple lines of code, can be free of bugs. It is just no timely possible. The amount of bugs can be reduced in a timely manner though. The error rate was reduced from 15% to 8% according to the article [“Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised”](#).

Prison Officials

44 %

Because...

Since the “computer system can’t access an inmate’s disciplinary record,” whereas a prison official can, who also have the final say in if an inmate can be put on non-revocable parole or not, I believe they are the most to blame for the issue of inmates considered violent criminals being put on this program that they are not eligible for. They cannot rely heavily on the software they are using just because it makes the decision easier, it’s ultimately up to them for the fate of an inmate.

Victims/
Inmates

1 %

Because...

If there were not any victims in a criminal scenario, there would not be any people that we would call criminals. There would not be any criminal scenarios to claim the level of risk a single inmate and even being considered as a criminal.

Bibliography

- [1] J. Dolan, "California prisoners: Computer errors allow violent California prisoners to be released unsupervised," in Los Angeles Times, latimes, 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/may/26/local/la-me-prisons-20110526>. Accessed: Feb. 20, 2017.
- [2] "Division of Adult Parole Operations Non-Revocable Parole," in California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation, Web Task Force, 2009. [Online]. Available: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/parole/non_revocable_parole/index.html. Accessed: Feb. 20, 2017.

Citation Style: IEEE